

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2018 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	289
Involved Officers	541
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	250
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	361
Command Review Deficiencies	328

Reporting

- Officer
 - Out of 38 potential reporting deficiencies per Force Data Collection Report (FDCR), officers incurred an average of 0.39 deficiencies per FDCR audited – less than half a deficiency per case audited. This is a decrease from the 2017 deficiency rate of 1.50 deficiencies per FDCR audited.
 - Collectively, officers demonstrated a 98.8% reporting accuracy rate¹. This is greater than the 2017 force reporting accuracy rate of 96.0%.
 - The number of reporting deficiencies decreased significantly beginning in Q2 2018 due to extensive revisions made to the After Action Report (AAR) and FDCR forms that occurred in the spring of 2018.
 - Also due to the new FDCR, officer reporting improved in all categories/topics when compared to the 2017 force audit results – most notably in the Mental Health/Injury and Witness categories, 60% and 50% reductions in deficiencies, respectively.
 - The topic with the largest number of deficiencies in 2018 was the Force and Resistance category. This category encompasses six paragraphs from the US DOJ Settlement Agreement and relies heavily on the officer's description of the use of force on the FDCR.
 - Among officers assigned to Patrol (Central, East and North Precincts), reporting improved for all precincts in 2018, but the largest improvement in officer reporting occurred at Central, followed by East, then North Precinct.
 - Among officers assigned to specialty divisions, in 2018 officers assigned to the Detective and Transit divisions had the lowest reporting accuracy rate and officers assigned to the Tactical Operations (TOD) and Traffic divisions had the highest reporting accuracy rate.

¹ Reporting accuracy formula: $\frac{\text{Total Number of Errors (}\# \text{ of possible errors)} \times (\# \text{ of FDCRS or Cases)} - \text{Actual Number of Errors}}{\text{Total Number of Possible Errors}}$

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2018 Force Audit Results

- Sergeant and Command
 - Sergeant review/reporting deficiencies improved by 0.57 deficiencies per case audited in 2018. Out of 54 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, sergeants incurred an average of 1.25 review/reporting deficiencies per case audited. This is an improvement when compared to the 2017 deficiency rate of 1.82.
 - North Precinct sergeants had the highest reporting/review deficiency rate. However, the deficiency rate improved by 0.86 deficiencies per case audited when compared to North Precinct sergeant reporting during 2017.
 - Categories with the greatest number of deficiencies
 - Corrective Action
 - Review of Officer Reporting
 - Compared to the 2017 force audit results, sergeant reporting improved in all categories with the exception of Timeliness, Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence, and Legal Justification.
 - The Lieutenant's, Reporting Unit (RU) Manager's and Chief's Office (CHO's) reviews are each evaluated utilizing 25 questions.
 - Both, the Lieutenant's and CHO's accuracy when reviewing cases decreased compared to 2017. RU Managers improved in their accuracy when reviewing cases in 2018.
 - Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for both Lieutenants and RU Managers:
 - Completeness of 940 Reports (After Action Reports)
 - Notification – Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies)
 - 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.

BUREAU WIDE

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	289
Involved Officers	541
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	250
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	361
Command Review Deficiencies	328

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- Out of 38 potential reporting deficiencies per Force Data Collection Report (FDCR), officers incurred an average of 0.39 deficiencies per FDCR audited. This is a decrease from the 2017 deficiency rate of 1.50 deficiencies per FDCR audited.
- Collectively, officers demonstrated a 98.8% reporting accuracy rate³. This is greater than the 2017 force reporting accuracy rate of 96.0%.
- As shown in the officer Reporting Deficiencies by RU table, the number of reporting deficiencies decreased significantly beginning in Q2 2018 due to major revisions made to the After Action Report (AAR) and FDCR forms that occurred in the spring of 2018.
- Officers were most deficient in their reporting in the Force/Resistance and De-escalation and Decision Point Analysis categories.
- Compared to use of force audit results for 2017, officers improved in all reporting categories during 2018 – most notably in the Mental Health/Injuries (60% improvement) and Witness (50% improvement) categories.

