



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON



Bureau of Police

Ted Wheeler, Mayor

Danielle M. Outlaw, Chief of Police

1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue • Portland, OR 97204 • Phone: 503-823-0000

Integrity • Compassion • Accountability • Respect • Excellence • Service

MEMORANDUM

January 31, 2018

TO: Danielle Outlaw
Chief of Police
(Through Channels)

FROM: Craig Dobson
Inspector, Professional Standards Division

SUBJECT: Recommendations from the 2017 Annual Force Audit Report.

Attached you will find the executive summary and 2017 Force audit report. I have reviewed the report and concur with the findings. As a unit we have identified three areas where we are looking to improve. Two areas involve reporting errors. The third area directly relates to the audit unit and the feedback loop required to address concerns identified through the after action process or the auditing of those reports.

After review, we believe many of the officer errors and deficiencies are caused by the mechanical way in which officers are required to report force. The current MRE system is not intuitive and does not allow officers to see the template while they are writing a narrative and vice versa. That same problem exists when supervisors review the officer's reports. Sergeants are required to move back and forth between templates and narratives to ensure that all of the required points of 1010.00 have been fulfilled.

- Although the average error rate of officers is low at 1.5 errors per report, we believe that this can be improved through the use of a new FDCR and additional training. The new FDCR will be introduced by spring of 2018. The new FDCR allows the officers to write their report and collect the necessary force data all on one report. The form is chronologically ordered and prompts answers to fulfill all the required areas from directive 1010.00 based on the type of force used. Some minor additional training will be required to familiarize the officers to the new form.
- Because the information will be better organized and have all the required information required by directive 1010.00 in a systematic and chronological

order, it will also help decrease the supervisors error rates and improve their efficiency.

- With this change in FDCRs we will also be retooling the Force After Action report. Now that the new FDCR will be capturing much of what supervisors have been capturing in the past, the goal of the new AAR is to reduce redundancy of work and focus the supervisors effort on the analysis of officer's decision points during an incident.
- Finally, we have looked at our internal processes and in 2018 we will be initiating a formal feedback loop for the findings discovered in the force after actions to ensure that:
 - RU command gets quick feedback in regards to their after actions to:
 - i. correct errors in reporting and ensure compliance of EIS entries and;
 - ii. identify patterns or practices that fall outside 1010.00 or best practice by officers or supervisors that need to be addressed
 - the audit team can more closely monitor, identify and report on trends or concerns by individuals, units, RUs or shifts within the bureau to the appropriate chain of command.
 - any policy, training, tactical or equipment issue requiring attention is systematically identified and handled through a formal action item reporting process.

We believe these changes in the FDCR, AAR and adding a feedback loop will help bring us into compliance with the DOJ under paragraphs 74 through 77.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2017 Force Audit Results

The Portland Police Bureau (PPB)'s Inspector conducts a systematic audit of officer's use of force reports and supervisor's After Action reports (AARs) to ensure that they meet the reporting requirements outlined in the United States Department of Justice (US DOJ) Settlement Agreement (SA) paragraphs 74, 75, 76, and 77.

Summary

Force Cases Audited	304
Involved Officers	427
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	455
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	552
Command Review Deficiencies	403

Reporting

- Officer
 - Out of 38-52 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, officers incurred 1.5 reporting deficiencies per case audited. On average, officers demonstrated a 96.1% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Quarter on quarter, officers were most deficient in reporting categories: "Force and Resistance" (checkbox errors on the Force Data Collection Report (FDCR)) and "De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis".
 - Consistent reporting deficiencies around the documentation of decision point analysis and checkbox errors on the FDCR prompted PPB to revise its FDCR. In the spring of 2018, officers will be using an FDCR specifically designed to require the documentation of decision point analysis and provide less room for error with regard to force type selection. As such, PPB expects improvement on reporting in these areas.
- Sergeant and Command
 - Out of 54 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, sergeants incurred 1.8 reporting deficiencies per case audited. On average, Sergeants demonstrated a 96.7% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Out of 25 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, command incurred 1.3 reporting deficiencies per case audited. On average, Lieutenants and RU Commanders demonstrated a 94.8% reporting accuracy rate.
 - The audit found that sergeant-reporting deficiencies improved in 2017. Reporting deficiencies per case audited were 2.3 (deficiencies/case) in Q1 compared to 1.6 (deficiencies/case) in Q4 2017. The improvement seen in sergeant reporting deficiencies is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.
 - Based on Sergeant and Command Reporting deficiencies found, there is a need for additional training in the following areas:
 - Sergeant documentation of officer reporting errors in EIS
 - Lieutenant level awareness of officer and sergeant reporting requirements and the necessary corrective action.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2017 Force Audit Results

- The audit found that North Precinct Sergeant's reporting deficiencies were noticeably greater than other Patrol sergeants reporting deficiencies. The same pattern was found for North precinct command review deficiencies, but not for North precinct officer reporting deficiencies. Additional supervisor training on officer and supervisor After Action reporting requirements for North Precinct supervisors is recommended.
- Regarding the Command Review and the "Notification-Misconduct" category; misconduct is defined as reporting deficiencies for the purpose of this audit. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.

CEW Applications

- In 2017, officers at the Portland Police Bureau applied 88 cycles of CEW to subjects. The rate of application declined over the course of the year.
 - In Q1, officers applied 21 cycles.
 - In Q2 officers applied 32 cycles.
 - In Q3, officers applied 19 cycles.
 - And in Q4 officers applied 16 cycles.
- 32 Subjects were armed when a CEW was applied – some subjects were armed with more than one type of weapon.
 - 5 subjects were armed with a blunt object
 - 2 subjects implied possession of a firearm
 - 15 subjects were armed with a knife or edged weapon
 - 2 subjects were armed with replica firearms
 - 7 subjects were reported to be armed with a weapon, or a weapon was present but not threatened or used.
 - 1 subject attempted to run officers over with their vehicle.
- 93% of the CEW cycles were applied as probe deployment. Only 6 cycles were applied as "drive-stuns".

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	304
Involved Officers	427
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	455
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	552
Command Review Deficiencies	403

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2,3}

Bureau Wide					
2017 Applications	Type of Force	Q1 2017	Q2 2017	Q3 2017	Q4 2017
23	Aerosol Rest	0.4%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%
2	Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
83	CEW	1.6%	3.0%	1.7%	1.5%
12	CHWI*	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%
8	K9	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
31	Less Lethal	0.0%	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%
94	Strikes/Kicks	2.0%	4.4%	1.1%	1.3%
235	Takedown	6.2%	9.6%	4.5%	1.8%
2	P.I.T			0.1%	0.1%
1	FD to stop an aggressive animal			0.0%	0.1%
0	Vehicle Ram			0.0%	0.0%
2	Baton (Nonstrike)			0.0%	0.2%
12	Box - In			0.3%	0.8%
94	Control Against Resistance			0.4%	8.4%
38	Controlled Takedown			0.6%	3.0%
0	Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal			0.0%	0.0%
8	Hobble Restraint			0.1%	0.7%
91	Resisted Handcuffing			1.1%	7.4%
332	PFA	13%	10%	6.0%	1.9%

In 2017, the Force Audit Team Audited 1068 applications of force.

Q3 and Q4 witnessed a decrease in takedowns, because the updated use of force directive (1010.00) split the category of takedown into (1) takedown and (2) controlled takedown.

PFA's were highest in Q1 and Q2 because in Q3 the updated use of force directive (1010.00), required the audit of only 20% of Category IV force (PFA is a Category IV event).

