Supervision Audit February 2021

(FOB and ISB)

Report # Supervision 2021-02
April 1, 2021

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Unit individuals listed below:

Innovation Manager Michael Sarver
Auditor Betty Johnson
Auditor Tim Lindsey
Auditor Charmel Peterson
Auditor Faith Thornton

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Supervision Audit in February 2021. Supervision audits are completed to ensure that supervisors are held accountable for providing the close and effective supervision necessary to direct and guide officers. This requires that supervisors: respond to the scene of felony arrests; review each arrest report; respond to the scene of uses of force; investigate each use of force (except those investigated by FIT); review the accuracy and completeness of officers' Daily Activity Sheets; respond to each complaint of misconduct ; ensure that officers are working actively to engage the community and increase the public trust and safety; and provide counseling, redirection, and support to officers.

This audit, conducted in February 2021, was completed prior to the completion of the Supervision Audit Protocol, which is in draft status as of this writing.   This audit consists of 5 main sections: Paragraph 306; Technology; Scheduling; Detective Selection; and Insight. Paragraph 306 pertains to paragraph 306 of the Consent Decree and covers the items listed above in the opening paragraph of this summary.

Scores of 95% or higher are considered substantial compliance. Supervisors should address any noted deficiencies with specific training through In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced by close and effective supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries.

The overall scores of the 5 sections of the Supervision Audit are as follows:

Paragraph 306 – 97%
Technology – 99.8%
Scheduling – 92%
Detective Selection – 100%
Insight – 100%

More detailed results are located in the Scorecards and Conclusion sections.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Supervision audit in February of 2021.

Purpose

Supervision audits are completed to ensure supervision is conducted effectively and in accordance with the rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Supervision requirements are regulated by the following policies of the New Orleans Police Department's Operations Manual:

Chapter 1.3 Use of Force
Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force
Chapter 1.9 Arrests
Chapter 11.0 Organizational Command Responsibility
Chapter 11.0.1 Duties and Responsibilities of District Commanders, Supervisory Members and Officers
Chapter 35.1.9 Insight: Early Intervention System
Chapter 41.3.10 Body Word Camera
Chapter 41.13 Bias-Free Policing
Chapter 42.3 Task Forces
Chapter 42.11 Custodial Interrogations
Chapter 52.1.1 Misconduct Intake and Complaint Investigation

This list is not all inclusive.

Objectives

This audit is designed to ensure that an adequate number of qualified first-line supervisors are deployed in the field to allow supervisors to provide the close and effective supervision necessary for officers to improve and grow professionally; to police actively and effectively; and to identify, correct, and prevent misconduct.

Generally, the auditor is responsible for verifying and documenting that the NOPD provided proper supervision through:
1. A supervisor's presence when required
2. Required reports were reviewed and signed
3. Officer activity reports were reviewed and signed
4. Use of force incidents were reviewed, approved (action taken when not acceptable), and signed
5. Misconduct cases were accepted, investigated, and reported as required
6. Supervisors took corrective action (redirection, counseling, training, discipline) when necessary

7. Supervisors ensured officers reported non-working recording equipment (MVR, BWC, CEW, hand-held recorders, etc.)
8. Supervisors ensured required vehicles had operable recording devices
9. Supervisors ensured there were recordings of required police actions
10. Supervisors ensured proper testing of all recording devices
11. Supervisors ensured non-working equipment was reported and repaired
12. Supervisors ensured officers used recording equipment (CEW, MVR, and BWC)
13. Supervisors reviewed recordings
14. Supervisors possess a handheld recording device
15. Supervisors use the handheld recording devices to record use of force investigations and misconduct investigations
16. Supervisors ensured the proper level of supervision was provided daily in the districts (one supervisor to 8 officers)
17. Supervisors ensured patrol officers reported to the same supervisor(s)
18. Supervisors ensured detectives regularly reported to the same supervisor (except during training, annual leave, or sick leave)

Background

Supervision audits have been conducted, whole or in part, since May of 2016. No Supervision Audits were conducted in 2020 because of other Consent Decree priorities and as a result of the December 2019 cyber-attack that victimized the technology infrastructure of the City of New Orleans. As of this writing, a new enhanced Supervision Audit Protocol is being developed. All future audits will be completed using this protocol.