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

³ Reporting accuracy formula: $\frac{\text{Total Number of Errors} (\# \text{ of possible errors}) \times (\# \text{ of FDCRS or Cases}) - \text{Actual Number of Errors}}{\text{Total Number of Possible Errors}}$

BUREAU WIDE

2018 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies by RU - Q1-Q4 2018																												
Total FDCRs Audited				Total Reporting Deficiencies				Precinct/Division	Mental Health and Injuries				Force and Resistance				De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis				Witness				CEW			
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
57	53	51	52	31	11	0	5	CENTRAL	3	2	0	2	10	5	0	1	6	4	0	1	7	0	0	0	5	0	0	1
0	1	0	0	*	0	*	*	CHIEFS OFFICE	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*
1	2	3	2	4	2	4	2	DETECTIVE	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	0	0	5	0	*	*	DRUGS AND VICE	0	0	*	*	1	0	*	*	1	0	*	*	3	0	*	*	0	0	*	*
71	38	35	49	20	16	8	12	EAST	2	1	1	1	8	9	2	7	8	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	3	2
1	0	1	1	2	*	0	0	FAMILY SERVICES	0	*	0	0	1	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	1	*	0	0	0	*	0	0
52	41	29	22	53	28	6	10	NORTH	4	5	1	2	10	11	3	6	18	9	2	1	19	1	0	1	2	2	0	0
0	1	2	1	*	2	1	0	PERSONNEL	*	1	0	0	*	0	1	0	*	1	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0
2	19	5	5	0	2	0	0	TACTICAL OPERATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	5	1	2	2	1	0	1	TRAFFIC	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	2	0	*	*	0	*	TRAINING	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*
5	4	4	2	10	3	7	0	TRANSIT	2	2	2	0	4	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	2	2	0	*	0	YOUTH SERVICES	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	1	0	*	0	1	0	*	0	0	0	*	0
199	166	133	138	129	65	26	30	QUARTER TOTAL	11	12	4	6	37	30	10	15	38	17	6	3	36	2	3	2	7	4	3	3
636				250				YEAR TOTAL	33				92				64				43				17			

* No FDCR Audited

BUREAU WIDE

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeant Review

- Out of 54 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, sergeants incurred an average of 1.25 review/reporting deficiencies per case audited. This is an improvement when compared to the 2017 deficiency rate of 1.82. sergeant review/reporting deficiencies improved by 0.57 deficiencies per case audited in 2018.
- Sergeants demonstrated a 97.7% reporting accuracy rate in 2018. This is greater than the 96.6% reporting accuracy rate in 2017.
- Categories with the greatest number of deficiencies
 - Corrective Action⁴
 - Review of Officer Reporting⁵
- When compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting was in the Tactical/Training Implications, Review of Officer Reporting, and EIS categories.
- Reporting captured in the Legal Justification, Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence, and Timeliness categories did not improve when compared to 2017.

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies by RU - Q1-Q4 2018																																																								
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				EIS				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												
25	20	28	19	33	30	15	13	CENTRAL	0	0	1	2	4	9	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	3	7	3	7	8	3	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
1	2	1	1	2	3	0	2	DETECTIVE	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1	0	1	0	1	*	0	*	DVD	0	*	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	*								
29	18	14	25	33	21	19	24	EAST	0	0	1	2	2	7	4	9	0	0	6	0	1	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	8	6	5	12	18	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0				
21	22	13	12	61	41	6	23	NORTH	0	1	0	0	6	11	1	7	3	5	0	3	6	6	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	7	3	7	26	7	2	2	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	1	*	*	*	0	PERSONNEL	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0								
5	4	3	4	5	8	1	2	TOD	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
6	1	0	0	6	0	*	*	TRAFFIC	0	0	*	*	1	0	*	*	1	0	*	*	0	0	*	*	0	0	*	*	0	0	*	*	3	0	*	*	1	0	*	*	0	0	*	*	0	0	*	*								
3	3	3	2	4	2	4	1	TRANSIT	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0								
0	0	0	1	*	*	*	1	YSD	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	0												
91	70	63	65	145	105	45	66	QUARTER TOTAL	1	2	2	5	14	29	6	17	9	9	7	4	9	10	1	4	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	43	25	13	29	48	21	10	5	11	7	4	2	1	0	0	0				
289				361				YEAR TOTAL	10				66				29				24				7				2				4				110				84				24				1							

* No Case Audited

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

BUREAU WIDE

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- Out of 25 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, Lieutenants incurred 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenant's accuracy when reviewing cases decreased compared to 2017 (0.49 deficiencies per case).
- Lieutenants demonstrated a 97.6% accuracy rate in 2018. This is less than the 2017 rate of 98.0%.
- Out of 25 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, RU Managers incurred 0.71 deficiencies per case audited in 2018.
- RU Managers improved in their accuracy when reviewing cases in 2018. The rate of reporting/review deficiencies per case audited for RU Managers decreased from 0.79 in 2017 to 0.71 in 2018.
- On average, RU Managers demonstrated a 97.2% review/reporting accuracy rate in 2018. In 2017, RU Managers demonstrated a 96.8% reporting/review accuracy rate.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for both Lieutenants and RU Managers:
 - Completeness of 940 Reports (After Action Reports)⁶
 - Notification – Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies)⁷
- Out of 25 potential reporting deficiencies per case audited, the Chief's Office (CHO) incurred 0.47 deficiencies per case audited. Compared to 2017 force audit results, the CHO's accuracy when reviewing cases decreased (0.32 deficiencies per case in 2017 compared to 0.47 in 2018). On average, the CHO demonstrated the greatest review/reporting accuracy rate (98.1%) amongst those who reviewed cases at the command level.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.**