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

³ On August 19, 2017, the Portland Police Bureau implemented an updated Use of Force directive (1010.00); auditing 100% of serious use of force cases, 100% of force cases with substantial injury to the subject (defined as requiring hospital treatment), 100% of CEW cases and 20% of all other use of force cases. At the end of the Q4 2017, the audited sample is compared to the population of cases in order to verify that the sample is representative. If the sample is not representative of the population, additional cases are audited to achieve representativeness. In Q4 2017 an additional 9 cases were audited to ensure the sample was representative of officer precinct, officer shift and force type applied.

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

CEW use was consistent and relatively low across the main divisions.

2017 Rate of Force			
Type of Force	Central	East	North
Aerosol Rest	1.1%	0.4%	0.3%
Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
CEW	1.4%	3.5%	2.5%
CHWI*	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%
K9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Less Lethal	0.6%	1.5%	0.8%
Strikes/Kicks	1.2%	4.1%	2.2%
Takedown	7.7%	7.0%	4.8%
P.I.T	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
FD to stop an aggressive animal	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Vehicle Ram	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Baton (Nonstrike)	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Box - In	0.0%	1.0%	0.1%
Control Against Resistance	3.5%	3.5%	1.2%
Controlled Takedown	1.8%	1.1%	0.7%
Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hobble Restraint	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%
Resisted Handcuffing	4.7%	2.5%	1.1%
PFA	6.7%	12.2%	8.0%

Central, East and North Precinct applications of force make up 89.4% of the total audited force for 2017.

Use of Force Analysis

- **CEW**
 - In 2017, officers at the Portland Police Bureau applied 88 cycles of CEW to subjects. The rate of application declined over the course of the year.
 - In Q1, officers applied 21 cycles.
 - In Q2 officers applied 32 cycles.
 - In Q3, officers applied 19 cycles.
 - And in Q4 officers applied 16 cycles.
 - 32 Subjects were armed when a CEW was applied – some subjects were armed with more than one type of weapon.
 - 5 subjects were armed with a blunt object
 - 2 subjects implied possession of a firearm

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

- 15 subjects were armed with a knife or edged weapon
- 2 subjects were armed with replica firearms
- 7 subjects were reported to be armed with a weapon, or a weapon was present but not threatened or used.
- 1 subject attempted to run officers over with their vehicle.
- 93% of the CEW cycles were applied as probe deployment. Only 6 cycles were applied as “drive-stuns”.

2017 Out of Policy Cases -- see Appendix A

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results) ^{4,5}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 1.5 reporting errors per case. On average, officers demonstrated a 96.1% reporting accuracy rate.
 - The average rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.19 errors per case
 - Q2: 1.22 errors per case
 - Q3: 1.09 errors per case
 - Q4: 2.42 errors per case
 - The rate of officer reporting errors per case rose in the fourth quarter as a consequence of the 1010.00 policy change which required enhanced reporting of Category IV events. Sergeants often identified these officer level reporting errors (demonstrated below by the general trend of improved Sergeant reporting quarter on quarter for 2017) and, with the introduction of a new Force Data Collection Report (FDCR) in the spring of 2018, PPB anticipates improved officer reporting for these events.
- Quarter on quarter, officers were most deficient in the Force and Resistance category and the De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis category. Each category contains a number of reporting components, see definitions page for further detail.
 - In the Force and Resistance Category, officer inaccuracies were generally related to checkbox errors on the Force Data Collection Report (FDCR).
 - Inaccuracies in the Decision Point Analysis category were expected, as in 2017 PPB was still communicating and training officers on how to document their Decision Point Analysis during force events. Training on this topic was delivered to officers during the Fall 2017 In-Service.
 - Consistent reporting deficiencies around the documentation of decision point analysis and the correct documentation of force types prompted PPB to revise its FDCR. In the spring of 2018, officers will be using an FDCR specifically designed to require the documentation of decision point analysis and provide less room for error with regard to force type selection. As such, PPB expects improvement on reporting in these areas.

⁴ Force cases audited during 2017.

⁵ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies by RU - Q1-Q4 2017																															
Total Cases Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Precinct	Mental Health and Injuries				Force and Resistance				De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis				Witness				ECW						
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			
19	18	26	28	17	26	32	46	CENTRAL	6	2	5	8	6	13	15	18	4	3	7	9	1	7	4	10	0	1	1	1			
1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	DETECTIVES	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	DVD	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0			
22	33	27	22	29	39	24	75	EAST	6	5	6	12	10	12	7	28	8	13	7	17	1	5	4	18	4	4	0	0			
15	24	14	18	21	34	19	59	NORTH	6	7	1	14	7	11	4	11	5	5	8	21	3	8	5	11	0	3	1	2			
6	4	2	3	6	0	1	0	TOD	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			
1	6	2	3	1	6	2	0	TRAFFIC/CANINE	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0			
2	4	0	3	3	1	0	4	TRANSIT	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0			
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	YSD	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
66	89	71	78	79	109	78	189	QUARTER TOTAL	18	18	12	35	28	37	27	61	22	22	22	48	6	24	14	42	5	8	3	3			
304				455				YEAR TOTAL				83				153				114				86				19			

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeants

- During 2017, Sergeant reporting deficiencies improved. On average, Sergeants demonstrated a 96.7% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Reporting deficiencies per case audited were 2.3 (deficiencies/case) in Q1, 2.0 (deficiencies/case) in Q2 compared to 1.4 (deficiencies/case) in Q3 and 1.6 (deficiencies/case) in Q4 2017.
 - The improvement seen in sergeant reporting deficiencies is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Review of Officer Reporting
 - EIS
 - Reporting deficiencies per case improved in these topics during 2017 (from an average of 1 deficiency/case audited in Q1 and Q2 to an average of less than 0.5 deficiency/case audited in Q3 and Q4. The improvement is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies by RU - Q1-Q4 2017																																																					
Total Cases Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Precinct	Timeliness				Review of Officer Reporting				Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence				Decision Point Analysis				Out of PPB Policy				Legal Justification				Tactical and Training Implications				Corrective Action				ES				Notification				Detective Notification				
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4					
19	18	26	28	45	31	52	40	CENTRAL	0	0	1	0	12	8	16	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	10	10	12	18	10	16	14	3	1	3	3	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	DETECTIVES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
22	33	27	22	41	48	23	34	EAST	1	0	2	0	9	14	6	9	1	1	0	4	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	8	10	7	13	13	16	3	6	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	
15	24	14	18	49	81	26	42	NORTH	0	0	1	0	14	25	4	11	1	4	1	1	1	2	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	16	8	18	23	31	7	6	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0		
6	4	2	3	7	5	0	1	TOD	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	6	2	3	0	7	0	2	TRAFFIC/CANINE	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	4	0	3	5	5	0	6	TRANSIT	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	YSD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
66	89	71	78	149	177	101	125	QUARTER TOTAL	1	1	4	0	35	50	26	31	4	5	2	5	5	4	12	7	2	4	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	1	30	39	25	45	63	65	26	27	4	6	6	8	0	0	0	0			
304				552				YEAR TOTAL	6				142				16				28				6				1				9				139				181				24				0				

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- On average, Lieutenants and RU Commanders demonstrated a 94.8% reporting accuracy rate.
- When an officer's narrative was missing required information or the sergeant's review was deficient the issue was most often addressed in the CHO's review.⁶
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Lieutenants:
 - EIS
 - Notification – Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies)
 - The rate of deficiencies per case audited for these two topics remained at less than 0.5 deficiency/case in 2017 with no improvement seen.⁷ With the implementation of the updated Use of Force 1010.00 directive and supervisor training, improvement in these two topics is expected to be seen in 2018.
- Topic with the greatest number of deficiencies for RU Managers (Captains/Commanders):
 - EIS
 - The rate of deficiencies per case audited for this topic improved in 2017. Improvement seen in this topic during Q3 and Q4 2017 is most likely due to category IV force events not requiring a chain of command review beyond the Lieutenant.

