189573

Authorize a competitive solicitation for a law enforcement records management system for the Police Bureau

If you wish to speak to Council, please print your name, address and email

Name (PRINT)	Address and Zip Code (*Optional*)	Email (*Optional*)
~~*(illegible)*~~		~~*(illegible)*~~
✓ Maggie		
✓ Diana		
✓ Joanne		
✓ Steve Suo		

Date 6-19-19   Page ___1___ of ___1___

McClymont, Keelan

From:	SPJ Oregon <spjoregon@gmail.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:53 AM
To:	Council Clerk – Testimony
Subject:	[User Approved] [Zip File Attached]Written testimony for this morning's agenda item # 602
Attachments:	SPJcomments-Portlandrecordsmanagement.pdf; publicrecordssystems.zip

Hi there, we at the Society of Professional Journalists would appreciate it if you could circulate the attached testimony, including with members of the Council, in advance of item #602 this morning. Please email us with any questions, attention Amanda Waldroupe, chapter president. Thanks.

```
********************************************************************
************ Please Do Not Reply To This Message **************

As per the City of Portland email policy, the email security
appliance (SonicWALL) has quarantined an email that contains a
zip file
attachment. To protect your computer, this file has been placed
in your personal Junk Box.

As always, please exercise caution when retrieving attached zip
files. Unsolicited email or emails from an unknown source may
contain files containing malware, viruses, or other malicious
computer code.

If you have questions, please call the BTS Helpdesk at 503-823-5199.

********************************************************************
********************************************************************
```

SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS®

June 19, 2019

Re: City of Portland agenda item #602, police records management system

To the City Council:

The Society of Professional Journalists, Oregon Territory Chapter, believes an essential function of any new Portland records management system should be the ability to efficiently retrieve and disclose public records upon request.

In item #602 on this morning's agenda, regarding a proposed police records management system, SPJ appreciates the proposed council direction of "greater efficiency and ease of use than the current RMS and user interface, at a lower total operating cost." We would respectfully request that you also ask that any future system employed by the city of Portland be efficient for the public — not just for internal bureau users. Specifically, to the extent that the new system will interact with or produce databases — as the current system does — we urge the Portland Police Bureau to include the following requirements:

- System shall allow all tables in any database to be exported in bulk or in part, with all or selected fields to be included, into a non-proprietary format such as comma-delimited text. Export shall occur in response to simple user inputs rather than requiring specialized new code to be written.

- Any production of databases produced by the system shall include a document, sometimes known as a data dictionary, describing the names, contents and formats of all fields and tables in the database. This document shall be a public record that is available for public inspection under ORS 192.420 et seq.

Some vendors do not make exportability a standard feature, and others make it so that any export requires agency programmers to write specialized queries. This drives up the cost to government, as well as the public, of providing records that are public under Oregon law. The export function should be point-and-click, so that it may be performed by city employees without programming knowledge.

Data dictionaries, meanwhile, make it possible for requesters to formulate narrow and intelligent requests for electronic records. They provide a menu of data elements that are most useful to answering the requester's questions. A data dictionary makes clear how records in one part of the database are linked to records in another part. It helps a requester to evaluate whether or not a specific data field could plausibly be considered exempt when a public body asserts that it is. A dictionary also enables requesters to avoid data components that would be considered exempt for one reason or another, or elements that would require costly review or redaction.

Portland's existing database vendor for police data, Versaterm, considered its data dictionary a trade secret. Requests for copies were denied due to the trade secrets exemption in Oregon records law, adding unnecessary hurdles and cost for the public's ability to analyze information about how police apply the law. As you can see in the attached zip file, which includes a published article from a professional journal, and surveys conducted on the topic, government informational professionals around the country are increasingly recognizing the importance of sensible records and data management systems when it comes to public information. We ask that Portland consider this factor as well.

Yours,

Amanda Waldroupe

President, Oregon Territory Chapter, Society of Professional Journalists

Member, SPJ Freedom of Information Committee

Crime Reporters Survey 2016 Excerpt on Public Records

Are public records available online?

All the time	4	2.7%
Most of the time	19	12.7%
Some of the time	61	40.7%
Rarely	39	26.0%
Never	24	16.0%
Special cases	3	2.0%

Does the police department you mostly deal with have a computer system that makes public records more readily accessible?

Yes	37	24.7%
No	75	50.0%
Partially	38	25.3%

If "partially," please explain.

Info is emailed	4	11.4%
Limited access	8	22.9%
Limited/Redacted Information	14	40%
Other	9	25.7%

Question 31: Does the police department you mostly deal with have a computer system that makes public records readily accessible? If "partially," please explain.

It's their own system, and access is limited to what they can retrieve from their own computers.
Breaking news items are no longer available online as it had been in the past.
we get some very limited info about crimes that occur online
They have a portal that gives you access to offense reports, calls and jail blotter information however the narratives are usually skimpy in detail.
The availability of documents depends on what the incident is.
Older records are rarely online
Some information, such as annual reports, jail booking records and crime statistics, is available online. But police reports for specific cases are not.
VSP has a blog where they post their press releases
Court dockets are available online
DPD emails daily Incident and Arrest reports that provides information about suspects and victims that, frankly, the PIO might not release if you asked for it. The jail website also provides information about arrestees, their charges, court schedule, bond, court case #
It's hard to find names, and almost impossible to find officers' names.
Online
No juvenile records.
The documents are readily available to them, but we have to wait for them to be sent to us. Some older records aren't as readily available.
Indiana allows quite a bit of redaction under "investigative" privilege. We used to get brief narratives, but now only date, time, type of call, etc.
Our county jail has records of inmates online but the information it shares only goes so far
On a daily basis, the blotter is sent faxed to me, and then I speak personally to the police chief. The sheriff sends his report by email, and if need be I communicate with him either in person or by email. The current sheriff does not send a report daily, but we get a jail log daily.
Jail booking information and some court records are available online, as are daily watch logs.
Police reports are not posted but will be emailed if requested - unless the investigation is ongoing, and then only some will be
The police do not publish police reports online, only basic info. If a defendant is served with a warrant, I rather go get the criminal complaint. That record will have more information than the PIO can provide.
Some limited information is available on the web. The rest has to be gathered in other ways.
Quick summaries are listed in an online police log. Most are a sentence or two long. Must call or obtain for more info.

Arrests and some police reports available online

there is seldom uniformity. if a case is "straight up," with no questions about police conduct, then records are more accessible than when there are questions about police conduct.
It's a court system under all agencies. Not always updated, but typically is.
You can track crime trends, but it only goes back so far and the vitals of most crimes are usually not included, such as names, addresses, ages, etc.
Accident reports are available from a statewide data base for a fee as are criminal histories.
Yes they have a computer system, but the media is not allowed to have much of that information - only initial police reports, not supplemental ones.
They e-mail me reports or mug shots (after clearing it with the Chief Deputy.)
The department is quite willing to pull up CAD reports, etc. in a timely manner, but it typically requires swinging by the department.
Officers have fast access to information to pass along to me, but I can't access an electronic system with records of their arrests.
We receive daily police reports but they are the typed/edited versions and, they are not always complete. I used to go through each handwritten report every day (often 1-2 hours at a time). You could get real information from those.
Detailed information often is not available.
Inmate rosters and arrest records are online, but contain minimal information. Press releases are texted and emailed. but they only write releases for things that make their office look good. They sporadically use Facebook for safety-related and breaking news situations.
Most police depts. are going digital, but not all. Redactions of key info (names, addresses, etc.) is an overwhelming problem.
Sometimes info is available
each jurisdiction is different
Not all records are accessible.
Names, trial dates and charges are usually available online, but details about the cases are not.
The metro area that I deal in has 41 different jurisdictions, with the two biggest being Arlington and Fort Worth. The resources, the access, the staffing, the outlooks of the different organizations vary.