Methodology

Auditors qualitatively assess supervision using the audit forms for each of the 5 sections of the Supervision Audit (see Appendix A). Auditors analyze the following data sources:

1. Officer Daily Activity Sheets (trip sheets)
2. Supervisor's Daily Activity Sheets
3. Daily lineups
4. Felony arrest reports
5. Use of force reports
6. After action reports for specialized units
7. List of misconduct complaints reported to an officer or a supervisor either in the police station or in the field
8. Counseling/Redirection files or SFL entries
9. INSIGHT data
10. List of disciplinary actions
11. List of all vehicles assigned to the district/unit
12. List of vehicles with AVL
13. Record of testing for AVLs
14. List of vehicles with MVRs
15. Record of testing for MVRs

16. Record of recording equipment failures and repairs
17. BWC recordings
18. CEW recordings
19. MVR recordings
20. Equipment repair records
21. Log of supervisor reviews of recordings, if available
22. Documentation that supervisors used information learned from the reviews of recordings for officer performance evaluations
23. Evidence officers reported non-working recording equipment – possible sources include:
    a) Log of officers reporting non-working equipment
    b) Activity sheets (trip sheets)
24. Evidence supervisors ensured non-operating equipment was repaired– possible sources include:
    a) Log of supervisors reporting non-working equipment for repairs
    b) List of repairs to recording equipment
    c) Other documented evidence of supervisors ensuring recording equipment was repaired
25. Evidence supervisors ensured officers used recording devices
26. Evidence supervisors have a hand-held recording device
27. Evidence supervisors use the devices for use of force and misconduct investigations

All documents and related incidents that are in the sample and are not audited must be deselected. All deselections are recorded in the Deselection Log. A review of the Deselection Log shows there were no items deselected for this audit.

Auditors read the guidance in the audit forms on a regular basis. Changes to audit forms are clearly communicated to auditors by the audit supervisor. Auditors re-read policies when guidance in audit forms recommends they do so or when the policy requirements are not clear enough to the auditor to allow him/her to confidently score an audit criterion.

When audit results require comments, auditors thoroughly explain the evidence they observed that led to their determination of the result for the audit criteria in question. Drawing on their knowledge of NOPD policies, auditors note any policy violations they observe that are not specifically addressed in the Supervision Audit tools in the "Auditor Comments" section of the form.

By applying the audit forms as a rubric, the auditors qualitatively assessed the Supervision data to determine whether Supervision substantively met the requirements of policy.

1. A week prior to the audit, districts/units were notified of the audit to ensure the duty location was prepared for the audit and all documentation was available for review.
2. One auditor was assigned to each district/unit to be audited.
3. The auditor used a paper version of the audit form to verify the existence of the required documentation while in the field.
4. The auditor inspected the selected documents provided by the district/unit as evidence of compliance or reviewed online data.
5. When the documentation was unavailable at the time of the audit, the district/unit was given until the end of the day to provide the documentation.
6. **Audit Criteria**
   A. **Respond to felony arrests**
   B. **Review arrest reports –** the online report for this category was unavailable at the time of the audit. Auditors review copies of EPRs to determine compliance.
   C. **Use of force reporting, response & investigation**
   D. **Daily Activity Reports**
      i. Each auditor reviewed one randomly selected month of officer's daily activity reports for a randomly selected platoon for the district/unit in question.
      ii. Evidence of compliance included:
         a. Indications by the officer that an event was not recorded, or a recording device malfunctioned
         b. Completed technology check boxes
         c. The supervisor's signature, indicating his/her review.
      iii. Auditor recorded:
         a. The randomly selected month and platoon
         b. The total number of activity sheets reviewed
         c. The date and unit number of activity sheets missing a signature
         d. The date and unit number of up to three activity sheets on which the officer self-reported unrecorded events
         e. The date and unit number of activity sheets with incomplete technology checkboxes.
   E. **Misconduct/citizen complaints**
      i. Each auditor requested a list of all citizen complaints filed at the duty location
      ii. Evidence of compliance was determined if complaints with were assigned PIB control numbers
      iii. Auditor recorded:
         a. The total number of citizen complaints filed at the duty locations for the time period
         b. The number of complaints without a PIB control numbers