(See next page for Lieutenant and RU Manager Reporting Tables)

⁶ The Category Notification – Criminal Conduct (77f), refers to section 77f of the USDOJ SA, which states that “all supervisors in the chain of command [will] suspend an investigation immediately and notify the branch Assistant Chief, the Director of PSD, and the Detectives Division whenever the investigating supervisor, shift commander or Division commander finds evidence of apparent criminal conduct by a PPB officer. The Category Notification – Misconduct (77g), refers to section 77g of the USDOJSA, which states that “all supervisors in the chain of command [will] report matter[s] to PSD for review and investigation whenever an investigating supervisor, shift commander, or precinct commander finds evidence of apparent misconduct by a PPB officer or employee.” PPB defines the phrase “apparent misconduct” to include reporting errors and inaccuracies.

⁷ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed. Misconduct is represented by reporting deficiencies. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies by RU - 2017																																															
Precinct	Total Cases Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Timeliness				In/Out Policy (75e)				Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)				Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)				Modify Findings (77c)				Additional Investigation (77d)				EIS (77e)				Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)				Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)						
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			
Central	14	15	25	27	5	7	11	23	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	
Det.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
East	20	36	25	22	5	13	2	16	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	9		
North	17	23	12	17	7	17	7	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	8				
Traffic/K9	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0			
Transit	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0				
TOD	5	4	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
YSD	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Quarter Total	58	82	65	69	21	40	20	54	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	10	4	10	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	7	16	0	0	0	0	6	13	5	23			
Annual Total	274				135				7				1				3				28				8				1				40				0				47						

RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies by RU - 2017																																													
Precinct	Total Cases Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Timeliness				In/Out Policy (75e)				Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)				Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)				Modify Findings (77c)				Additional Investigation (77d)				EIS (77e)				Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)				Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Central	18	16	21	13	15	15	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	3
Det.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
East	22	35	19	13	17	12	1	11	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	
North	15	23	12	9	25	57	4	12	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	44	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	6		
Traffic/K9	1	5	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Transit	2	3	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOD	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
YSD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Quarter Total	66	86	58	38	57	93	15	31	2	5	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	8	2	8	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	44	72	5	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	15		
Annual Total	248				196				9				4				4				19				7				0				125				0				28				

BUREAU WIDE

2017 Force Audit Results

CHO Reporting Deficiencies - 2017																																																
Precinct	Total Cases Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Timeliness				In/Out Policy (75e)				Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)				Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)				Modify Findings (77c)				Additional Investigation (77d)				EIS (77e)				Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)				Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)							
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4				
Investigations & Services	10	7	0	0	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Operations	56	82	53	18	9	17	10	17	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	8	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	6	
Quarter Total	66	89	53	18	25	21	10	17	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	6			
Annual Total	226				73				3				2				1				6				6				0				36				0				15							

CANINE/TRAFFIC

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	12
Involved Officers	16
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	9
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	9
Command Review Deficiencies	7

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2,3}

- Applications of force used by the Canine/Traffic division are documented in the Bureau-wide section of this report.
- Twelve Canine/Traffic division cases were audited this year, including a total of 8 applications of Canine bites.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results)⁴

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 0.75 reporting errors per case. This is much lower than the bureau-wide average for officer reporting deficiencies.
- Overall, officer reporting deficiencies were not heavily concentrated in any particular category. The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.0 errors per case
 - Q2: 1.0 errors per case
 - Q3: 1.0 errors per case
 - Q4: 0 errors per case
- In Q4 officers demonstrated substantial improvement in their reporting.

(See next page for Officer Reporting table)

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

³This table is aggregated at the Sergeant division level. During Q4 one of the K-9 officers whose reporting is documented here (due to the fact that this is his assigned division) was working at East Precinct when he did a box-in. That box in is captured under the east precinct Rate of Force page.

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

⁴CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

CANINE/TRAFFIC

2017 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Canine/Traffic - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Q2	6	6	2	0	1	3	0
Q3	2	2	0	1	0	0	1
Q4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	12	9	2	1	2	3	1

CANINE/TRAFFIC

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- The rate of Sergeant reporting deficiencies improved during 2017
 - Reporting deficiencies per case audited were 1.2 (deficiencies/case) in Q2 2017 compared to less than 1 deficiency/case audited (0.7) in Q4 2017.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action (0.25 deficiencies/case audited)
 - EIS⁵ (0.33 deficiencies/case audited)

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Traffic/Canine Division - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
1	0	Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	7	Q2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0
2	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
12	9	TOTAL	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0

⁵ Deficiencies noted here do not simply capture when an EIS entry has not been made; a deficiency can be 1-4 missing EIS requirements, such as case number, the nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified), and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). If an EIS entry was not made for a case, then the sergeant would receive four deficiencies for each of the EIS requirements for that case.

CANINE/TRAFFIC

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- There were 2 reporting deficiencies for Traffic/K9 lieutenants in 2017 (.5/case).
 - The rate of reporting deficiencies per case audited improved during 2017 – from 1.0 in Q2 2017 to 0 in Q4 2017.
- There were 5 reporting deficiencies for Traffic/K9 RU Managers in 2017 (.36/case).
 - The rate of reporting deficiencies per case audited improved during 2017 – from 0.8 in Q2 2017 to 0 in Q4 2017.

Traffic/K9 Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Q3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Traffic/K9 RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Q3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	91
Involved Officers	137
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	121
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	168
Command Review Deficiencies	94

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

Central Precinct					
2017 Applications	Type of Force	Q1 2017	Q2 2017	Q3 2017	Q4 2017
12	Aerosol Rest	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	1.2%
0	Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	CEW	0.3%	0.3%	2.2%	1.9%
4	CHWI*	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%
0	K9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	Less Lethal	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%
13	Strikes/Kicks	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	1.9%
82	Takedown	6.5%	10.6%	6.2%	2.2%
0	P.I.T			0.0%	0.0%
0	FD to stop an aggressive animal			0.0%	0.0%
0	Vehicle Ram			0.0%	0.0%
0	Baton (Nonstrike)			0.0%	0.0%
0	Box - In			0.0%	0.0%
43	Control Against Resistance			1.2%	12.1%
19	Controlled Takedown			0.9%	5.0%
0	Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal			0.0%	0.0%
6	Hobble Restraint			0.3%	1.6%
50	Resisted Handcuffing			2.2%	13.4%
72	PFA	9.0%	6.8%	5.3%	1.2%

In 2017, the Force Audit Team audited 322 applications of force used by officers at Central Precinct.

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force audited and PFAs reported during Q3 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Rate of Force - Central Precinct	
Type of Force	Central
Aerosol Rest	3.7%
Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%
CEW	4.7%
CHWI*	1.2%
K9	0.0%
Less Lethal	1.9%
Strikes/Kicks	4.0%
Takedown	25.5%
P.I.T	0.0%
FD to stop an aggressive animal	0.0%
Vehicle Ram	0.0%
Baton (Nonstrike)	0.0%
Box - In	0.0%
Control Against Resistance	13.4%
Controlled Takedown	5.9%
Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal	0.0%
Hobble Restraint	1.9%
Resisted Handcuffing	15.5%
PFA	22.4%

All CEW cases are audited. CEW use at Central Precinct accounts for less than 5% of audited force for 2017.