3

How long did it take the PIO or other designated custodian of records to respond for a request for a public record?

Immediately	6	4.0%
Within the required timeframe under relevant law	106	70.7%
Eventually, but after the deadline under relevant law	22	14.7%
Didn't respond at all	2	1.3%
I have not made these requests	14	9.3%

If the request was fulfilled, did they provide you with the information you asked for?

Yes	74	56.1%
No	9	6.8%
Partially	49	37.1%

If "partially," please explain.

Confidential	3	7.50%
Other	6	15%
Partial information given	15	37.50%
Redacted	16	40%

Question 34: If the (public records) request was fulfilled, did they provide you with the information you asked for? If "partially," please explain.

It's hit or miss
they rarely give us all we need
some names are redacted
There will be times when the PIO does not reveal some information I requested until I've asked a few times.
Some of it was not public record, in their opinion
Sometimes relevant information is redacted when the investigation is ongoing
So things redacted, per Ohio law.
Records of closed criminal investigations often refer to other records that aren't included
Often they bank on the notion that you're not going to sue, and provide only partially responsive records or compiled (not primary) records.
redaction runs rampant.
Some will be denied based on their interpretation of what is confidential.
If I ask more than one question, seems as though they rarely address more than the first one.
Sometimes documents are redacted to the point they are of no use to a reporter.
they always refuse to give us 911 calls
Some of it was excepted.
It depends on the case and the circumstance.
It wasn't everything I was looking for
redactions

Insisted some information wasn't public because of an "ongoing" investigation when such claim was dubious at best
Often, the do not provide historical records when asked
Redacted
seldom does a law enforcement agency not challenge a request to the AG's office, but there are exceptions
This is always a hit or miss process. Sometimes helpful, sometimes not. Most smaller metro agencies are easier to work with as far as getting quick info.
I've made several requests. the last one involved a request for detailed data in an electronic format. they provided aggregate data in a grainy pdf of a photocopy.
Sometimes yes, sometimes no. It rarely met all of what was being asked.
Redactions, and sometimes denials on grounds of ongoing investigation
often receive redacted copies
We receive redacted documents. Names, phone numbers, addresses are redacted.
Redactions often made of names, addresses, other identifiers
sometimes the PIO gets back with redacted records, sometimes doesn't respond at all hoping I will go away, sometimes responds completely-- I have actually had a PIO tell me he'll give me the records this time "because he wants this information out"
If a detail is not included in the original record
I have had cases where they said they are unable to find the information I want.
Not all detailed information was provided.
Usually the information is heavily redacted, even if the subject of the information is dead and has no more privacy rights.
The sheriff's office claimed not to be able to find an old file for a cold case investigation. Someone eventually found it in an obscure place and turned it over to me. But it was only a partial file, and it became clear that they hadn't actually looked for it in all the places they needed to look.
Most police and law enforcement reports are heavily redacted; they provide them, but key info (names, addresses, etc.) are often redacted for a variety of reasons.
provided what they thought was relevant and not what they wanted to use in case of an appeal of convicted felon but the requested info was shown in a public court
Some was "Still part of an ongoing investigation" some was redacted
Some information was provided, but not to the extent requested.
Some items fall into a gray area of sunshine law; police often do not release information that they deem to be of an "investigative" nature. PA law keeps "investigative" information off the table.

Did the PIO or custodian answer questions you had about the public records or the information you were seeking?

Yes	88	67.7%
No	17	13.1%
Partially	25	19.2%

If "partially," please explain.

Bare minimum/unaware	10	62.5%
Info on redactions	3	18.75%

18

Other	3	18.75%

Question 36: Did the PIO or custodian answer questions you had about the public records or the information you were seeking? If "partially," please explain.

Sometimes the question can't be answered by the officer in charge's access to the records, in which case no effort is made to ask the officers directly.
They usually let the records speak for themselves, or will only explain them on background.
we rarely get answers to all our questions
they cannot explain why they redact so much info.
They do not get very specific about why it is not being provided, sometimes.
Same as last answer
they give us some news but don't answer all questions

34

the PIO answers some questions, but not others, particularly re redactions
Normally once a release or a request is sent, they will only say the things on the release. So if you had a follow up question to the information obtained, it is rarely answered on the spot.
Not all of the information was included and often matters are classified as "under investigation," but a fuller explanation is not given.
Give only bare minimum, and require questions be super specific. They play games with semantics and police definitions in ways to deny even basic information. It's a game for them to prevent info from getting out.
Difficult to explain
PIO often lacked relevant knowledge or access to information desired
often vague or unaware of the full expectations/requirements of the law
see answer 33
Gave bare minimum with an attitude.

How old is the records management software in the computer system being used by your police department?

1-3 years	31	21.4%
4-6 years	21	14.5%
7-9 years	18	12.4%
10-15 years	21	14.5%
More than 15 years	10	6.9%
I don't know	43	29.7%
Our records are not computerized	1	0.7%

Does the system allow you to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents?

Yes	70	50.4%
No	38	27.3%
Partially	31	22.3%

Does the system allow you to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents? If "partially," please explain.

Redactions	13	54.17%
Other	11	45.83%

Has the department worked with organizations specializing in public records, such as SPJ or others, to develop a system for easily and quickly providing public records sought out by the public and by journalists?

Yes	22	15.5%
No	63	44.4%
I don't know	57	40.1%

Were you instructed on the use of records management software and public records system?

Yes, thoroughly	42	29.8%
Yes, somewhat	75	53.2%
No, not at all	24	17.0%

Question 21
Does the system allow you to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents? If "partially," please explain.