F. **Officers engaged with the community**
   i. Auditors reviewed evidence of compliance with this requirement, such as:
      a. Community policing records
      b. Problem solving activities with the community
      c. Officer's attendance at community events accompanied by some documentation the officer(s) positively interacted with community members
      d. Instruction provided to officers at roll call or during the shift
   ii. Auditors determined:
      a. If Supervisors ensured officers worked actively to engage the community and increase public trust. Failure to provide documentation was recorded as evidence of non-compliance.
G. **Redirection/Counseling**
   i. Auditors reviewed the reporting function of the SFL (Supervisor Feedback Log) application.
   ii. All counselings and redirections for the time period and district was noted as evidence of compliance

H. **Support**
   i. Auditors requested evidence of compliance with this requirement.
   ii. Evidence of compliance can be:
      a. Referrals to officer assistance
      b. Officer peer support provided
      c. Officer commendations (not all evidence should be in this area)
      d. Evidence of positive reinforcement at roll call and during the shift
      e. Other documentation of evidence of support
I. **Patrol officers assigned to the same supervisors**
   i. Auditors reviewed the monthly schedule of one randomly selected month for each shift.
   ii. Evidence of compliance was line-ups that showed each officer consistently worked with the same lieutenant and sergeants assigned to that platoon.
      a. An officer regularly assigned to report to a supervisor who is not assigned to the platoon is evidence of non-compliance.
      b. If no lineup or other evidence is provided for any day, the shift was marked non-compliant.
J. **Officer/Supervisor ratio –** this review was completed independent of this audit. See the separate scorecards for details.
K. **District investigators and their assigned supervisors**
   i. Auditors reviewed the monthly schedule for each detective squad for the period.
   ii. Evidence of compliance was noted if the detective sergeant worked the same day as the detectives.
      a. If the detectives reported to another detective supervisor for whatever reason (furlough, sick, training, etc), the name of that supervisor must have been included somewhere on the schedule.
L. **AVL –** at the time of this audit, this system was unavailable.

M. **Mobile Video Recorders (In-Car Cameras)**
   i. Auditors reviewed up-to-date fleet reports from each district/unit and reviewed In-Car Camera (ICC) videos.
   ii. Evidence of compliance was noted if vehicles assigned to platoons/units that answer calls for service, conduct self-initiated activity or prisoner transport as indicated on the fleet report, that are listed as in-service on the fleet report, and that have an ICC video within one week of the date the fleet report was updated.

N. **MVR required recordings** (see ICC Test & CFS Protocol)
   i. Auditors reviewed evidence of compliance that an MVR was activated when officers conducted any of the 9 below listed police interactions:
      a. All traffic stops
      b. Deployed drug detection dogs
      c. Requested a consent to search
      d. Conducted a vehicle search
      e. Transported a prisoner who was violent or resistant
      f. Handled prisoners with injuries to the prisoner or officer
      g. Used force
      h. Engaged in a pursuit
      i. Were subject to a misconduct complaint
   ii. A random check was made of at least 3 interactions that required a MVR recording.

O. **Officers' notification of recording failures** (see D – Daily Activity Report)

P. **Testing recording equipment** (see D – Daily Activity Report)

Q. **Supervisors' handheld digital recording devices**
   i. Auditors met with an available Sergeant.
   ii. Evidence of compliance was demonstrated if the available Sergeant has an audio recording device, can take a test recording, and knows to use it to take statements when investigating uses of force and misconduct complaints.

7. Once the auditors entered their audit results, as recorded on the paper copies of the audit form, into the auditing database, the compliance rate for each of the requirements was determined. This final report documents whether the compliance rate for each requirement met the threshold for substantial compliance (95%).

Audit results data in Excel spreadsheet, raw data based on individual questions on the Supervision Audit Forms.

Supervision - ¶ 306 Scorecard

Review Period: February 2021

Compliance percentage for requirements in Paragraph 306

District	Made Felony Scenes	Approved Arrest Reports	# of L2/L3 UoF	Made Scene	Watched Videos	Force Suitability Statement	Interviewed Witnesses and Suspects	Approved Activity Sheets	Responded to Misconduct Complaints	Engaged Community/ Increased Public Trust	Redirection/ Counseling	Support	Overall
				Level 2 and 3 Use of Force Investigations									
1	100%	Y	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.86%	100%	100%	Y	Y	100%
2	100%	Y	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	Y	Y	100%
3	100%	N	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Y	Y	91%
4	100%	Y	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Y	Y	100%
5	100%	Y	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Y	Y	100%
6	100%	N	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Y	Y	91%
7	100%	N	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Y	Y	91%
8	100%	Y	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.86%	-	100%	Y	Y	100%
SOD	100%	Y	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	-	100%	Y	Y	100%
Child Abuse						na					Y	Y	100%
Sex Crimes						na					-	Y	100%
Homicide						na					Y	Y	100%
Overall	100%	67%	18	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%