Takedowns and the Pointing of Firearms account for almost 50% of Central Precinct's audited force in 2017.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results) ^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 1.32 reporting errors per case. This is below the bureau-wide average for 2017. On average, Central Precinct officers demonstrated at 96.5% reporting accuracy rate.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 0.89 errors per case
 - Q2: 1.44 errors per case
 - Q3: 1.23 errors per case
 - Q4: 1.64 errors per case
- Officers at Central Precinct were most deficient in their reporting for the Force and Resistance Category. These deficiencies are largely related to checkbox errors on the Force Data Collection Report.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Central Precinct - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	19	17	6	6	4	1	0
Q2	18	26	2	13	3	7	1
Q3	26	32	5	15	7	4	1
Q4	28	46	8	18	9	10	1
TOTAL	91	121	21	52	23	22	3

³ Force cases audited 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- During 2017, Central Precinct Sergeant reporting deficiencies improved. On average, Central Precinct Sergeants demonstrated a 96.5% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Reporting deficiencies per case audited were 2.4 (deficiencies/case) in Q1 and 1.7 (deficiencies/case) in Q2 compared to 2.0 (deficiencies/case) in Q3 and 1.4 (deficiencies/case) in Q4 2017.
 - The improvement seen in sergeant reporting deficiencies is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Review of Officer Reporting
 - EIS⁵
 - Reporting deficiencies/case improved in these topics during 2017 (from an average of near 1 deficiency/case audited in Q1 and Q2 to an average of less than 0.5 deficiency/case audited in Q3 and Q4. The improvement is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Central Precinct - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
19	45	Q1	0	12	0	2	0	0	1	9	18	3	0
18	31	Q2	0	8	0	0	2	0	0	10	10	1	0
26	52	Q3	1	16	1	5	0	0	0	10	16	3	0
28	40	Q4	0	8	0	2	0	0	1	12	14	3	0
91	168	TOTAL	1	44	1	9	2	0	2	41	58	10	0

⁵ Deficiencies noted here do not simply capture when an EIS entry has not been made; a deficiency can be 1-4 missing EIS requirements, such as case number, the nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified), and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). If an EIS entry was not made for a case, then the sergeant would receive four deficiencies for each of the EIS requirements for that case.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- Central Lieutenants had 46 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (.57/case). On average, Central Precinct Lieutenants demonstrated a 98% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Central Lieutenants:
 - EIS
 - Notification – Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies)
 - The average rate of deficiencies per case audited for these two topics remained at less than 0.5 deficiency/case in 2017 with some improvement seen.⁶
- Central RU Managers had 48 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (.71/case). On average, Central Precinct RU Managers demonstrated a 98.5% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Topic with the greatest number of deficiencies for Central Precinct RU Managers (Captains/Commanders):
 - EIS
 - The rate of deficiencies per case audited for this topic improved in 2017 (from 0.67 deficiencies/case audited in Q1 2017 to 0 deficiencies/case audited in Q4 2017). Improvement seen in this topic during Q4 2017 is most likely due to category IV force events not requiring a chain of command review beyond the Lieutenant.

Central Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	14	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0
Q2	15	7	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2
Q3	25	11	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	4
Q4	27	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	0	6
Total	81	46	3	0	1	5	2	0	23	0	12

⁶ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed. Misconduct is represented by reporting deficiencies. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Central Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	18	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	1
Q2	16	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	12	0	1
Q3	21	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	4
Q4	13	8	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Total	68	48	1	2	2	3	3	0	28	0	9

DETECTIVES

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	1
Involved Officers	2
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	2
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	2
Command Review Deficiencies	0

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2,3}

- Applications of force used by the Detectives division are documented in the Bureau-wide section of this report.
- One Detectives division case was audited this year.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results)

Audit Results- Officers

- Two detectives used force in one case during this quarter. They each incurred one reporting deficiency in the force and resistance category.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies -Detectives - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0
Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	2	0	2	0	0	0

¹ Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

DETECTIVES

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeants

- During 2017, a Sergeant assigned to Detectives reviewed one case and had two reporting deficiencies in the EIS topic. Note that the EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Detectives - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
1	2	Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
0	0	Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0

DETECTIVES

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- In 2017, one case was audited that was reviewed by members of the Detectives Division chain of command. The audit found no deficiencies in the review.

Detectives Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Detectives RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Drugs and Vice Division (DVD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	0
Involved Officers	5
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	7
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	0
Command Review Deficiencies	0

Types of Force Applied

- Use of Force by DVD officers was reviewed by Central Sergeants. Applications of force used by DVD officers are documented in the Central Precinct Use of Force Table.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, DVD officers incurred 1.75 reporting errors per case. This is higher than the bureau-wide average for officer reporting deficiencies.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows
 - Q1: (no cases audited)
 - Q2: 1.0 errors per case
 - Q3: (no cases audited)
 - Q4: 2.5 errors per case
- Officer reporting deficiencies were concentrated in the areas of witness documentation and the documentation of force and resistance.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - DVD - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	*	2	0	1	0	1	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	**	5	1	2	0	2	0
TOTAL		7	1	3	0	3	0

*Two cases involving DVD officers, both reviewed by Central Sergeants. Both cases are counted under Central Precinct for Total Cases Audited.

**Two cases involving DVD officers, both reviewed by Central Sergeants. Both cases are counted under Central Precinct for Total Cases Audited.

***All DVD force applications are counted under Central Precinct totals.

¹ Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

Drugs and Vice Division (DVD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeants

- Force used by officers assigned to DVD was reviewed by Sergeants assigned to other precincts/divisions. No Sergeant assigned to DVD reviewed a force event during 2017.

Audit Results – Command Review

- DVD cases were reviewed by Central Precinct chain of command. Results from the chain of command audit are contained in the Central Precinct Audit Report.

EAST PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	104
Involved Officers	151
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	167
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	146
Command Review Deficiencies	77

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

East Precinct					
2017 Applications	Type of Force	Q1 2017	Q2 2017	Q3 2017	Q4 2017
4	Aerosol Rest	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%
2	Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
37	CEW	3.0%	3.7%	1.5%	1.0%
4	CHWI*	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%
0	K9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	Less Lethal	0.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.0%
44	Strikes/Kicks	1.0%	6.7%	1.2%	2.0%
75	Takedown	5.5%	8.2%	4.0%	1.0%
1	P.I.T			0.0%	0.2%
0	FD to stop an aggressive animal			0.0%	0.0%
0	Vehicle Ram			0.0%	0.0%
0	Baton (Nonstrike)			0.0%	0.0%
11	Box - In			0.7%	2.0%
37	Control Against Resistance			0.0%	9.2%
12	Controlled Takedown			0.7%	2.2%
0	Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal			0.0%	0.0%
2	Hobble Restraint			0.0%	0.5%
27	Resisted Handcuffing			1.0%	5.7%
130	PFA	13.2%	11.9%	4.2%	3.0%

In 2017, the Force Audit Team audited 402 applications of force used by officers at East Precinct.