BUREAU WIDE

2018 Force Audit Results

CHO Reporting Deficiencies - 2018																																												
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 (Reporting Deficiencies) (77g)			
	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	0	2	2	4	*	2	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	1	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	1	0	0				
OPERATIONS	27	17	8	14	18	4	4	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	3	3
Quarter Total	27	19	10	18	18	6	4	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	3	3
Annual Total	74				35				1				3				2				9				0				0				4				0				16			

Audit Results - Inspector

For the 289 cases audited in the force audit, PPB's Inspector assessed an additional 31 topics, for example: overall report writing, situation/information gathering, initial response to the call, decision point analysis, medical aid, Graham Standard, risk assessment, and training/tactical concerns.

In 2018, the Inspector initiated an internal process to provide feedback for the findings discovered by the force audit and the Inspector's audit to ensure that:

- RU command gets quick feedback in regards to their after actions to:
 - correct errors in reporting and ensure compliance of EIS entries and;
 - 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 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.

Findings for the feedback process were identified for 63 cases. For findings addressed to the RU command requiring their action, 22 completed the feedback process and documented the corrective action in EIS.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	92
Involved Officers	171
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	47
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	91
Command Review Deficiencies	30

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers assigned to Central Precinct incurred 0.22 reporting errors per FDCR audited. This is less than the bureau-wide average for 2018 (0.39 errors/FDCR audited). On average, the officers demonstrated a 99.4% reporting accuracy rate (see Officer Reporting Deficiencies – Central Precinct – Annual 2018 table).
- As shown in the Officer Reporting Deficiencies table, the number of reporting deficiencies decreased significantly beginning in Q2 2018 due to major revisions made to the AAR and FDCR forms that occurred in the spring of 2018.
- Officers at Central Precinct were most deficient in their reporting in the Force/Resistance and De-escalation and Decision Point Analysis categories. The Force and Resistance topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74aⁱⁱ, 74aⁱⁱⁱ, 74a^{vi}, 74c^{iv}, 74c^{vii}, 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. The De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis topic includes the results of auditing officer reports for compliance to DOJ Settlement Agreement paragraphs 74c^{vi}, 74cⁱⁱⁱ, 74c^{viii}, 74cⁱⁱ, and 74a^{iv} 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.
- With the exception of the CEW category, reporting deficiencies decreased in each of the reporting categories, when compared to 2017. The largest reductions were in the Mental Health/Injuries and Witness categories, which decreased by 67% and 68%, respectively.

¹ Force cases audited 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Central Precinct - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point	Witness	CEW
Q1	57	31	3	10	6	7	5
Q2	53	11	2	5	4	0	0
Q3	51	0	2	0	0	0	0
Q4	52	5	2	1	1	0	1
TOTAL	213	47	9	16	11	7	6

- Both, the officer reporting deficiency and accuracy rates improved in 2018. Notably, for Central Precinct officers, the deficiency rate improved by 84% when compared to the deficiency rate in 2017.

Central Precinct Comparison of Deficiency Rate and Accuracy Rate 2017 to 2018		
YEAR	DEFICIENCY RATE	ACCURACY RATE
2017	1.33	96.50%
2018	0.22	99.42%

Audit Results - Sergeants

- On average, Central Precinct sergeants demonstrated a 98.2% reporting accuracy rate and reporting deficiencies per case audited were 0.99 (deficiencies/case). The accuracy rate is greater than the Bureau wide average of 97.7% and the deficiency rate is less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25.
- During 2018, Central Precinct sergeant reporting deficiencies improved. After the introduction of the revised AAR and FDCR in the spring of 2018, the number of sergeant reporting/review deficiencies decreased by half when compared to the two previous quarters.
- Both, the deficiency rate and the accuracy rate improved when compared to Central Precinct sergeant reporting during 2017: 1.85 deficiency rate and 96.6% accuracy rate.