There are redaction functions but we still have to use Adobe to ensure it is fully redacted as allowed by Georgia Open Records Act.
Manual tracking
If there are additional documents attached in the original report. All public records requests are handled by our records bureau/city clerk's office. Not the PIO for official records
Some items are automatically redacted and some items must be done manually
Everything documented by a law enforcement agency has the potential to be considered investigatory.
Information in our records system must be redacted by computer software or by hand depending on the type of record. Personal identifying information is not automatically redacted either.
There is a redact feature listed but not used.
Based on Louisiana public record laws, some things are obvious (black and white) as to whether they can be released publicly, while others are up for interpretation. Ultimately, I only release what I KNOW to be public record. Otherwise, I would have the reporter make an official records request which is handled by our staff attorney, not me as the PIO.
I still have to use my own judgment or get advice from detectives on whether certain information can/should be released.
It has redaction built in, but not perfect - records staff and I still have to do hand redaction. Working on this with software company.
Our RMS generates PDF documents. We use a combination of RMS tools and PDF redacting tools to ensure only "right to know" information is released.
I don't know if I can accurately explain.
For media distribution, I must redact phone numbers on reports and social security numbers and driver license numbers on warrants.
We have public copies of reports but often provide additional information upon request if it doesn't interfere with an investigation or violate confidentiality or privacy laws.
There are different access levels in the program, so the investigatory product is generally not accessible, but sometimes too much information is put in the initial report which is accessible to the public.
It is incumbent on my office to look at what is investigative, cleared, expunged or sealed, etc.
The system we use was originally started in 1993 and has had numerous updates and upgrades over the years. Some of the functions are sometimes sketchy.

Must be able to determine public and private copies of reports.

If an investigation is still on-going I confer with the detective to ensure evidentiary information is not released if it is included in the initial police report.

33

Information on public versions of reports differs slightly depending on which modules of the system you use. We do have a very user-friendly public-facing module that allows people to get crash reports and public case reports. I strongly encourage departments to get crimemapping.com so residents can see what crime trends are in their neighborhood.

Some information still has to be redacted manually

Phone information is present on incident reports and must be redacted before forwarding to the media. Social security numbers and driver's license numbers are present on warrants and must be redacted before forwarding to the media.

I have a section I can utilize that most others cannot access.

I can find the information but I must redact or limit what is put out

189573

Mediated Access

Police Public Information Officers and Crime Reporters on Message Control, Social Media, Body Camera Footage and Public Records

Dr. Carolyn S. Carlson
Kennesaw State University;
School of Communication and Media.
Kennesaw, United States
ccarls10@kennesaw.edu

Paymon Kashani
Kennesaw State University;
School of Communication and Media,
Kennesaw, United States
pkashani@grad.kennesaw.edu

Abstract—Crime reporters and police public information officers struggle over control of the messages that the public receives on crime. This study is based on national surveys of both groups in the United States and measures their perceptions on message control, use of social media, and the handling of body camera footage and public records.

Keywords—gatekeeping, agenda setting, public information officers, crime reporting, message control, police body cameras, social media, public records

I.   INTRODUCTION

Journalists and public relations professionals have long had a love-hate relationship, mainly because of conflicts over setting the public agenda and struggles over gatekeeping (Cameron et al. 2012). This tension is seen vividly in the relationship between reporters who cover crime and the public information officers who work in law enforcement. Crime reporters are not alone among reporters who feel government public information officers in the United States are focusing their efforts more and more on trying to control the messages that their agencies send out to the public, by trying to control what information reporters have access to (Carlson & Cuillier, 2014).

Research has shown that obtaining interviews with government officials have become more difficult throughout the years since the increase in power of public information officers (PIOs) (Cameron et al. 2012;

Carlson & Cuillier, 2014; Carlson. Cuillier, and Royer, 2015). PIOS are the communication professionals of governmental organizations such as police organizations, environmental organizations and so

forth. Many governmental organizations require that all interviews with government employees be cleared by or in the presence of a PIO. Naturally, this occurrence causes an increase of work for journalists and governmental employees. Part of this research seeks to examine whether or not PIOs are also acting as controllers for messages being sent by employees.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

A great deal of research has been conducted on the relationship between public relation practitioners and journalists. An earlier study of the relationship between government public information officers and political reporters, for instance, found that message control was a higher priority among federal level PIOs – and a bigger source of frustration for the political reporters who cover them – than with PIOs and reporters at lower levels of government (Carlson & Cuillier, 2014). Another study conducted by Carlson. Cuillier, and Royer (2015) found that science and environmental workers tend to struggle retrieving information from government agencies. Carlson. Cuillier. and Royer (2015) found that 74.2 percent of respondents in the study had to have their questions preapproved before interviewing.

Not many studies have been conducted on the relationships between public information officers and journalists concerning body cameras and information being sent and received between the two. This literature review will explain the definition as well as the application of the agenda setting theory and the theory of gatekeeping. previous research conducted on the use and importance of body cameras, and the relationships between government PIOs and the media.

a.   Agenda-Setting Theory

Serban (2015) described the theory of gatekeeping as infinite events take place every day and thus journalists must pick and choose which

information is to be delivered to the public. Thus with so many events taking place the journalists have the power on which topics should be shown and discussed. This theory however acts as though the journalists have complete control where as other studies claimed that external factors also come into play such as professional norm.

The theory of gatekeeping is the actual travel of information before being received by the public. Once received and ready to be broadcasted to the public is where the agenda-setting theory takes place. According to Mohn (2015), agenda-setting theory states "the media affects society by deciding which topics people view as most important." The agenda-setting theory states that what the media decides to cover has a direct impact on the public's mind regarding several issues such as political figures, events, and other objects of attention.

Agenda-setting ultimately creates social norms and can alter what is accepted and unacceptable in society such as fashion trends, politics and so forth. (McCombs and Shaw 1972, McCombs 2005, Berkowitz 1992). Though journalists are retained as gatekeepers who carry an agenda to create a setting, the police department's PIOs can ultimately be seen as gatekeepers too. This is because they are a part of the message being sent, the PIOs have a direct hand in the message even though ultimately the journalist has the power to direct that message in a certain light. PIOs can make the decision of how much or little information is given to the gatekeepers which can ultimately define how the public receive and understand that information. Journalists, as gatekeepers, have the choice in whether to release that information given or seek information elsewhere (Bennett 1990, Gans 1979). This relationship a part of what this study seeks to examine more in-depth.

b. Body Cameras

The call for police officers to wear body worn cameras (BWC) is growing rapidly in the US (Moreno, 2016; Sweat, 2016; Reinitz, 2016, Grimm, 2016). A great deal of news articles has been written on the positive and negative traits that the use of BWC's have for the public and government. Stanley (2013) says that overall however, individuals and the government will find the use of them as a win-win. According to Stanley (2013) "We're against pervasive government surveillance, but when cameras primarily serve the function of allowing public monitoring of the government instead of the other way around, we generally regard that as a good thing."

According to Drover and Ariel (2015) officers were gradually becoming more and more supportive of BWCs because there had been many incidents in which the footage captured had led to guilty pleas. Coudert, Butin, and Le Métayer (2015)

said that police forces have been able to reclaim credibility in some countries dealing with corruption issues. The US Department of Justice said the need for body cameras is to capture the police officer's perspective during a time when camera phones are so easily accessible (Coudert, Butin, & Le Métayer, 2015). Drover and Ariel (2015) also found that once officers had informed members of the public that they were being captured by body cameras the individuals' demeanors would become more calm which allowed a more compliant situation to take place. Overall, however, the use of BWCs is still in its infancy in the United States and little has been written about the issues involved in handling the footage from these cameras as it relates to public records. This paper seeks to examine these issues.

c. Social Media

Social media has become an essential aspect of many organizations. According to Dyer (2016) 78 percent of Americans now have a social media presence on at least one platform. The importance of timing when it comes to social media is crucial to an organizations brand (Scott, 2012). Fitch (2012) explained that clear policies must be created before social media usage because professionals will typically want to respond quickly to one's publics. These policies will help slow down the social media manager and keep the individual on keeping a consistent message.