Supervision - Technology Scorecard

Review Date: February 2021

Compliance percentages for supervision requirements pertaining to technology

District	AVL Screen Shots with Dates	Cars have ICC Videos with Working External Mic	Examples of When Officer Notes Events are Not Recorded	Supervisors Ensure Technology is Working and is Used*	Supervisors Ensure Technology is Repaired	Officers Who Fail to Properly Use/Care for Equipment are Referred for Investigation	Supervisors are Prepared to Take Statements	Demonstrate that L3 in the Interrogation Room works	Overall
1	-	100%	Y	99.6%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
2	-	100%	Y	100.0%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
3	-	100%	Y	99.9%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
4	-	100%	Y	99.9%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
5	-	100%	Y	99.9%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
6	-	-	Y	100.0%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
7	-	100%	Y	100.0%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
8	-	100%	Y	99.9%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
SOD	-	100%	Y	100.0%	Y	-	100%	Y	100%
Child Abuse	-	-	-	100.0%	-	-	100%	Y	100%
Sex Crimes	-	-	-	100.0%	-	-	100%	Y	100%
Overall	-	100%	100%	99.0%	100%	-	100%	100%	99.8%

Supervision - Scheduling Scorecard

Review Period: February 2021

Compliance percentages for supervision requirements pertaining to Scheduling

District	DIU Schedule Specifies Supervisor When Regular Supervisor Is Out	Complete Schedules Are Available	Overall
1	Y	100%	100%
2	Y	100%	100%
3	Y	100%	100%
4	Y	100%	100%
5	Y	100%	100%
6	Y	100%	100%
7	Y	100%	100%
8	N	94%	47%
SOD	Y	100%	100%
Child Abuse	Y	100%	100%
Sex Crimes	Y	100%	100%
Homicide	Y	100%	100%
Overall	92%	99%	95%

Detective Selection Scorecard

Review Date: February 2021

Compliance percentages for supervision requirements pertaining to Detective selection

District	Applicant Packet Meets Requirements	Detectives Received Required Training	Detectives Know to Use NOPDAI for LEP Interrogations	Overall
1	100%	100%	100%	100%
2	100%	100%	100%	100%
3	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	100%	100%	100%	100%
5	100%	100%	100%	100%
6	100%	100%	100%	100%
7	100%	100%	100%	100%
8	100%	100%	-	100%
SOD	-	-	-	-
Child Abuse	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sex Crimes	-	100%	100%	100%
Homicide	100%	100%	100%	100%
Overall	100%	100%	100%	100%

Supervision - Insight Scorecard

Compliance percentages for supervision requirements pertaining to Insight

District	# SGTs Interviewed	# LTs Interviewed	Org Hierarchy (ADP) is Correct	No Pending Employee Review Tasks Over 30 Days	Overall
1	1	1	100%	100%	100%
2	2	0	100%	100%	100%
3	1	1	100%	100%	100%
4	2	0	100%	100%	100%
5	1	0	100%	100%	100%
6	1	0	100%	100%	100%
7	2	0	100%	100%	100%
8	2	0	100%	100%	100%
SOD	0	2	100%	100%	100%
Child Abuse	1	0	100%	100%	100%
Sex Crimes	1	0	100%	100%	100%
Homicide	2	0	100%	100%	100%
Overall	16	4	100%	100%	100%

Conclusion

The results of this audit were verified through an Audit Supervisor Review. Once this process was finished, the districts/units had an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. If the they identified any discrepancies or had any concerns, an Audit Re-Evaluation Request Form could have been submitted to PSAB documenting their concerns. No Audit Re-Evaluation Request Forms were submitted, however.

Paragraph 306 – as noted above, requires that supervisors: respond to the scene of felony arrests; review each arrest report; respond to the scene of uses of force; investigate each use of force (except those investigated by FIT); review the accuracy and completeness of officers' Daily Activity Sheets; respond to each complaint of misconduct ; ensure that officers are working actively to engage the community and increase the public trust and safety; and provide counseling, redirection, and support to officers.