CENTRAL PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action
 - EIS³
- When compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting was seen in the Review of Officer Reporting, Decision Point Analysis, and Tactical and Training Implications categories for sergeants at Central Precinct.
- Reporting categories that did not improve when compared to 2017:
 - Timeliness
 - Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Central Precinct - Annual 2018													
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
25	33	Q1	0	4	3	1	1	2	0	14	3	5	0
20	30	Q2	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	9	7	4	0
28	15	Q3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	0
19	13	Q4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	0
92	91	TOTAL	3	15	4	1	1	2	0	33	21	11	0

³ 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

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- Lieutenants at Central Precinct incurred 0.26 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenants at Central Precinct demonstrated a 99.0% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is higher than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.6%.
- Both rates improved when compared to Central Precinct Lieutenant reporting during 2017: 0.57 deficiency rate and 97.3% accuracy rate.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Central Lieutenants:
 - EIS⁴
 - Completeness of 940 (After Action) Reports
- RU Managers at Central Precinct incurred 0.36 deficiencies per case audited, which is lower than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. The RU Manager at Central Precinct demonstrated a 98.6% review/accuracy rate, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- Topics with the greatest number of deficiencies for Central Precinct RU Managers (Captains/Commanders):
 - EIS
 - Timeliness

Central Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	24	7	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Q2	10	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
Q3	25	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1
Q4	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	78	20	0	1	1	3	1	1	4	0	9

⁴ 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

2018 Force Audit Results

Central Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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 (77c)	EIS (77e)	Notification - Criminal Conduct (77f)	Notification - Misconduct (77g) (Reporting Deficiencies)
Q1	9	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1
Q2	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Q3	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q4	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	28	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	2

DETECTIVE DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	5
Involved Officers	8
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	12
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	7
Command Review Deficiencies	9

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results- Officers

- The reporting deficiency rate for officers at the Detective Division was greater than the Bureau wide rate of 0.39. Detective Division officers incurred deficiencies at a rate of 1.50 deficiencies per FDCR audited. This is a decrease from the 2017 deficiency rate of 2.00 deficiencies per FDCR audited.
- Officers at the Detective Division demonstrated a 96.1% reporting accuracy rate. This is less than the Bureau wide force reporting accuracy rate of 99.0%. However, the reporting accuracy rate increased when compared to the 2017 force audit results in which officers at the Detective Division had a reporting accuracy rate of 94.7%.
- Officers were most deficient in their reporting in the Force and Resistance category.

¹ Force cases audited 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

DETECTIVE DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies -Detectives - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	1	4	0	2	1	1	0
Q2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
Q3	3	4	0	3	1	0	0
Q4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8	12	1	7	2	1	0

Audit Results – Sergeants

- The reporting deficiency rate for sergeants at the Detective Division was greater than the Bureau wide average of 1.25. Sergeants at the Detective Division incurred an average of 1.40 reporting deficiencies per case audited. The sergeants demonstrated a 97.4% review/reporting accuracy rate. This is less than the Bureau wide rate, 97.7%.
- Both rates improved when compared to 2017: 2.00 deficiency rate, 96.3% accuracy rate.
- The topic with the greatest number of deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action

DETECTIVE DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Detectives - Annual 2018													
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
2	3	Q2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
1	0	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2	Q4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5	7	TOTAL	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0

Audit Results - Command Review

- The reporting/review deficiency rate of 1.17 for Lieutenants at the Detective Division, was greater than the Bureau wide rate of 0.60.
- Compared to the 2017 force audit results, the deficiency rate increased in 2018 (0.00 deficiency rate in 2017).
- Lieutenants at the Detective Division demonstrated a 95.3% accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau wide accuracy rate (97.6%).
- Topics with the largest number of reporting/review deficiencies:
 - Notification of Misconduct³
 - Completeness of 940 Reports (After Action Reports)
- RU Managers at the Detective Division reviewed 2 cases and incurred 2 deficiencies during 2018. The RU Managers incurred 1.00 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. The RU Managers demonstrated a 96.0% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.

³ 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.**

DETECTIVE DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Detectives Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Q2	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Q3	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q4	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	6	7	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3

* No Cases Audited

Detective RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Q3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Q4	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

* No Cases Audited

Drugs and Vice Division (DVD)

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	2
Involved Officers	5
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	5
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	1
Command Review Deficiencies	1

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, DVD officers incurred 1.00 reporting deficiency per case. This is higher than the bureau-wide average for officer reporting deficiencies (0.39).
- Officers at DVD were most deficient in their reporting in the Witness category.
- Compared to force audit results for 2017, officers at DVD improved their reporting in the Mental Health/Injury and the Force/Resistance categories.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - DVD - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	ECW
Q1	4	5	0	1	1	3	0
Q2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q4	0	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL	5	5	0	1	1	3	0

* No FDCRs Audited

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

Drugs and Vice Division (DVD)

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeants

- Sergeants at DVD reviewed 2 cases and incurred 1 deficiency in the Corrective Action category in 2018. The sergeants had a deficiency rate of 0.5 and an accuracy rate of 99.1%. Both rates are better than the Bureau wide rates: 1.25 deficiency rate and 97.7% accuracy rate.