Social media should be closely monitored by an organization and kept up to date. Social media allows organizations to conduct two-way communication which keeps their respective communities engaged as well as create a cheaper and easier way for organizations to listen and study their publics.

According to Fitch (2012), one of the greatest assets an organization can have is a website to communicate to the public as well as reporters. This quick access to the public and reporters' organizations hold the power to either make or break a brand's image. If one took too long to release information then speculation can lead to rumors and if one responds too fast with inaccurate information than future information may be disregarded (Fitch, 2012).

Also according to Fitch (2012), social media and websites of the organization can affect employee morale. If police officers are constantly being contacted because the reports are not being released or too little information is being released it can deter morale.

A study conducted by Meijer and Thaens (2013) found that the participating police departments each used social media in different forms to meet their individual needs. Meijer and Thaens (2013) found that "all police departments use social media to increase

transparency, to support inter- and intra-organizational collaboration and to enable new and innovative forms of public participation and engagement" (p. 349).

d. Public Records

Seeking public records has become a routine task for journalists. Public records are a main source for journalists who cover crime and other governmental positions. The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) was created in 1967 and provides individuals of the public to access records of any federal agency (FOIA, 2016).

Journalists White (2015) said, "I usually file at least one request a week." Journalists who request public records tend to have to wait several days and in some rare cases months in order to gain access to them (Dissell, 2011; Gillum, 2016; Wallack, 2014; Blasko, 2015a; Blasko 2015b).

Lightfoot and Wisniewski (2014) found that power resides in the governmental agents who collect data on the public and they retain that power by selectively disseminating it. Lightfoot and Wisniewski felt that, to avoid censorship, it is necessary for the collected data to be looked over by a third party.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study is experimental in nature, mainly because few studies have been conducted in the area of crime reporters and their relationships with police public information officers. Therefore, the researchers are examining a number of research questions:

R1: What are police PIOs doing to control the message from their police agencies? And, relatedly, how do reporters deal with these controls and where are these controls more pronounced?

R2: How are police PIOs handling the release of body camera footage and to what extent and how are crime reporters using the footage?

R3: How are police PIOs using social media to distribute their messages, and what are the issues that crime reporters have about using it?

R4: What roles do the computer systems and programs play in the release of police public records? How smoothly is that process working?

IV. METHODOLOGY

The police public information officer survey was conducted online from January 11, 2016, to February 9, 2016.. An email invitation was sent by National Information Officer Association to its membership roster of 783, with two reminder messages. We received 181 responses, for a response rate of 23.1 percent. The margin of error for a sample size of 783 is 3.5 percent.

Of the respondents, 95.6 percent work full-time for a law enforcement agency as a PIO. The rest worked as a PIO as only part of their duties. One described themselves as a freelance PIO. Over half the respondents (56.2%) have six or fewer years of experience working as a PIO. Nearly a fifth (18.1%) of the respondents have been working as a PIO for more than 15 years, 14.2 percent with seven to nine years' experience and 11.6 percent with 10 to 15 years' experience. Over half (57.8%) worked in law enforcement before working as a PIO, 16.2 percent worked in journalism and 9.7 percent worked in public relations; the rest worked in other fields or were students. The largest portion of respondents (42.1%) work in the South, 21 percent in the Midwest, 13.1 percent in the West, 11.2 percent in the Southwest, 10.5 percent in the Northeast and 2.1 percent worked either internationally or nationally. Nearly 100 (92) out of 129 respondents are between the ages of 37 and 56.

The crime reporters survey was conducted online from January 4, 2016, to February 8, 2016. An email invitation was sent to a sample list of people identified as journalists covering crime or journalists identifying themselves as general assignment. The list of participants was provided by the Meltwater Intelligence Company. The original list of 6,500 was purchased by the Society of Professional Journalists. Using the random number generator function in Excel, we took a sample of 1,626 to send the initial invitation to. We sent five reminder emails over the next several weeks. We were somewhat surprised that almost half of the emails either bounced back or were never opened. We made telephone calls to 41 individuals on the sample list who had not responded and half were apparently no longer employed and most of the rest were out of the office. We think that was the issue with our sample as a whole.

Table 1: There are reporters or media outlets I will not allow officers to talk to because of problems with their stories in the past.

	Level of Government			
	Fed	State	County	City
Strongly agree	0	27.8	29.5	16.7
Somewhat agree	33.3	44.4	34.1	30.0
Somewhat disagree	33.3	16.7	25.0	26.7
Strongly disagree	33.3	11.1	11.4	26.7*
Not applicable	0	0	4	7

*Independent Z-Test, $p<.05$, City compared to County

However, 738 did open one of the emails and 256 clicked through to the survey (15.7%). Of those, 195, or 12 percent, went on to complete at least some of the survey, with 144 completing the entire survey, which was somewhat lengthy. The sample size of 1,626 carries a margin of error of 2.4% at a confidence level of 95 percent.

Of the respondents, 91.7 percent work full-time as reporters and/or editors/producers. The others worked part-time, as a freelancer, or something other. The most workers worked for a small daily newspaper (20.2%), closely followed by mid-sized daily newspaper (19.7%). The rest of the reporters working are as follows: for television (18%), for large daily newspapers (13.7%), for weekly newspapers (9.3%), for magazines (1.6%), for wire services (2.7%), for radio (3.8%), online only media (7.1%) and the rest

Table 2: I have been prevented by the public information office from interviewing officers/investigators in a timely manner.

	Region				
	NE	SO	MW	W	SW
All the time	4.3	5.9	4.3	9.1	
Most of the time	30.4*	17.6	13.0	9.1	5.9
Some of the time	32.6	32.4	39.1	27.3	47.1
Rarely	19.6	32.4	13.0	36.4*	23.5
Never	13.0	11.8	30.4	18.2	23.5
MEAN	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4

*Independent Z-Test, $p<.05$, NE compared to SW and W compared to MW

Table 3: Thinking of the last time you were prevented from interviewing a police officer/investigator, please explain the reason you were given, if any.

	Region				
	NE	SO	MW	W	SW
PIO Only/ Not authorized/ It's police	22.6	37.5	28.6	45.5	38.5
Ongoing Investigation	19.4	37.5*	21.4	27.3	7.7
Unavailable	22.6	12.5	35.7	18.2	23.1
No reason given	25.8*	8.3	14.3	4.5	15.4
Other	9.7	4.2	0	4.5	15.4

*Independent Z-Test, $p<.05$, South compared to Southwest and Northeast compared to West

(3.8%). Their beats were closely divided with crime and police (33.0%) and general assignment (31.9%), courts (14.8%) and other (20.3%) followed. Nearly a quarter of the participants (24.1%) said they spend 75 percent of their time contacting local or state law enforcement agencies for stories. Almost a third of participants said they spend about 50 percent of their time doing so. Most of the respondents had a good bit of experience as a crime reporter: 29.3 percent more than 20 years, 23.8 percent, 11 to 20 years, 29.9 percent three to 10 years, and 17.0 percent less than three years. Roughly half of the respondents (50.37%) were between the ages of 47 to 66.