The compliance percentage for requirements in Paragraph 306 are as follows:

1. Made Felony Scenes – this requires the district/unit to show five examples of trip sheets or incident reports with a supervisor making the scene of felony arrest scenes. The overall score for this category was 100%.

2. Approved Arrest Reports – this requires the district/unit to show that there are no "pending" incident reports older than 30 days. Auditors used the internal EPR Application to view a list of EPRs, filtered by date range, district, incident or supplemental, and status. Three of the nine units reviewed had at least one unapproved EPR older than 30 days and therefore was marked as non-compliant. The overall score for this category was 67%.

3. Made Scene (UoF) – this requires that the investigating supervisor make the scene of Level 2 and Level 3 Uses of Force. For each district/unit, auditors reviewed all or 10, whichever was less, Level 2 and Level 3 Use of Force Reports to determine compliance. The total number of L2 and L3 Uses of Force reviewed was 18. The overall score for this category was 100%.

4. Watched Videos (UoF) - this requires that the investigating supervisor watch all videos related to Level 2 and Level 3 Uses of Force. For each district/unit, auditors reviewed all or 10, whichever was less, Level 2 and Level 3 Use of Force Reports to determine compliance. The overall score for this category was 100%.

5. Force Suitability Statement (UoF) - this requires that the investigating supervisor make a determination about the suitability of force for Level 2 and Level 3 Uses of Force. For each district/unit, auditors reviewed all or 10, whichever was less, Level 2 and Level 3 Use of Force Reports to determine compliance. The overall score for this category was 100%.

6. Interviewed Witnesses and Suspects (UoF) - this requires that the investigating supervisor interviewed witnesses and suspects for Level 2 and Level 3 Uses of Force. For each

district/unit, auditors reviewed all or 10, whichever was less, Level 2 and Level 3 Use of Force Reports to determine compliance. The overall score for this category was 100%.

7. Approved Activity Sheets – this requires that a supervisor review and approve all activity sheets for the district being audited. Auditors reviewed the activity sheets of a random platoon for the period. Compliance was determined by counting the number of unsigned trips sheets compared to the number of approved activity sheets. The overall score for this category was 99.97%.

8. Responded to Misconduct Complaints – this requires that supervisors respond to citizen-initiated complaints appropriately. Auditors reviewed all citizen complaints filed at the duty location. Compliance was determined if the complaint was assigned a PIB control number. The overall score for this category was 100%.

9. Engaged Community/Increased Public Trust – Auditors reviewed daily lineups or other documentation that showed roll calls pertained to bias-free policing, procedural justice, or community engagement for the time period. Failure to provide documentation was recorded as non-compliance. The overall score for this category was 100%

10. Redirection/Counseling – this section pertains to non-disciplinary counseling or redirection. When needed, supervisors are required to give guidance to an officer to correct a problem or an inappropriate behavior. These interactions are documented in the Supervisor Feedback Log (SFL). Auditors reviewed SFL entries to determine compliance. The overall score for this category is 100%.

11. Support – this section pertains to where officer have access to support services. Auditors reviewed examples of compliance, such as: referrals to the Officer Assistance Program; documentation of peer support; commendations; and documentation of positive reinforcement during roll calls.

Technology

1. AVL Screen Shots w/dates – Supervisors are required to ensure that officers maintain and operate the AVL system. To ensure compliance, auditors should review 2 AVL screenshots per platoon, per month. However, at the time of this audit, the AVL system was down.

2. Cars have ICC Videos with Working External Mic – Auditors reviewed an updated fleet report, randomly choosing 3 working patrol vehicles that are required to have an MVU/ICC. The ICC system (Axion or L3) was checked to ensure the vehicle had a video with external sound within the last 3 days.   The overall score for this category was 100%.

3. Examples of When Officer Notes Events are not Recorded – Officers are required to note on the activity sheet or in an email when events are not recorded or of technology failures. Auditors reviewed examples of this documentation to determine compliance. The overall score for this category was 100%.

4. Supervisors Ensure Technology is Working and is Used – Auditors reviewed fleet reports,

section of the activity sheet that highlights the equipment testing checkbox, 105s relevant to the proper activation of technology, or roll call topics relevant to the proper use of technology. The overall score for this category was 99%.