Audit Results – Command Review

- Lieutenants at DVD reviewed 2 cases and incurred 1 deficiency in the Notification Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies) category. The Lieutenants had a deficiency rate of 0.5 and an accuracy rate of 98.0%. Both rates are above the Bureau wide rates for Lieutenants: 0.6 deficiency rate and 97.6% accuracy rate.
- A RU Manager at DVD reviewed 1 case and incurred 1 deficiency in the Notification Misconduct (Reporting Deficiencies) category. The RU Manager had a deficiency rate of 1.00 and an accuracy rate of 96.0%. Both rates are below the Bureau wide average: 0.71 deficiency rate and 97.2% accuracy rate.

EAST PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	86
Involved Officers	161
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	56
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	97
Command Review Deficiencies	68

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- The reporting deficiency rate for East Precinct officers was less than the Bureau wide rate of 0.39. East Precinct officers incurred deficiencies at a rate of 0.29 deficiencies per FDCR audited. This is a decrease from the 2017 deficiency rate of 1.61 deficiencies per FDCR audited.
- East Precinct officers demonstrated a 99.2% reporting accuracy rate. This is greater than the Bureau wide force reporting accuracy rate of 99.0% and the 2017 accuracy rate of 96.0%.
- Officers at East Precinct were most deficient in their reporting in the Force/Resistance and De-escalation and Decision Point Analysis categories.
- Compared to use of force audit results for 2017, officers at East Precinct improved in all reporting categories during 2018 – most notably in Mental Health/Injuries (83% improvement) and Witness (82% improvement).

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

EAST PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - East Precinct - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total Cases Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	CEW
Q1	71	20	2	8	8	2	0
Q2	38	16	1	9	3	1	2
Q3	35	8	1	2	1	1	3
Q4	49	12	1	7	1	1	2
TOTAL	193	56	5	26	13	5	7

Audit Results - Sergeant Review

- The reporting deficiency rate for sergeants at East Precinct was less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25. Sergeants at East Precinct incurred an average of 1.13 reporting deficiencies per case audited. Sergeants at East Precinct demonstrated a 97.9% review/reporting accuracy rate. This is greater than the Bureau wide rate, 97.7%.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Review of Officer Reporting
 - Corrective Action
 - EIS³
- When compared to the 2017 use of force audit results, the greatest improvement in reporting was seen in the Notification, Out of PPB Policy, and Tactical and Training Implications categories for sergeants at East Precinct.
- Reporting categories that did not improve when compared to 2017:
 - Decision Point Analysis
 - Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence

³ 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

2018 Force Audit Results

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - East Precinct - Annual 2018													
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
29	33	Q1	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	8	18	1	1
18	21	Q2	0	7	0	4	0	0	0	6	3	1	0
14	19	Q3	1	4	6	1	0	0	2	5	0	0	0
25	24	Q4	2	9	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	0	0
86	97	TOTAL	3	22	6	7	1	0	3	31	21	2	1

Audit Results - Command Review

- Lieutenants at East Precinct incurred 0.57 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenants at East Precinct demonstrated a 97.7% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.6%.
- Both rates worsened when compared to East Precinct Lieutenant reporting during 2017: 0.35 deficiency rate and 98.6% accuracy rate.
- RU Managers at East Precinct incurred 0.61 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. RU Managers at East Precinct demonstrated a 97.6% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is higher than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- Both rates worsened when compared to East Precinct RU Manager reporting during 2017: 0.46 deficiency rate and 98.2% accuracy rate.
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Lieutenants and RU Managers at East Precinct were in the Completeness of 940 Reports (AAR) and the Notification of Misconduct⁴ categories.
- Compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting/review was in the EIS and Timelines categories.

⁴ 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.**

EAST PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

East Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	29	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Q2	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Q3	11	8	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	3
Q4	24	23	0	1	0	10	1	1	0	0	10
Total	76	43	0	2	3	14	1	2	0	0	21

East Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Q2	9	10	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	3
Q3	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Q4	10	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2
Total	41	25	0	1	3	5	0	0	5	0	11

NORTH PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	68
Involved Officers	120
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	97
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	131
Command Review Deficiencies	111

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers at North Precinct incurred 0.67 reporting errors per FDCR audited. This is above the Bureau wide 2018 rate of 0.39. On average, North Precinct officer demonstrated a 98.2% reporting accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau wide rate, 98.8%.
- As shown in the Officer Reporting Deficiencies table, the number of reporting deficiencies began decreasing significantly during Q2 2018 due to the revision of After Action Reports (AARs) and Force Data Collection Reports (FDCRs) in the spring of 2018.
- The officer reporting deficiency rate decreased more than 2 times when compared to 2017 (from 1.87 in 2017 to 0.67 in 2018). The reporting accuracy rate increased from 95.1% in 2017 to 98.2% in 2018.
- Officers at North Precinct were most deficient in their reporting in the Force/Resistance and De-escalation and Decision Point Analysis categories.
- Reporting deficiencies decreased in each of the reporting categories, when compared to 2017. The largest reductions were in the Mental Health/Injury and CEW categories.