The results of the two surveys were analyzed primarily by cross tabulation, with the questions in the PIO study sorted by education, gender, and level of government, and the questions in the crime reporters study sorted by type of media outlet, beats, percentage of time spent on the beat and geographic region. The only crosstabs to yield any significant findings were the level of government for the PIOs and the geographic regions for the crime reporters. Also, three areas of questions were similar for both surveys and those results were compared to each other and tested for significance using the Independent Z-test for percentages.

V.   FINDINGS

a) Controlling the Message

Almost all the law enforcement public information officers surveyed believe it is their job to make sure accurate information from their agency is conveyed to the public (98%). They try to manage the message that goes out to the public by instituting policies that require the officers in their agencies to refer reporters to the PIO when they are contacted directly by reporters (74% strongly agree, 26% somewhat agree).

Table 4: I am able to acquire crime information easily from the officer in charge at a crime scene.

	Region				
	NE	SO	MW	W	SW
All the time	0	9.7	12.6	3.4	11.8
Most of the time	15.0	25.8	25.0	27.6	29.4
Some of the time	50.0	29.0	37.5	44.8	41.2
Rarely	25.0*	35.5*	20.8	20.7	5.9
Never	10.0	0	4.2	3.4	11.8
MEAN	2.7	3.1	3.2*	3.1	3.2

*Independent Z-Test, $p<.05$, Northeast compared to Southwest, South compared to Southwest, Midwest compared to Northeast

When there have been problems with a reporter's or media outlets' stories in the past, about half of the PIOs will not hesitate to ban the reporter or the outlet from interviews with their agency's personnel (strongly agree 19.3%, somewhat agree 30.3%). Generally, PIOs for state law enforcement agencies (27.5% strongly agree, 44.4% somewhat agree) were far more likely to ban a reporter for problem stories than PIOs for city police departments (16.7% strongly and 30.0% somewhat), and city PIOs were significantly more likely to strongly disagree (26.7%) with the practice than PIOs with county police agencies (11.4%).

Three-fourths feel it is necessary to supervise or otherwise monitor the interviews with police officers that they do grant (30.7% strongly agree, 48.7% somewhat agree). Asked for their reasons for monitoring interviews, 111 gave an answer and 70 of those mentioned a need to control the message being given out. Thirty-five said they were there to provide comfort and support to the officer being interviewed. And six said they just wanted to make sure the reporter "stayed on track".

Crime reporters, on the other hand, struggle to find information beyond the tightly controlled message sent out by the public information office. Most were allowed to interview the police chief at least some of the time (30.1%, 15.7% most of the time and 22.9% all of the time), while a quarter said it was rare that they got to speak to the chief (24.7%) and a few said it never happened (6.6%). Reporters in the South (20.6%) are more likely than reporters in the West (3.0%) to say "most of the time" they can interview the chief, while reporters in the Northeast (34.8%) are more likely than reporters in the West to say it never happens.

Access to the chief can be helpful on some stories, but in many stories about specific crimes or incidents, reporters often seek to interview a front-line officer or investigator. However, more than half reported that the PIO actually prevented them from interviewing officers and investigators in a timely manner (33.7% some of the time, 18.4% most of the time and 4.9% all of the time). More reporters in the Northeast say they are actively stopped from interviewing officers or investigators most of the time (30.4%) compared with reporters in the Southwest (5.9%). Reporters in the West, however, say this rarely happens – significantly more than reporters in the Midwest (36.4% vs. 13.0%).

When asked to explain what reasons the respondents' were given, the largest number (35 of 108) said it was simply the department's policy to prohibit the interviews with anyone other than the PIO and sometimes the police chief, sheriff or chief deputy. The two other big reasons for not getting interviews

were that the officers were in the middle of an ongoing investigation (28 of 108) or that they simply were unavailable (23 of 108).

Reporters in the South are more often given the "ongoing investigation" excuse (37.5%) compared with reporters in the Southwest (7.7%), while reporters in the Northeast say they usually don't get a reason at all (25.8%) – significantly more than reporters in the West who don't get a reason (4.5%).

These problems persist at crime scenes, where almost two-thirds of crime reporters say they get information easily from the officer in charge only

Table 5: The public information officers is present at the crime scene to deal with reporters.

	Region				
	NE	SO	MW	W	SW
All the time	0	3.3	5.0	3.7	5.9
Most of the time	8.3	40.0*	45.0*	40.7*	29.4
Some of the time	52.8	36.7	30.0	29.6	41.2
Rarely	25.0	16.7	10.0	18.5	17.6
Never	13.9	3.3	10.0	7.4	5.9
MEAN	2.6	3.2*	3.3*	3.1*	3.1*

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05, All compared to the Northeast

some of the time (40.3%), rarely (23.5%) or never (7.4%). Getting information from the officer in charge at the crime scene, however, happens less often for reporters in the Northeast (25% rarely) and South (35.5% rarely) compared with reporters in the Southwest (5.9% rarely). On average, it happens more often in the Midwest (3.2 out of 5.0) compared to the Northeast (2.7).

Crime reporters most often cannot interview the appropriate detectives or officers at the crime scenes (28.9% some of the time, 37.6% rarely, 17.4% never). Instead, they are required to obtain permission from the PIO before they can do any crime scene police interviews (20.3% all the time, 28.7% most of the time, 26.2% some of the time). That is, when the PIO is present at the crime scene to deal with reporters. That happens most of the time according to 29 percent of respondents, but only some of the time according to 36.6 percent and rarely according to 17.2 percent. PIOs show up at crime scenes most of the time in the South (40.0%), Midwest (45.0%) and West (40.7) significantly more often than in the Northeast (8.3%), where the majority of reporters (52.8%) say they see the PIO at a crime scene only some of the time (average 2.6 out of 5.0, significantly lower than 3.2 South, 3.3 Midwest, 3.1 West and 3.1 Southwest).

Table 6: How much information about crimes and incidents do you post on your agency's website, e-blast list or its social media accounts (Twitter, Facebook)?

	Level of Government			
	Fed	State	County	City
We post a news release with detailed information	0	61.1	52.1	44.1
We post a short synopsis with links to the crime incident report and/or a detailed news release	33.3	11.1	27.1*	11.8
We post a short synopsis with no links	0	5.6	4.2	27.9** and *
We typically do not post information on our website and/or social media accounts about crimes and incidents.	66.7*	15.7	6.3	8.8
We post the crime incident report and a news release.	0	5.6	10.4	7.4

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05, County compared to City, City compared to State, Federal compared to County and City (note: n=3 at the Federal level)
**Independent Z-Test, p<.01, City compared to County

When police are not being cooperative, crime reporters have learned to pursue other sources of information, sometimes witnesses and neighbors (42 of 120) or court documents and records (20 of 120). One respondent listed the way he/she would go about getting the information as "rephrase my question, ask another agency, contact attorneys, contact victims, contact suspects, contact family members involved, contact witnesses, etc." Another list included: "Attending funerals, interviewing families, pastors, store owners and neighbors, (and) cross referencing social media."