5. Officer Who Fail to Properly Use/Care for Equipment are referred for Investigation – There were no instances of officers failing to properly use or care for equipment.

6. Supervisors are Prepared to Take Statements – Auditors met with a random supervisor and verified that the supervisor could display the digital recording device, take a recording and play it back, and know that statements are required to be recorded for Misconduct Complaints and Use of Force investigations. The overall score for this category was 100%.

7. Demonstrate that the L3 in the Interrogating Room Works – Auditors met with a random detective and verified that the detective was able to take an L# test video and play it back. The overall score for this section was 100%.

Scheduling (CD paragraphs 307, 308)

1. DIU/Detective Schedules Specifies Supervisor When Regular Supervisor is Out – Auditors reviewed monthly schedules to determine if detectives reported to another supervisor for whatever reason (furlough, sick, training, etc), the name of that supervisor was noted on the schedule. The overall score for this category was 92%. Only one district/unit was not in compliance.

2. Complete Schedules are Available – Auditors reviewed all monthly schedules for the time period. Auditors ensured that the schedules were complete and had days off entered for each employee listed. The overall score for this category was 99%. Only one district/unit was not in compliance.

Detective Selection (CD paragraphs 169 – 170)

1. Applicant Packets Meet Requirements – Auditors reviewed the application packet for the most recently assigned detective(s), including sergeants. The packets are required to include: applicant's writing sample; resume; a supervisor's recommendation; and the applicant's IAPro Short Form. The overall score for this category was 100%.

2. Detectives Received Required Training – Auditors reviewed documentation that showed a list of all assigned detectives (including sergeants and lieutenants) and the date of their most recent detective training. The overall score for this category was 100%.

3. Detectives Know to Use NOPDAI (authorized interpreters) for LEP Interrogations – Auditors measured compliance by independently asking 2 random detectives, "When you interrogate a subject whose primary language is not English, what method do you use to communicate?" Answer: NOPDAI. The overall score for this category was 100%.

Insight (CD paragraphs 317 – 324) – 20 supervisors were interviewed for this portion of the audit.

1. Org Hierarchy (ADP) is Correct – Auditors checked for compliance by having a supervisor access the organizational hierarchy report (ADP) and verify if its correct. The overall score for this category was 100%.

2. No Pending Employee Review Tasks Over 30 days – Supervisors were asked to access the Threshold Response Task Manager and the Quarterly Review Task Manager to show that no tasks were more than 30 days old. The overall score for this category was 100%.

There were no serious deficiencies identified by this audit.

Recommendations

Only two categories in this audit were below the substantial compliance threshold of 95%. "Approved Arrest Reports" was 67% and "DIU Schedule Specifies Supervisor When Regular Supervisor is Out" was 92%. No serious or systemic deficiencies were identified.

The "Approved Arrest Reports" test is a pass or fail test. Therefore, the three districts non-compliance scores impacted the overall score dramatically but does not signify a need for corrective action.

1. This report will serve as notification of district/unit performance during this audit.
2. Work with Policy Standards Section to develop DTB's to address the training issues identified in this report.

Michael Sarver
Innovation Manager and Audit Supervisor Michael Sarver, Lt. Retired/Reserve
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – Supervision Audit Forms

Supervision Audit Forms:

1 Make the scene of felony arrests

Show all or 5 trip sheets or Incident Reports, (whichever is less), of a supervisor making the scene of a felony arrest.

No. of Felony A | No. Rank Made

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5

2 Approve incident reports

Show that there are no "pending" incident reports older than 30 days (use available report)

Entire Interrogation Recorded

Yes
No
NA

3 Investigate Level 2 and 3 Uses of Force: make scene, review videos, make statement about appropriateness

Show all or 10, whichever is less, level 2 and 3 "Use of Force reports" highlighting the narrative where it says the supervisor:
(Other documentation can demonstrate compliance, i.e. trip sheets, video, etc.)