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

EAST PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Rate of Force - East Precinct	
Type of Force	Central
Aerosol Rest	1%
Impact Weapon (baton)	0%
CEW	9%
CHWI*	1%
K9	0%
Less Lethal	4%
Strikes/Kicks	11%
Takedown	19%
P.I.T	0%
FD to stop an aggressive animal	0%
Vehicle Ram	0%
Baton (Nonstrike)	0%
Box - In	3%
Control Against Resistance	9%
Controlled Takedown	3%
Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal	0%
Hobble Restraint	0%
Resisted Handcuffing	7%
PFA	32%

All CEW cases are audited. CEW use at East Precinct accounts for less than 10% of audited force for 2017.

Takedowns and the Pointing of Firearms account for just over 50% of East Precinct's audited force in 2017. This trend in use of force is similar to that of Central Precinct.

EAST PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results) ^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 1.60 reporting errors per case. This is just above bureau-wide average for 2017. On average, East Precinct officers demonstrated a 95.7% reporting accuracy rate.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.31 errors per case
 - Q2: 1.18 errors per case
 - Q3: 0.88 errors per case
 - Q4: 3.40 errors per case
- In Q4 officers demonstrated substantial decline in their reporting. The Audit team attributes this to the 1010.00 policy change in Q3 requiring enhanced reporting for Category IV events.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - East Precinct - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	22	29	6	10	8	1	4
Q2	33	39	5	12	13	5	4
Q3	27	24	6	7	7	4	0
Q4	22	75	12	28	17	18	0
TOTAL	104	167	29	57	45	28	8

³ Force cases audited during 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events
28 of 54

EAST PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeant Review

- One hundred and four East Precinct cases were audited during 2017 and 146 reporting deficiencies (1.4 deficiencies/case audited) for East Sergeants were identified by the audit. On average, East Precinct Sergeants demonstrated a 97.4% reporting accuracy rate.
 - Reporting deficiencies/case were 1.9 (deficiencies/case) in Q1, 1.5 (deficiencies/case) in Q2 compared to 0.9 (deficiencies/case) in Q3 and 1.5 (deficiencies/case) in Q4 2017.
 - The improvement seen during 2017 in sergeant reporting deficiencies is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Review of Officer Reporting (0.4 deficiencies/case audited)
 - Corrective Action (0.4 deficiencies/case audited)
 - EIS⁵ (0.4 deficiencies/case audited)

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - East Precinct - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
22	41	Q1	1	9	1	2	2	0	4	8	13	1	0
33	48	Q2	0	14	1	2	1	0	3	10	16	1	0
27	23	Q3	2	6	0	2	0	0	0	7	3	3	0
22	34	Q4	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	13	6	2	0
104	146	TOTAL	3	38	6	6	3	0	7	38	38	7	0

⁵ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed.

EAST PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- Overall errors
 - East Lieutenants had 36 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (.34/case). On average, East Precinct Lieutenants demonstrated a 98.6% reporting accuracy rate.
 - East RU Managers had 41 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (.46/case). On average, East Precinct RU Managers demonstrated a 98.1% reporting accuracy rate.
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies were seen in EIS entries and the Notification of Misconduct⁶ in reporting.
 - A large majority of the RU Manager errors stemmed from EIS entry deficiencies in Q1 and Q2. These deficiencies dropped significantly in Q3 and Q4.

East Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	20	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Q2	36	13	1	0	0	2	1	0	4	0	5
Q3	25	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Q4	22	16	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	9
Total	103	36	3	1	0	9	3	0	4	0	16

East Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	22	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	0	3
Q2	35	12	2	0	0	1	1	0	8	0	0
Q3	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Q4	13	11	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	6
Total	89	41	2	1	0	6	3	0	20	0	9

⁶ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed. Misconduct is represented by reporting deficiencies. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	71
Involved Officers	93
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	133
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	198
Command Review Deficiencies	144

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

North Precinct					
2017 Applications	Type of Force	Q1 2017	Q2 2017	Q3 2017	Q4 2017
3	Aerosol Rest	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
0	Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
27	CEW	0.8%	6.8%	2.1%	1.7%
1	CHWI*	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
0	K9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	Less Lethal	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
24	Strikes/Kicks	2.5%	6.3%	1.3%	0.0%
51	Takedown	6.3%	8.4%	4.6%	2.1%
1	P.I.T			0.4%	0.0%
1	FD to stop an aggressive animal			0.0%	0.4%
0	Vehicle Ram			0.0%	0.0%
2	Baton (Nonstrike)			0.0%	0.8%
1	Box - In			0.0%	0.4%
13	Control Against Resistance			0.0%	5.5%
7	Controlled Takedown			0.0%	3.0%
0	Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal			0.0%	0.0%
0	Hobble Restraint			0.0%	0.0%
12	Resisted Handcuffing			0.4%	4.6%
85	PFA	16.0%	11.4%	7.2%	1.3%

In 2017, the Force Audit Team audited 237 applications of force used by officers at North Precinct.

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Rate of Force - North Precinct	
Type of Force	Central
Aerosol Rest	1.3%
Impact Weapon (baton)	0.0%
CEW	11.4%
CHWI*	0.4%
K9	0.0%
Less Lethal	3.8%
Strikes/Kicks	10.1%
Takedown	21.5%
P.I.T	0.4%
FD to stop an aggressive animal	0.4%
Vehicle Ram	0.0%
Baton (Nonstrike)	0.8%
Box - In	0.4%
Control Against Resistance	5.5%
Controlled Takedown	3.0%
Firearm discharge to end the suffering of a wounded animal	0.0%
Hobble Restraint	0.0%
Resisted Handcuffing	5.1%
PFA	35.9%

All CEW cases are audited. CEW use at North Precinct accounts of just over 10% of audited force in 2017.

Takedowns and the Pointing of Firearms account for 60% of North Precinct's audited force in 2017. This is consistent with the use of force trends in the other main divisions.

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results) ^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officer incurred 1.87 reporting errors per case. This is above the bureau-wide average for 2017. On average, North Precinct officer demonstrated a 95% reporting accuracy rate.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.4 errors per case
 - Q2: 1.4 errors per case
 - Q3: 1.3 errors per case
 - Q4: 3.27 errors per case
- In Q4 officers demonstrated substantial decline in their reporting. The audit team attributes this to the 1010.00 policy change in Q3 requiring enhanced reporting for Category IV events.
- Officer reporting deficiencies were concentrated in the categories of documentation of force and resistance and documentation of de-escalation and decision point analysis.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - North Precinct - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	15	21	6	7	5	3	0
Q2	24	34	7	11	5	8	3
Q3	14	19	1	4	8	5	1
Q4	18	59	14	11	21	11	2
TOTAL	71	133	28	33	39	27	6

³ Force cases audited during 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events
33 of 54

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- During 2017, 71 North Precinct force cases were audited and 198 deficiencies were identified for Sergeant reporting (2.8 deficiencies/case). On average, North Precinct Sergeants demonstrated a 94.8% reporting accuracy rate.
- North Precinct Sergeant's reporting deficiencies were more than two times greater than East Precinct Sergeant's and nearly two times greater than Central Precinct Sergeant's reporting deficiencies in 2017. The same pattern was found for North precinct command review deficiencies, but not for North precinct officer reporting deficiencies. Additional supervisor training on officer and supervisor After Action reporting requirements is needed to correct the disparity.