Crime reporters were somewhat divided on whether their access to police officers and law enforcement agents has become easier (5.0% significantly, 15.5% marginally), stayed the same (24.2%), or become more difficult (20.5% marginally, 21.1% significantly) over the past 5-10 years. (The rest, 13.7 percent, hadn't been on the job long enough to say.)

b) Social Media
About half of the PIOS post a news release with detailed information about crimes and incidents on their agency's website, e-blast list or social media accounts such as Twitter or Facebook (47.9%). Some post a short synopsis with a link to the more detailed crime incident report (17.6%), and some just post the synopsis with no links (16.9%). Very few will post the crime incident report itself (7.7%) or no information at all (9.9%). Two out of three PIOs for federal-level law enforcement agencies said they typically

Table 7: Speed of Posting on Internet
Reporters question -- How quickly was information posted on the website or social media accounts by a public information officer?
PIOs question -- How quickly after police learn of the incident are you typically able to post the basic information on the website or social media accounts?

	Crime Reporters (n=128)	PIO (n=123)
Within Minutes	20.3%	35.8%*
Within Hours	62.5%	43.1%*
Within Days	15.6%	21.1%

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05

Table 8: Speed of Responding to Requests for Additional Information

Reporters question -- If you asked the public information office for information not included on the website or social media accounts, how quickly did they respond?

PIOs question -- If a reporter asks you for information not included on the website or social media accounts, how quickly are you typically able to respond to the query if the information is available for release?

	Crime Reporters (n=148)	PIO (n=124)
Immediately	2.0%	11.3%*
Within Minutes	28.4%	53.2%*
Within Hours	56.8%	29.8%*
Within Days	8.8%	0.8%*

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05

do not post information on the website or social media accounts.

Both the crime reporters and the police public information officers were asked about how quickly the PIOs got information out on the Internet, and their answers showed startling different perceptions. Invariably, the PIOs thought they were delivering the materials much faster than the reporters perceived they were getting it. Most PIOs thought they were getting information posted on the Internet within minutes, or at least within hours. Fewer crime reporters said they received the information off the Internet within minutes; most said it took hours.

When reporters asked for information not posted on the Internet, the PIOs mostly thought they were getting that extra information back to the reporters within minutes. The reporters, however, were more likely to say it took hours.

Police public information officers will devote much of their resources, as in man-hours, to keeping the social media accounts and websites updated. About 10 percent say 75 percent of their resources go to social media (9.8%), while one in five say it's over half (21.1%) and about one-third say they spend 25-49 percent of their resources on social media (37.4%).

Women PIOs were more likely than men PIOs to devote more than 75 percent of their resources to updating social media (17.3% n=52, vs 4.3% n=70). State law enforcement PIOs were much more likely than municipal PIOs to devote less than 24 percent of their resources to social media (53.3% vs. 22.6%) while city PIOs were more likely to spend 50 to 74% of their time keeping social media up to date (25.8% vs. 6.7%).

c) *Body Cameras*

There's been a lot of talk about police using body cameras to record their activities, but in reality, at this point, relatively few are actually employing the devices. Only about one-third of the PIOs reported that their department employed body cameras (34.3%). Of that proportion, about 40 percent said more than 75 percent of the force wears the body cameras (39.2%), and the same amount said less than 25 percent wears body cams (39.2%).

Two-thirds of crime reporters said their state did not have specific laws governing public access to body camera footage, aside from general public records laws (64.0% no, 21.6% yes). About 30 respondents (21.6% of 139 answering the question) said their state did have specific laws governing public access to body camera footage, while seven more said their open records laws were currently being revised, or had recently been changed and the police departments had not yet developed implementation policies. "Body cameras are new around here and ordinances have not yet caught up," said one respondent.

Asked a slightly different question, police public information officers said their department had specific policies or were following laws regarding the release of body camera information to the public or the media (78.4% yes vs. 7.8% no). But apparently PIOs don't get requests for footage very often. Thirteen of the PIOs who responded said they had never gotten a request (27.1%), while 12 said they only got one every few months (25%) and 10 said they tended to get one once a month (20.8%). No one reported getting requests every day.

Table 9: What percentage of the public information office's resources (i.e., man hours) is spent on an average week updating the website, sending e-blasts and updating the social media accounts

	Level of Government			
	Fed	State	County	City
More than 76%	0	13.3	13.6	6.5
50 to 74%	0	6.7	20.5	25.8*
25 to 49%	0	26.7	31.8	45.2
Less than 24%	100	53.3*	34.1	22.6

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05, City compared to State, Federal compared to State, County and City (note: n=1 at the Federal level). State compared to City

Of the reporters, 43 of the respondents (28.9% of the 149 who answered this question) had requested footage from a police body camera. Of those, 27, or 62.8 percent, said their request was

answered positively. Only three had to pay money for the footage, at costs of $7, $50 and $80. For the rest it was free, or for two, the respondent didn't know how much it cost. For most, (n=13, 39.399), it was hard to tell if the footage had been edited, and seven (21.21%) said the footage hadn't been edited much, five said not at all. Seventeen said they used the footage on air, on a website or for information in a print news story. Four said they just watched it so they could see what happened during an arrest.

PIOs said that when they were asked for body camera footage, most commonly the footage involved a member of the public dying, an officer using bodily force or a confrontation between an officer and a member of the public. Of the requests they received, 30 percent said they are unable to grant any of them (29.3%), while about half were able to grant at least some of them (19.5% some, 19.5% most, 12.2% almost all and 7.3% all). More than half of the requests came from the media (58.3%), with the rest coming from lawyers (36.1%) and the public (5.6%).

Before the body camera footage is released, however, the footage is reviewed and sometimes edited, or redacted. Most of the time, the PIOs would redact the faces or identities of undercover officers or informants (81%), the faces of victims (71.4%), or the faces of people who were involved in the call but were not arrested or considered a victim (66.7%). Most would delete what the departments considered to be graphic images of injuries (52.4%) or inappropriate language or unnecessarily embarrassing footage, such as a naked person (47.6%). Most would NOT redact the faces of officers or those arrested, however.

d) Public Records

Not all PIOs are the public records custodians for their law enforcement agencies, but most have to deal with media requests for public records. Many are burdened with old computer systems. Half of the 145 responding said their records management software ranged from four years old to more than 15 years old (14.5% 4-6 years, 12.4% 7-9 years, 14.5% 10-15 years and more than 15 years 6.9%). Only one in five (21.4%) had records management software newer than three years old.

About half (50.4%) said the system allowed them to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents. But some said the system was only partially accessible. mostly because they still had to redact information that cannot be released, like driver's license numbers, manually.

But crime reporters tended to feel their police agencies' computer systems were not so user friendly. While more than half of the crime reporters said they could find public records online at least some of the time (40.7%, 12.7% most of the time, 2.7% all of the

time), half said the computer systems did not make public records readily accessible to either the public or the records custodian whom they were asking to find them, and 28.7 percent said those records were only partially accessible. Asked to elaborate on the "partially" answers, 22 of the 40 who said this explained that they had limited access to the information they needed.