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

NORTH PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - North Precinct - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	CEW
Q1	52	53	4	10	18	19	2
Q2	41	28	5	11	9	1	2
Q3	29	6	1	3	2	0	0
Q4	22	10	2	6	1	1	0
TOTAL	144	97	12	30	30	21	4

Audit Results - Sergeants

- On average, North Precinct sergeants demonstrated a 96.4% reporting accuracy rate and reporting deficiencies per case audited were 1.93 (deficiencies/case). The accuracy rate is less than the Bureau wide average of 97.7% and the deficiency rate is less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25.
- Among patrol sergeants, North Precinct sergeants had the lowest accuracy rate and greatest deficiency rate.

2018		
Sergeant Reporting/Review Comparison		
PRECINCT	DEFICIENCY RATE	ACCURACY RATE
CENTRAL	0.99	98.17%
EAST	1.13	97.91%
NORTH	1.93	96.43%

- However, the deficiency rate and the accuracy rate improved when compared to North Precinct sergeant reporting during 2017: 2.79 deficiency rate and 94.8% accuracy rate.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action
 - EIS³

³ 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

25 of 46

NORTH PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

- When compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting was seen in the Legal Justification and Review of Officer Reporting categories for sergeants at North Precinct.
- Reporting in the following categories did not improve when compared to the 2017 force audit results:
 - Out of PPB Policy
 - Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence
 - Decision Point Analysis

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - North Precinct - Annual 2018													
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
21	61	Q1	0	6	3	6	4	0	0	12	26	4	0
22	41	Q2	1	11	5	6	1	0	1	7	7	2	0
13	6	Q3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0
12	23	Q4	0	7	3	3	0	0	0	7	2	1	0
68	131	TOTAL	1	25	11	15	5	0	1	29	37	7	0

Audit Results – Command Review

- Lieutenants at North Precinct incurred 0.97 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenants at North Precinct demonstrated a 96.1% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.6%.
- Both rates worsened when compared to North Precinct Lieutenant reporting during 2017: 0.67 deficiency rate and 97.3% accuracy rate.
- RU Managers at North Precinct incurred 1.28 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. RU Managers at North Precinct demonstrated a 94.9% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- Compared to the 2017 force audit results, both rates improved for RU Managers at North Precinct (2017: 1.66 deficiency rate and 93.2% accuracy rate).
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Lieutenants and RU Managers at North Precinct were in the Completeness of 940 Reports (AAR) and the Notification of Misconduct⁴ categories.
- Compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting/review was in the EIS and Timelines categories.

(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.

⁴ 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.**

NORTH PRECINCT

2018 Force Audit Results

North Precinct Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	22	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	12
Q2	17	18	0	1	2	4	0	2	4	0	5
Q3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Q4	12	15	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	7
Total	58	56	0	5	3	16	0	2	5	0	25

North Precinct RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	11	22	0	4	1	5	0	2	4	0	6
Q2	13	15	0	1	2	4	0	3	0	0	5
Q3	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Q4	12	13	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	5
Total	43	55	1	5	3	16	0	6	5	0	19

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	16
Involved Officers	30
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	2
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	16
Command Review Deficiencies	14

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results)^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- The reporting deficiency rate for TOD officers was less than the Bureau wide rate of 0.39. TOD officers incurred deficiencies at a rate of 0.06 deficiencies per FDCR audited. This is less than the 2017 TOD deficiency rate of 0.47 deficiency per FDCR audited.
- The 2018 reporting accuracy rate of officers at TOD was among the highest in the Bureau. TOD officers demonstrated a 99.8% reporting accuracy rate. This is greater than the Bureau wide force reporting accuracy rate of 99.0% and the 2017 TOD accuracy rate of 98.8%.
- Officers at TOD were most deficient in their reporting in the Force and Resistance category.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies -TOD - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	CEW
Q1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	19	2	0	2	0	0	0
Q3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	31	2	0	2	0	0	0

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- On average, TOD sergeants demonstrated a 98.2% reporting accuracy rate and reporting deficiencies per case audited were 1.00 (deficiencies/case). The accuracy rate is greater than the Bureau wide average of 97.7% and the deficiency rate is less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25.
- During 2018, TOD sergeant reporting deficiencies improved. After the introduction of the revised AAR and FDCR in the spring of 2018, the number of sergeant reporting/review deficiencies decreased by more than half when compared to the two previous quarters.
- Both, the deficiency rate and the accuracy rate worsened when compared to TOD sergeant reporting during 2017: 0.87 deficiency rate and 98.4% accuracy rate.
- Topics with the largest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action
 - EIS