2017 Overall Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies Per Case Audited			
	Central	East	North
Q1	2.4	1.9	3.3
Q2	1.7	1.5	3.4
Q3	2.0	0.9	1.9
Q4	1.4	1.5	2.3
Year	1.8	1.4	2.8

- Similar to Central and East Sergeants, North Precinct Sergeant reporting deficiencies improved in 2017 – from 3.3 deficiencies/case in Q1 2017 to 2.3 deficiencies/case in Q4 2017. The improvement seen in Sergeant reporting deficiencies is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Review of Officer Reporting
 - EIS⁵
 - Reporting deficiencies/case improved in these topics during 2017 (from an average of 1 deficiency/case audited in Q1 and Q2 to an average of approximately 0.5 deficiency/case audited in Q3 and Q4. The improvement is most likely due to the enactment of the updated Use of Force directive 1010.00 that clearly outlines the Sergeant reporting requirements.

⁵ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed.

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - North Precinct - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
15	49	Q1	0	14	1	1	0	0	0	10	23	0	0
24	81	Q2	0	25	4	2	1	0	0	16	31	2	0
14	26	Q3	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	8	7	0	0
18	42	Q4	0	11	1	2	0	1	0	18	6	3	0
71	198	TOTAL	1	54	7	10	1	1	0	52	67	5	0

Audit Results – Command Review

- Overall errors
 - North Lieutenants had 46 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (.67/case). On average, North Precinct Lieutenants demonstrated a 97.3% reporting accuracy rate.
 - North RU Managers had 98 review deficiencies for cases reviewed in 2017 (1.66/case). On average, North RU Managers demonstrated a 93.3% reporting accuracy rate.
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies were seen in EIS entries and Notifications of Misconduct in Reporting⁶.
 - A large majority of the RU Manager errors stemmed from EIS entry deficiencies in Q1 and Q2. These deficiencies dropped significantly in Q3 and Q4.

North Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	17	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	2
Q2	23	17	0	0	1	6	1	0	4	0	5
Q3	12	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1
Q4	17	15	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	0	8
Total	69	46	1	0	2	12	2	1	12	0	16

⁶ EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed. Misconduct is represented by reporting deficiencies. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.

NORTH PRECINCT

2017 Force Audit Results

North Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	15	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	20	0	2
Q2	23	57	2	0	2	6	1	0	44	0	2
Q3	12	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Q4	9	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	6
Total	59	98	5	1	2	10	1	0	69	0	10

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	15
Involved Officers	12
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	7
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	13
Command Review Deficiencies	3

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

- Applications of force used by the TOD division are documented in the Bureau-wide section of this report.
- Fifteen TOD cases were audited this year.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results)^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 0.46 reporting errors per case. This is lower than the bureau-wide average for officer reporting deficiencies.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.0 errors per case
 - Q2: 0.0 errors per case
 - Q3: 0.5 errors per case
 - Q4: 0.0 errors per case
- Overall, officer reporting deficiencies were not heavily concentrated in any particular category.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies -TOD/SERT - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	6	6	0	2	3	1	0
Q2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
Q4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	15	7	0	2	3	2	0

¹ Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

³ CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force case audited during 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- Fifteen TOD force cases were audited during 2017. Thirteen Sergeant reporting deficiencies were identified by the audit.
- The rate of Sergeant reporting deficiencies improved during 2017
 - Reporting deficiencies/case audited were 1.2 (deficiencies/case) in Q1 2017 compared to less than 1 deficiency/case audited (0.9) in Q4 2017.
- Topic with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - EIS⁵ (0.4 deficiencies/case audited)

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Tactical Operations Division (TOD) - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
6	7	Q1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0
4	5	Q2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
2	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	Q4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	13	TOTAL	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	0

⁵ Deficiencies noted here do not simply capture when an EIS entry has not been made; a deficiency can be 1-4 missing EIS requirements, such as case number, the nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified), and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). If an EIS entry was not made for a case, then the sergeant would receive four deficiencies for each of the EIS requirements for that case.

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- Overall errors
 - TOD Lieutenants had 3 review deficiencies for cases audited in 2017 (.27/case).
 - TOD RU Managers had 0 review deficiencies for cases audited in 2017.

TOD Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Q2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Q3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1

TOD RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TRANSIT

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	9
Involved Officers	7
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	8
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	16
Command Review Deficiencies	6

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

- Applications of force used by Transit division are documented in the Bureau-wide section of this report.
- Nine Transit division cases were audited this year.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results)^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 0.88 reporting errors per case. This is lower than the bureau-wide average for officer reporting deficiencies.
- The rate of officer reporting deficiencies per quarter was as follows;
 - Q1: 1.5 errors per case
 - Q2: 0.25 errors per case
 - Q3: -
 - Q4: 1.33 errors per case
- Officer reporting deficiencies were concentrated in the force and resistance category and were related to the correct documentation of the force officers applied.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Transit - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	2	3	0	1	1	0	1
Q2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	3	4	0	2	1	1	0
TOTAL	9	8	1	3	2	1	1

¹CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

³CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

TRANSIT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- Nine Transit force cases were audited during 2017. Sixteen Sergeant reporting deficiencies were identified by the audit.
- The rate of Sergeant reporting deficiencies decreased in 2017
 - Reporting deficiencies per case audited were 2.5 (deficiencies/case) in Q1 2017 compared to 2.0 deficiencies/case audited in Q4 2017.
- Topic with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - EIS⁵ (0.7 deficiencies/case audited)
 - Reporting deficiencies improved in this topic during 2017 from 2.0 deficiencies/case audited in Q1 2017 to 0 deficiencies/case audited in Q4 2017.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Transit Division - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of PPB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
2	5	Q1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
4	5	Q2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0
0	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	6	Q4	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
9	16	TOTAL	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	2	6	1	0

⁵ Deficiencies noted here do not simply capture when an EIS entry has not been made; a deficiency can be 1-4 missing EIS requirements, such as case number, the nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified), and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). If an EIS entry was not made for a case, then the sergeant would receive four deficiencies for each of the EIS requirements for that case.

TRANSIT

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- Overall errors
 - Transit Lieutenants had 2 review deficiencies for cases audited in 2017 (.5/case).
 - Transit RU Managers had 4 review deficiencies for cases audited in 2017 (.57/case).

Transit Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Q2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Transit RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0

YOUTH SERVICES DIVISION (YSD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	1
Involved Officers	2
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	1
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	0
Command Review Deficiencies	0

2017 Rate and Trends of Force Applied^{1,2}

- Applications of force used by the Youth Services Division are documented in the Bureau-wide section of this report.
- One case was audited this year.

2017 Reporting of Force Applied (Audit Results)^{3,4}

Audit Results – Officers

- There was one officer reporting deficiency in the Youth Services division case that was audited this year. This deficiency was related to the documentation of the mental health status or injury status of the subject.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - YSD - Annual 2017							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	*	1	1	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	1	1	0	0	0	0

*This case involved a YSD officer but was reviewed by a Sergeant in North Precinct, is counted under the North Precinct Total Cases Audited total

¹ Force cases audited during 2017.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

*Control Hold with Injury includes Control Against Resistance with Injury to Subject.

³ CHWI: Control Holds with Injury; PFA: Pointing a Firearm. Force cases audited during 2017.

⁴ Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

YOUTH SERVICES DIVISION (YSD)

2017 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- One YSD force case was audited in 2017. There were zero Sergeant reporting deficiencies.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Youth Services Division - Annual 2017													
Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Quarter	Timeliness	Review of Officer Reporting	Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	Decision Point Analysis	Out of ppB Policy	Legal Justification	Tactical and Training Implications	Corrective Action	EIS	Notification	Detective Notification
0	0	Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Audit Results – Command Review

- There were no review deficiencies for the YSD Command in Q4. For the one force case reviewed during the year, the Lieutenant was serving as an Acting Captain, making him the highest level of review necessary for a Category III event.