Only a handful of PIOs (15.5%) said their agency worked with an organization that specialized in public records, such as SPJ or others, to develop the system that easily provided public records to the public and journalists. Most PIOs said they received instruction on how to use the records management software and public records system (53.2% yes, somewhat, 29.8% yes, thoroughly). And two thirds (67.3%) said they have had training in the state's open records law as it applies to police records. Some received the training from city, county or state attorneys, some from state agencies or police training facilities, some from self-initiated study and a few from sessions with First Amendment organizations or media outlets.

For the crime reporters, the majority of the time, the custodian of the public records responds to requests within the time frame allowed under their state's public records laws (70.7%), while a few (14.7%) respond eventually but after the deadline. Just over half of the time (56.1%) they provide the

Table 10: Comparing PIOs' perception of computer system's accessibility to crime reporters' perception
Reporter- Does the police department you mostly deal with have a computer system that makes public records readily accessible?
PIOs- Does the system allow you to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents?

	Crime Reporters (n=150)	PIO (n=139)
Yes	24.7%	50.4%*
No	50.0%	27.3%*
Partially	25.3%	22.3%

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05

information requested. More than 37 percent say their requests tend to be only partially filled, with the law enforcement agency redacting information from the record or only giving out part of what was requested. Two-thirds of the time (67.7%), when the reporters get the records, they are able to get the PIO or custodian to answer any questions they have about those records. Rarely, however, do they get an explanation for the redactions.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In reference to the research questions, the two studies clearly show that police PIOs are intent on controlling the message from their police agencies, mainly by requiring all reporters to go through the public information office to get crime information or to talk to anyone in the agency. They go so far as to punish reporters with whom they have had problems with their previous stories by banning them from future interviews. Many also will squelch any chance of an officer or investigator speaking on issues beyond the official message by carefully monitoring or sitting in on the interviews themselves. Crime reporters have developed various strategies for getting crime information from other sources because of these message control issues. The control problems appear to be concentrated in the Northeastern region of the United States, and the control efforts by PIOs appear to be stronger at the state level than at the local level of government.

The United States are in the early stages of using body cameras for police officers, and approximately two-thirds of both the PIOs and the crime reporters said their police agencies didn't have the cameras yet. Laws and policies for the release of the footage are still being developed. The PIOs say the few requests they've received for footage focus on potential cases of police misconduct. The biggest holdup in release the footage is having to delete, or redact, private information from the video, such as faces of bystanders or undercover officers, private spaces, or sometimes particularly gory wounds or nude people. The few reporters who have requested and received footage said they used the footage in their stories, either on television or on websites or as background for a print story.

Police public information offices have started devoting considerable time to social media, particularly using their websites to distribute information about crimes. The amount of information posted varies considerably and crime reporters say they invariably have to call for additional information. And, interestingly, the perceptions of how quickly the information is placed online is in marked contrast between the two groups – PIOs think they get it out very quickly while reporters think the time is much longer.

Not a lot of the public records kept by police agencies are posted on their websites for easy access. And when crime reporters contact the PIOs to ask for records, they report that the request often takes some time to be answered. The PIOs say their computer systems are generally old and have record-keeping software that does not make it easy to delete information that they must, by law, keep private, so they generally have to print out requested records and then go through it page by page and mark out private information. The process delays response. And reporters say when they finally get the documents, it's rare than anyone will even tell them why whole sections are deleted.

These surveys bring up many questions that warrant further study. As police body cameras become more prevalent, a more detailed study on the issues of storage of footage and the redaction process would be helpful. Another area worth exploring is the significant findings on the differences by region in the issues reporters have with police PIO message control efforts. A detailed investigation into the quality of record-keeping software might also turn up ways to expedite the release of public records by grouping private information so that it can be more easily deleted. Finally, the issues surrounding government public information officers' efforts to control the message are of great concern to the media. Twice in the last two years, 30 to 50 organizations representing the news media have co-signed letters to President Obama asking him to take action to improve transparency in federal agencies by reducing some of the strangling control efforts of federal PIOs (Reider 2014; SPJ, 2015). These efforts are likely to continue into the next U.S. presidency.

REFERENCES

[1]   Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103-125.

[2]   Berkowitz, D. (1992). Who sets the media agenda? The ability of policymakers to determine news decisions. *Public Opinion, the Press, and Public Policy*. 81-102.

[3]   Blasko, E. (2015a, Jun. 2). City's public records response called too slow. *South Bend Tribune*. 2W63019775957

[4]   Blasko, E. (2015b, Jun. 3). South Bend's public records response called too slow. *South Bend Tribune*. 2W6506082423

[5]   Coudert, F., Butin, D., & Le Métayer, D. (2015). Body-worn cameras for police accountability: Opportunities and risks. *Computer Law & Security Review: The International Journal Of Technology Law And Practice*, 31749-762. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2015.09.002

[6]   Glenn T. Cameron, Lynne M. Sallot and Patricia A. Curtin, Public Relations and the Production of News: A Critical Review and a Theoretical Framework," in *Communication Yearbook: Vo. 20*, ed. Brant R. Burleson (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2012): 111-155

[7]   Carlson, C. S., & Cuillier, D. (2014, Aug. 6). Gatekeepers Under Siege: Assessing Factors of Government Public Information Officers' Controls on Journalists. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication conference, Montreal, Canada.

[8]   Dissell, R. (2011, Mar. 14). Cleveland is slow releasing public records; Columbus often responds immediately. *Cleveland*. Retrieved from: http://blog.cleveland.com

[9]   Drover, P., & Ariel, B. (2015). Leading an experiment in police body-worn video cameras. *International Criminal*

189573

Justice Review, 25(1), 80-97. doi:10.1177/1057567715574374

[10] Dyer, J. (2016, Apr. 20). The importance of social media advertising for small businesses. *Business 2 Community*. Retrieved from: http://www.business2community.com/

[11] Fitch, B. (2012). *Media relations handbook for government, associations, nonprofit, and elected officials*. Alexandria, VA; TheCapitol.Net, Inc.

[12] FOIA. (2016). What is FOIA. *Freedom of Information Action*. Retrieved from: foia.gov

[13] Gans, H. (1979) Deciding What's News. *Pantheon Books*.

[14] Gillum, J. (2016, Apr. 13). U.S. records access on the slow track. *The Detroit News*. Retrieved from: http://www.detroitnews.com

[14] Grimm, N. (2016, Apr. 11). A year later, body cameras have positive impact in Wood River. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from: http://thetelegraph.com

[15] Johnston, L. & Baird, G. (2011, Mar. 14). Cleveland is slow releasing public records; Columbus often responds immediately. *Cleveland*. Retrieved from: cleveland.com

[16] Lightfoot, G., & Wisniewski, T. P. (2014). Information asymmetry and power in a surveillance society. *Information and Organization*, (24) 214-235. doi:10.1016/j.infoandorg.2014.09.001

[17] McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187.

[18] McCombs, M. E. (2005). A Look at Agenda-Setting: Past, Present, and Future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 543-557.