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Tactical Operations Division (TOD) - Annual 2018													
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
5	5	Q1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
4	8	Q2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0
3	1	Q3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	2	Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
16	16	TOTAL	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- The reporting/review deficiency rate for Lieutenants at TOD was less than the Bureau wide rate (0.44 – TOD compared to 0.60 Bureau wide).
- Compared to the 2017 force audit results, the deficiency rate increased in 2018.
- Lieutenants at TOD demonstrated a 98.2% accuracy rate, which is greater than the Bureau wide accuracy rate (97.6%).
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting/review deficiencies:
 - Notification of Misconduct³
 - Completeness of 940 Reports (After Action Reports)
- Compared to 2017, the largest improvement in reporting/review for Lieutenants at TOD was in the EIS category.
- RU Managers at TOD incurred 0.45 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. RU Managers at TOD demonstrated a 98.2% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- The topic with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies for RU Managers at TOD:
 - EIS

TOD Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	4	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1
Q2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Q3	9	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Q4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	8	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4

³ 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.**

TACTICAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (TOD)

2018 Force Audit Results

TOD RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Q2	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Q4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0

TRAFFIC DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	7
Involved Officers	15
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	4
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	6
Command Review Deficiencies	11

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results)^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- On average, officers incurred 0.33 reporting errors per case. This is lower than the average Bureau wide average (0.39) for officer reporting deficiencies.
- Officers at the Traffic Division demonstrated a 99.1% accuracy rate, which is greater than the Bureau wide rate (99.0%).
- Reporting accuracy improved when compared to the 2017 force audit results (98.0%-2017 compared to 99.1%-2018).
- Officers at the Traffic Division were most deficient in the reporting in the Force and Resistance category.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Traffic - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	CEW
Q1	4	2	0	1	1	0	0
Q2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0
Q3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	12	4	1	2	1	0	0

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

TRAFFIC DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Sergeants

- The reporting deficiency rate for sergeants at the Traffic Division was less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25. The sergeants incurred an average of 0.86 reporting deficiencies per case audited. Sergeants at the Traffic Division demonstrated a 98.4% review/reporting accuracy rate. This is greater than the Bureau wide rate, 97.7%.
- Topic with the greatest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action
- When compared to the 2017 use of force audit results, the greatest improvement in reporting was seen in the EIS and Review of Officer reporting categories for sergeants at Traffic.
- Reporting category that did not improve when compared to 2017 force audit results:
 - Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Traffic Division - Annual 2018													
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	6	Q1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
1	0	Q2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	*	Q3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
0	*	Q4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
7	6	TOTAL	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0

* No Case Audited

TRAFFIC DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results - Command Review

- Lieutenants at Traffic incurred 0.45 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is better than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenants at Traffic demonstrated a 98.2% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is better than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.6%.
- Both rates improved when compared to Traffic Lieutenant reporting during 2017: 0.50 deficiency rate and 98.0% accuracy rate.
- RU Managers at Traffic incurred 0.60 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. RU Managers at Traffic demonstrated a 97.6% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is higher than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- Both rates improved when compared to Traffic RU Manager reporting during 2017: 0.56 deficiency rate and 97.8% accuracy rate.
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies for Lieutenants and RU Managers at Traffic were in the Notification of Misconduct³ category.
- Compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting/review was in the EIS category.

Traffic Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	6	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Q2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q4	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	11	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

* No Cases Audited

³ 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.**

TRAFFIC DIVISION

2018 Force Audit Results

Traffic RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	3	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	2
Q2	4	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Q3	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Q4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	6	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	3

* No Cases Audited

TRANSIT

2018 Force Audit Results

Force Cases Audited	13
Involved Officers	15
Officer Reporting Deficiencies	20
Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies	12
Command Review Deficiencies	22

2018 Reporting of Force (Audit Results) ^{1,2}

Audit Results – Officers

- The reporting deficiency rate for Transit officers was greater than the Bureau wide rate of 0.39. Transit officers incurred deficiencies at a rate of 1.33 deficiencies per FDCR audited. This is an increase from the 2017 deficiency rate of 0.89 deficiencies per FDCR audited.
- Transit officers demonstrated a 96.5% reporting accuracy rate. This is less than the Bureau wide force reporting accuracy rate of 99.0% and the 2017 accuracy rate of 97.7%.
- Officers at the Transit Division were most deficient in their reporting in the Force/Resistance and Mental Health/Injury categories.
- Compared to the force audit results for 2017, reporting by officers at the Transit Division improved in the CEW category, but declined in all other categories.