YSD Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2017											
Precinct	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Timeliness	In/Out Policy (75e)	Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews (77a)	Completeness of 940 Reports (77b)	Modify Findings (77c)	Additional Investigation (77d)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX A

2017 Force Audit Results

Appendix A: Out of Policy Cases for 2017						
Case	Force Type(s)	Type of Arrest	Type of Event	Number of Officers Who Used Force	Number of Out of Policy Officers	Number of Involved Subjects
1	Aerosol Restraint, Takedown	Arrest – Misdemeanor	Citizen Call for Service	2	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directives 1010.00, 315.30, and 1040.00. Officer did not wait long enough after arriving on scene to properly determine threat level. Subject was a white male.					
2	Takedown	Arrest – Misdemeanor	Citizen Call for Service	1	1	1
	Context: In policy for directive 1010.00, out of policy for 315.30. Supervisor found officer could have utilized additional officers on scene to possibly eliminate the need for force. Subject was a black male.					
3	Takedown, Strikes/Kicks	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	1	2	1
	Context: In policy for directive 1010.00, out of policy for 315.30. Supervisor found officer could have utilized additional officers on scene to possibly eliminate the need for force. One officer out of policy for 940.00 for not immediately reporting force to a supervisor. Subject was a hispanic male.					
4	CEW (2 cycles)	Arrest – Misdemeanor	Citizen Call for Service	2	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1051.00. Taser download indicates 6 second taser cycle. Case occurred before issuance of batteries preventing cycles of over 5 seconds. Subject was a black male.					
5	Takedown, Strikes/Kicks	Arrest – Felony	Officer Initiated	3	2	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 940.00. Officer did not make timely disclosure of force to a supervisor. Subject was a white male.					
6	Takedown	Arrest – Felony	Officer Initiated	2	4	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 650.00. Officers did not properly search subject to ensure he was clear of weapons prior to transport. Subject was a white male.					
7	PIT	Escaped	Officer Initiated	1	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 630.05. Officers did not have cause to engage in vehicle pursuit. Subject was a white female.					
8	Control Against Resistance, Hobble	Arrest – Warrant	Officer Initiated	3	2	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officers did not make timely disclosure of force to a supervisor. Subject was a white male.					
9	Takedown, Resisted Handcuffing, Control Against Resistance	Arrest – Misdemeanor	Citizen Call for Service	4	2	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 315.00. Officers did not have cause to engage in a foot pursuit. Subject was a white female.					
10	Aerosol Restraint	Detained and Released	Citizen Call for Service	1	1	2
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Did not deliver a proper warning prior to deploying aerosol restraint. Subjects were black females.					
11	Resisted Handcuffing, CEW (2 cycles), Hobble	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	4	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Did not deliver a proper warning prior to deploying CEW. Subject was a white female.					

APPENDIX A

2017 Force Audit Results

Appendix A: Out of Policy Cases for 2017 (continued)						
Case	Force Type(s)	Type of Arrest	Type of Event	Number of Officers Who Used Force	Number of Out of Policy Officers	Number of Involved Subjects
12	Resisted Handcuffing, Control Against Resistance, Hobble	Release to Medical	Citizen Call for Service	2	2	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Not an approved application of a hobble. Subject was a white male.					
13	Pointing of a Firearm	Arrest – Felony	Officer Initiated	1	1	2
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officer did not make timely disclosure of force to a supervisor. Subjects were black males.					
14	Takedown	Arrest – Warrant	Officer Initiated	1	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officer did not make timely disclosure of force to a supervisor. Subject was a white male.					
15	Takedown, Resisted Handcuffing	Arrest – Misdemeanor	Citizen Call for Service	2	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Did not issue a warning prior to takedown. Subject was a white male.					
16	CEW (2 cycles)	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	4	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officer did not provide a warning prior to second taser cycle. Sergeant used low level of force to control subject once he arrived on scene but still investigated force incident. Subject was a black male.					
17	Less Lethal, CEW (1 cycle)	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	5	3	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officers did not provide a proper warning prior to using force. Subject was a white male.					
18	CEW (1 cycle)	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	1	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1051.00. Warning provided by outside agency officer ("taser taser taser") was insufficient per PPB policy. Subject was a white male.					
19	Aerosol Restraint	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	1	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1040.00. Force used was not proportional to resistance offered by the subject in the moment. Subject was a black male.					
20	CEW (2 cycles)	Arrest – Felony	Citizen Call for Service	2	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officer did not reevaluate necessity of force between taser cycles. Subject was a white male.					
21	CEW (3 cycles)	Arrest – Felony	Assist Outside Agency	1	1	1
	Context: Out of policy for directive 1010.00. Officer did not reevaluate necessity of force between 2nd and 3rd taser cycles. Subject was a black male.					

Category II-III Force^{1,2}

Control Holds with Injury	A control hold with injury event occurs when a member applies physical control to a person and an injury results. The physical control may not have caused the injury but an FDCR will be completed and a force investigation will occur.
Takedown	A takedown occurs when a member moves a subject from an upright position to the ground by applying some amount of force. It is not a takedown if the subject goes to the ground under their own power.
Strikes/Kicks	Strikes/Kicks events occur when a member uses their hands, elbow, knees or feet to strike a subject as an application of force. These are different events from strikes with a baton, which are captured in the “Impact Weapon” category.
Impact Weapon	Uses of a baton or a less lethal weapon are considered the use of an impact weapon. A baton-impact weapon event occurs when an officer strikes a subject with a baton. A less lethal impact weapon event occurs when a member fires less lethal impact munition at a subject, whether the subject is struck or not.
Aerosol Restraint	An aerosol restraint event occurs when a member uses pepper spray on a person.
CEW	A CEW (Conducted Electrical Weapon) event occurs when a member deploys the CEW to a subject in probe or drive stun mode. CEW uses are counted whether they were effective applications or not.
K-9 Bite	A K-9 bite occurs when a K-9 is deployed and delivers a bite to a subject.
Maximum Restraint	Maximum restraint was discontinued as an approved use of force in April 2015. Numbers are as follows: Hobble: Q1 2014-16, Q2 2014-13; Maximum Restraint: Q3 2014-9, Q4 2014-8, Q1 2015-5, and Q2 2015-1. Previous Force Data Collection Reports (FDCR) featured this category labelled as “Hobble” although

¹ Categories II-IV force events require that a sergeant complete an After Action Report (AAR). Category II force events require a Lieutenant, RU Manager (Captain or Commander) and Chief's office (CHO) review. Category III force events require a Lieutenant and RU Manager (Captain or Commander) review. Category IV force events require a Lieutenant review.

² Twenty percent of Category III and IV cases are audited with the exception of Category III CEW cases in which 100% of those cases are audited. One hundred percent of serious use of force and CEW cases are audited; while 20% of Category II vehicle ram, canine bites, firearm discharges to stop an aggressive animal, and launched impact munitions with contact cases are audited.

it was not used to track all hobble applications, only those used to accomplish maximum restraint. The FDCR and subsequent quarterly reports were changed to more accurately reflect the data tracked.