[19] McCombs, M., Shaw, D., & Weaver, D., (2014). New Directions in Agenda-Setting Theory and Research. *Mass Communication and Society*, 17(6), 781-802. doi:10.1080/15205436.2014.964871

[20] Meijer, A., & Thaens, M. (2013). Social media strategies: Understanding the differences between North American police departments. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30343-350. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.023

[21] Mohn, E. (2015). Agenda-setting theory. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.

[22] Moreno, R. (2016, Apr. 9). National city cops moving toward use of body cameras. *The Star News*. Retrieved from: http://www.thestarnews.com

[23] Reider, R. (2014, Jul. 14). An Important Crusade for Open Government. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: http://www.usatoday.com/

[22] Reinitz, J. (2016, Apr. 14). Body cam helps clear Cedar Falls officer. *The Courier*. Retrieved from: http://wcfcourier.com

[23] Scott, D. M. (2012). *Real-Time Marketing & PR: How to instantly engage tour market, connect with customers, and create products that grow your business now*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons

[24] Şerban, S. (2015). On the origin of the Gatekeeping Theory and its application to journalism. *Annals Of Spiru Haret University, Journalism Studies*, 16(2), 12-24.

[25] Cuillier, D., Foxhall, K., & Royer, J. (2015, Aug. 11). More than 50 Journalism Groups Again Urge President Obama to Stop Excessive Controls on Public Information. *Society of Professional Journalistst*. Retrieved from: http://www.spj.org/

[26] Stanley, J. (2015, Mar.). Police body-mounted cameras: with right policies in place, a win for all. *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from: https://www.aclu.org

[27] Sweat, C. (2016, Apr. 5). Organizations Call for transparency with Raleigh body cameras.

[28] Wallack, T. (2015, Jul. 6). DCF slow to respond to public records requests. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from: https://www.bostonglobe.com

Author profiles

Dr. Carolyn S. Carlson is an Associate Professor of Communication and director of the Journalism and Emerging Media major at Kennesaw State University in suburban Atlanta, Georgia, USA. She teaches the reporting and writing classes, and media law. She was a reporter for 23 years with two newspapers and the Associated Press.

Paymon Kashani is a recent graduate from Kennesaw State University where he received his M.A. in Integrated Global Communications. Kashani focused primarily on sport communications with an interest in men and women's soccer. Kashani dreams to one day own a National Women's Soccer League team for Atlanta.

answered positively. Only three had to pay money for the footage, at costs of $7, $50 and $80. For the rest it was free, or for two, the respondent didn't know how much it cost. For most, (n=13, 39.399), it was hard to tell if the footage had been edited, and seven (21.21%) said the footage hadn't been edited much, five said not at all. Seventeen said they used the footage on air, on a website or for information in a print news story. Four said they just watched it so they could see what happened during an arrest.

PIOs said that when they were asked for body camera footage, most commonly the footage involved a member of the public dying, an officer using bodily force or a confrontation between an officer and a member of the public. Of the requests they received, 30 percent said they are unable to grant any of them (29.3%), while about half were able to grant at least some of them (19.5% some, 19.5% most, 12.2% almost all and 7.3% all). More than half of the requests came from the media (58.3%), with the rest coming from lawyers (36.1%) and the public (5.6%).

Before the body camera footage is released, however, the footage is reviewed and sometimes edited, or redacted. Most of the time, the PIOs would redact the faces or identities of undercover officers or informants (81%), the faces of victims (71.4%), or the faces of people who were involved in the call but were not arrested or considered a victim (66.7%). Most would delete what the departments considered to be graphic images of injuries (52.4%) or inappropriate language or unnecessarily embarrassing footage, such as a naked person (47.6%). Most would NOT redact the faces of officers or those arrested, however.

d) Public Records

Not all PIOs are the public records custodians for their law enforcement agencies, but most have to deal with media requests for public records. Many are burdened with old computer systems. Half of the 145 responding said their records management software ranged from four years old to more than 15 years old (14.5% 4-6 years, 12.4% 7-9 years, 14.5% 10-15 years and more than 15 years 6.9%). Only one in five (21.4%) had records management software newer than three years old.

About half (50.4%) said the system allowed them to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents. But some said the system was only partially accessible, mostly because they still had to redact information that cannot be released, like driver's license numbers, manually.

But crime reporters tended to feel their police agencies' computer systems were not so user friendly. While more than half of the crime reporters said they could find public records online at least some of the time (40.7%, 12.7% most of the time, 2.7% all of the

time), half said the computer systems did not make public records readily accessible to either the public or the records custodian whom they were asking to find them, and 28.7 percent said those records were only partially accessible. Asked to elaborate on the "partially" answers, 22 of the 40 who said this explained that they had limited access to the information they needed.

Only a handful of PIOs (15.5%) said their agency worked with an organization that specialized in public records, such as SPJ or others, to develop the system that easily provided public records to the public and journalists. Most PIOs said they received instruction on how to use the records management software and public records system (53.2% yes, somewhat, 29.8% yes, thoroughly). And two thirds (67.3%) said they have had training in the state's open records law as it applies to police records. Some received the training from city, county or state attorneys, some from state agencies or police training facilities, some from self-initiated study and a few from sessions with First Amendment organizations or media outlets.

For the crime reporters, the majority of the time, the custodian of the public records responds to requests within the time frame allowed under their state's public records laws (70.7%), while a few (14.7%) respond eventually but after the deadline. Just over half of the time (56.1%) they provide the

Table 10: Comparing PIOs' perception of computer system's accessibility to crime reporters' perception
Reporter- Does the police department you mostly deal with have a computer system that makes public records readily accessible?
PIOs- Does the system allow you to easily locate and separate public information from private and investigatory documents?

	Crime Reporters (n=150)	PIO (n=139)
Yes	24.7%	50.4%*
No	50.0%	27.3%*
Partially	25.3%	22.3%

*Independent Z-Test, p<.05

information requested. More than 37 percent say their requests tend to be only partially filled, with the law enforcement agency redacting information from the record or only giving out part of what was requested. Two-thirds of the time (67.7%), when the reporters get the records, they are able to get the PIO or custodian to answer any questions they have about those records. Rarely, however, do they get an explanation for the redactions.

1

Not a lot of the public records kept by police agencies are posted on their websites for easy access. And when crime reporters contact the PIOs to ask for records, they report that the request often takes some time to be answered. The PIOs say their computer systems are generally old and have record-keeping software that does not make it easy to delete information that they must, by law, keep private, so

they generally have to print out requested records and then go through it page by page and mark out private information. The process delays response. And reporters say when they finally get the documents, it's rare than anyone will even tell them why whole sections are deleted.

These surveys bring up many questions that warrant further study. As police body cameras become more prevalent, a more detailed study on the issues of storage of footage and the redaction process would be helpful. Another area worth exploring is the significant findings on the differences by region in the issues reporters have with police PIO message control efforts. A detailed investigation into the quality of record-keeping software might also turn up ways to expedite the release of public records by grouping private information so that it can be more easily deleted. Finally, the issues surrounding government public information officers' efforts to control the message are of great concern to the media. Twice in