Officer Reporting Deficiencies - Transit - Annual 2018							
Quarter	Total FDCRs Audited	Total Reporting Deficiencies	Mental Health and Injuries	Force and Resistance	De-Escalation and Decision Point Analysis	Witness	CEW
Q1	5	10	2	4	2	2	0
Q2	4	3	2	1	0	0	0
Q3	4	7	2	1	2	2	0
Q4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	15	20	6	6	4	4	0

¹ Force cases audited during 2018.

² Does not include RRT/Crowd Control events

TRANSIT

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Sergeant Review

- On average, Transit sergeants demonstrated a 98.2% reporting accuracy rate and reporting deficiencies per case audited were 1.00 (deficiencies/case). The accuracy rate is greater than the Bureau wide average of 97.7% and the deficiency rate is less than the Bureau wide average of 1.25.
- Both, the deficiency rate and the accuracy rate improved when compared to Transit sergeant reporting during 2017: 1.78 deficiency rate and 96.8% accuracy rate.
- Topics with the largest number of reporting deficiencies:
 - Corrective Action
 - Notification

Sergeant Reporting Deficiencies - Transit Division - Annual 2018													
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
3	4	Q1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
3	2	Q2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
3	4	Q3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
2	1	Q4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
11	11	TOTAL	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	0

TRANSIT

2018 Force Audit Results

Audit Results – Command Review

- Lieutenants at Transit incurred 1.70 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is greater than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.60 deficiencies per case audited. Lieutenants at Transit demonstrated a 93.2% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.6%.
- Both rates worsened when compared to Transit Lieutenant reporting during 2017: 0.50 deficiency rate and 98.0% accuracy rate.
- Topics with the greatest number of reporting/review deficiencies for the Lieutenants:
 - EIS
 - Completeness of 940 Reports (After Action Reports)
- RU Managers at Transit incurred 0.31 reporting deficiencies per case audited, which is less than the Bureau-wide rate of 0.71 deficiencies per case audited. RU Managers at Transit demonstrated a 98.8% review/reporting accuracy rate, which is higher than the Bureau-wide rate of 97.2%.
- Both rates improved when compared to Transit RU Manager reporting during 2017: 0.57 deficiency rate and 97.7% accuracy rate.
- The greatest number of reporting deficiencies for RU Managers at Transit were in the Notification of Misconduct³ category.
- Compared to 2017, the greatest improvement in reporting/review was in the EIS category.

Transit Lieutenant Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	3	5	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Q2	2	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Q3	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2
Q4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	17	3	1	0	3	0	0	4	0	6

³ 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.**

TRANSIT

2018 Force Audit Results

Transit RU Manager Reporting Deficiencies - 2018											
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	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Q2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Q3	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Q4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	16	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2

Table and Measurement Definitions¹

Officer Table – Total Cases Audited	This is the total number of unique cases (identified 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 74aai, 74aaii, 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

¹ Please refer to the USDOJ Settlement Agreement (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/article/506328>) for additional information.

<p>Officer Table – ECW</p>	<p>audited within this topic.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Total Cases Audited</p>	<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. Multiple subjects within the same case may have had force used against them, but the case will only be counted once.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Total Reporting Deficiencies</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Timeliness</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Review of Officer Reporting</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Evaluate the Weight of the Evidence</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Decision Point Analysis</p>	<p>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</p>

<p>Sergeant Table – Out of PPB Policy</p>	<p>the SA paragraph audited within this topic. 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: 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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Legal Justification</p>	<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>
<p>Sergeant Table – Tactical and Training Implications</p>	<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>
<p>Sergeant Table – Corrective Action</p>	<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>
<p>Sergeant Table – EIS</p>	<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. 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.</p>
<p>Sergeant Table – Notification</p>	<p>The Notification topic includes the results of auditing</p>

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.

Sergeant Table – Detective Notification

The Detective Notification topic includes the results of auditing sergeant After Action Reports for 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.

Command 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. 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.

Command Table – Total Reporting Deficiencies

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.

Command Table – Timeliness

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.

Command Table – In/Out of Policy

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. **Note: The number of deficiencies reflects whether the determination of In/Out of Policy was not made or**

<p>Command Table – Adequacy of Chain of Command Reviews</p>	<p><i>was unclear.</i></p> <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 deficiencies found for the SA paragraph audited within this topic.</p>
<p>Command Table – Completeness of After Action Reports (940 Reports)</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>
<p>Command Table – Modify Findings</p>	<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>
<p>Command Table – Additional Investigation</p>	<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>
<p>Command Table - EIS</p>	<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,</i></p>

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.

Command Table – Notification Criminal Conduct

The Notification Criminal Conduct topic includes the results of auditing the chain of command review of sergeant After Action Reports for compliance to DOJ 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.*