Category IV Force^{3,4}

Box In	Box-in is a coordinated tactic of positioning police vehicles around a subject's vehicle to stop or prevent the start of a pursuit. When a member performs a Box- in, the driver of the vehicle is considered the subject of the force event.
Baton – non-striking	Non-Striking use of the baton includes the use of the baton as a pry tool.
Controlled Takedown	A controlled takedown is defined as a takedown performed in a completely controlled manner where there is minimal resistance and no injury
Response to Resisted Handcuffing	Resisted handcuffing is handcuffing that occurs while a subject is resisting, this includes a subject tensing up, or any resistance that requires a member to push the subject's hands together for handcuffing.
Pointing of Firearm	A pointing of a firearm event occurs when a member points a firearm at a subject. This includes handguns, lethal shotgun and rifles. This does not include pointing a CEW or less lethal launcher at a subject.
Hobble Restraint	A hobble restraint is used to control a subject beyond the capability of handcuffs. It is used to secure a combative subject's legs together to prevent kicking. A hobble may also be used on the upper arms and legs of a subject, if the subject has demonstrated the intent to slip their handcuffs to the front.
Control against Resistance	Control against resistance refers to a member use of a control hold against a subject's resistance.
Firearm Discharge – End the suffering of an injured animal	A member may discharge their firearm to end the suffering of a critically injured animal.
For additional definition of Force Categories, please refer to Portland Police Bureau Directive 1010.00	

Table and Measurement Definitions⁵

Officer Table – Total Cases Audited	This is the total number of unique cases (identified
--	--

³ The PPB began counting and auditing the use of Category IV force on 8/19/2017

⁴ Twenty percent of most Category III and IV cases are audited. One hundred percent of serious use of force (Category II) and CEW (Category II and III) cases are audited; while 20% of Category II vehicle ram, canine bites, firearm discharges to stop an aggressive animal, and launched impact munitions with contact cases are audited.

⁵ Please refer to the USDOJ Settlement Agreement (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/article/506328>) for additional information.

	by case number) that included an FDCR-level force event audited during the reporting period. Multiple subjects within the same case may have had force used against them, but the case will only be counted once.
Officer Table – Total Reporting Deficiencies	The audit of officer reports assesses compliance to twenty-one paragraphs of the DOJ Settlement Agreement (74ai-74biv) using fifty-six questions. This is the total reporting deficiencies found.
Officer Table – Mental Health and Injuries	The Mental Health and Injuries topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74ai, 74cix, 74av, and 74cv using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of officer reporting deficiencies found for each of the four SA paragraphs audited within this topic.
Officer Table – Force and Resistance	The Force and Resistance topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74aii, 74aiii, 74avi, 74civ, 74cvii, and 74ci using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of reporting deficiencies found for each of the six SA paragraphs audited within this topic.
Officer Table – De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	The De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74cvi, 74ciii, 74cviii, 74cii, and 74aiv using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of officer reporting deficiencies found for each of the five SA paragraphs audited within this topic.
Officer Table – Witness	The Witness topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74cx and 74cxi using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of reporting deficiencies found for each of the two SA paragraphs audited within this topic.
Officer Table – ECW	The ECW topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74bi, 74bii, 74biii, and 74biv using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of officer reporting deficiencies found for each of the four SA paragraphs audited within this

	topic.
Sergeant Table – Total Cases Audited	This is the total number of unique cases (identified by case number) that included a Category II-IV use of force. A Sergeant is required to complete an After Action Report (AAR) for each event in which Category II-IV force was used. Multiple subjects within the same case may have had force used against them, but the case will only be counted once.
Sergeant Table – Total Reporting Deficiencies	The audit of sergeants After Action Reports (AARs) assesses compliance to twelve paragraphs of the DOJ Settlement Agreement (75a-75l) using ninety-six questions. This is the total reporting deficiencies found.
Sergeant Table – Timeliness	The Timeliness topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75a. These are the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.
Sergeant Table – Review of Officer Reporting	The Review of Officer Reporting topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75b using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.
Sergeant Table – Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence	The Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75c using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.
Sergeant Table – Decision Point Analysis	The Decision Point Analysis topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75d using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.
Sergeant Table – Out of PPB Policy	The Out of PPB Policy topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75e using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. Note:

	<p><i>When a sergeant is unclear, or the sergeant does not determine whether an officer's actions are in/out of PPB policy, it is counted as a deficiency.</i></p>
Sergeant Table – Legal Justification	<p>The Legal Justification topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75f. This is the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Sergeant Table – Tactical and Training Implications	<p>The Tactical and Training Implications topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 75g and 75h using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the two SA paragraphs audited within this topic.</p>
Sergeant Table – Corrective Action	<p>The Legal Justification topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75i. This is the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Sergeant Table – EIS	<p>The EIS topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75j using multiple questions. The answers to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. <i>Note: Deficiencies noted here do not simply capture when an EIS entry has not been made; a deficiency can be 1-4 missing EIS requirements, such as case number, the nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified), and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). If an EIS entry was not made for a case, then the sergeant would receive four deficiencies for each of the EIS requirements for that case.</i></p>
Sergeant Table – Notification	<p>The Notification topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75k using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Sergeant Table – Detective Notification	<p>The Detective Notification topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for</p>

	<p>compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75l. These are the total number of sergeant reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Command Table – Total Cases Audited	<p>This is the total number of unique cases (identified by case number) that included a Category II-IV use of force. A Sergeant is required to complete an After Action Report (AAR) for each event in which Category II-IV force was used. Category IV cases are reviewed by a Lieutenant. Category III cases are reviewed by a Lieutenant and RU Manager (Captain or Commander). Category II cases are reviewed by a Lieutenant, RU Manager and the Chief's Office (CHO). Multiple subjects within the same case may have had force used against them, but the case will only be counted once.</p>
Command Table – Total Reporting Deficiencies	<p>The audit of the review of sergeants After Action Reports by members of command assesses compliance to seven paragraphs of the DOJ Settlement Agreement (75a, 75e, 77a-77g) using twenty-seven questions. This is the total reporting deficiencies found.</p>
Command Table – Timeliness	<p>The Timeliness topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75a using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Command Table – In/Out of Policy	<p>The In/Out of Policy topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 75e using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. <i>Note: The number of deficiencies reflects whether the determination of In/Out of Policy was not made or was unclear.</i></p>
Command Table – Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews	<p>The Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77a using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting</p>

	<p>deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p> <p>The Completeness of After Action Reports (940 Reports) topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77b using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Command Table – Completeness of After Action Reports (940 Reports)	
Command Table – Modify Findings	<p>The Modify Findings topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77c using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Command Table – Additional Investigation	<p>The Additional Investigation topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77d using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
Command Table - EIS	<p>The EIS topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77e using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. <i>Note: EIS is assessed using 4 questions for each level in the chain of command review. If a member of the chain of command identifies a reporting discrepancy for the officer(s) or sergeant, the corresponding EIS entry should include the case number, nature of the incident, positive performance (if identified) and training deficiencies, policy deficiencies, or poor tactical decisions (if identified). The total deficiencies per case can represent 1-4 deficiencies for each point assessed.</i></p>
Command Table – Notification Criminal Conduct	<p>The Notification Criminal Conduct topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ</p>

Settlement Agreement paragraph 77f using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. **Note:** *Deficiencies in this topic represent when a case needs to be reviewed for an allegation/evidence of criminal conduct but the allegation/evidence was not addressed. This does not reflect the number of cases where someone in the chain of command identified criminal conduct.*

**Command Table – Notification Misconduct
(Reporting Deficiencies)**

The Notification Misconduct topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 77g using multiple questions. The answer to these questions are compiled to determine the total number of chain of command reporting deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic. **Note:** *Misconduct is defined as reporting deficiencies for the purpose of this audit. A deficiency is noted when someone in the chain of command review does not address officer and/or sergeant reporting deficiencies and subsequently does not make notification of those deficiencies.*