	# Reviewed	# Completed
Made the scene	0	0
Watched the video		0
Made a statement about the appropriateness of		0
Interviewed Witnesses and Suspects		0

4 Approve Activity Sheets

If paper: count unsigned trip sheets for a random platoon.
If digital: run MAX report back at HQ

Unsigned Tripsheets

0

Platoon Tripsheet Type

Paper
Electronic

Percent Tripsheets from MA | Platoon Audited

0

A
B
C

19

5	Respond to civilian initiated misconduct complaints	# Reviewed	# Completed
	Show all civilian initiated misconduct complaint forms highlighting the control number.	0	0

6	Encourage officers to work actively to engage the community and increase public trust	Engaged Comm	Engaged Comm
	Show 2 daily line-ups documenting roll calls related to bias-free policing, procedural justice, or community engagement per platoon for the month.	0	0

7 Provide counselling and redirection to officers

Show enough examples of non-disciplinary counseling or redirection. This is when a supervisor gives guidance to an officer to correct a problem or an inappropriate behavior. This is documented in the Supervisor Feedback Log, on the back of a supervisor's trip sheet, the complaint form, or in a 105.

(Use last 3 months for SOD, SVS, and Homicide)

Redirection / Counselling
Yes
No
NA

8 Provide support to officers

Show examples of a supervisor commending an officer for a job well done (Supervisor Feedback Log, email or video) or when officers are notified of beneficial services, like the college fair, financial services, or health services, for example (Supervisor Feedback Log, email, roll call, supervisor trip sheet, etc.).

Support
Yes
No
NA

ID Info	1-8	Review

Auditor Comments Custodial

Reviewer Comments Custodial

Previous Page   **First Page**

Supervison - Technology

ID Info | 1-8 | Review

Created By

Tim Lindsey
Faith Thornton
Charmel Peterson
Betty Johnson
Michael Sarver

Reporting Year

2019
2020
2021
2022
2023

Reporting Month

Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec

District

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
ISB
MSB
Other
SOD
*
Homicide

Next Page

				# Reviewed	# Completed
1	Ensures officers maintain and operate AVL		A Platoon	0	0
	Two (2) AVL screen shots per platoon per month with date are available for review (enter the number of screenshots that have a date for each platoon)		B Platoon		0
			C Platoon		0
2	Ensures officers' L3 is working		# that have video	0	0
	Three (3) random working patrol (platoon or GA) vehicles as indicated on the fleet report have a video with external sound within the past three days		# that have external sound		0

3 Ensure officers notify supervisors when events are not recorded	Tripsheet Examples Available
Examples of officer trip sheets or emails documenting notations about recording failures are available for review	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Yes No NA

				# out of service	# w/o Recent Vids
4	Ensure technology is working and is used	Fleet report is accurate	Three (3) platoon or GA/TF vehicles listed as out of service do not have recent videos	0	0

		Trip sheets have completed technology check boxes	If paper trip sheets: For the platoon selected, how many trip sheets have incomplete technology checkboxes If digital trip sheets: run MAX report	Tripsheet Type ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Paper Digital NA
				Tripsheet checklist Platoon Used A Platoon B Platoon C Platoon

# Incomplete, if Paper	% Complete, if Digital
0	0

5	Ensure equipment is repaired		Supvervisor Ensure Tech is Repaired
	Emails notifying the technology section about equipment malfunctions are available for review		████████████ Yes No NA

6	Refer for investigation officers who fail to properly use or care for equipment		Officer Referred for Equip Use/Care
	DI-1s relevant to equipment use are available for review (Districts are not marked noncompliant for having none for the month until the Unit has three months of data) (Enter the number reviewed)		████████████ Yes No NA

7	. Supervisors are prepared to take statements	A random supervisor:	Has a digital recording device	Yes No NA
			Can take a recording and play it back	Yes No NA
			Knows they need to use the recorder for: (circle the ones they say)	Misconduct Complaint Statements Use of Force Statements Both

8	Demonstrate that L3 in the Interrogation Room Works		Does L3 Works in Interrogation Room
	A random detective can take an L3 test video in the interrogation room and play it back on the L3 website		████████████ Yes No NA

ID Info | 1-8 | Review

Auditor Comments

[text box]

Reviewer Comments

[text box]

Previous Page   **First Page**

Supervison - Scheduling Audit Form

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

Created By

Tim Lindsey
Faith Thornton
Charmel Peterson
Betty Johnson
Michael Sarver

Reporting Year

2019
2020
2021
2022
2023

Reporting Month

Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec

District

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
ISB
MSB
Other
SOD
*
Homicide
Sex Crimes

Next Page

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

1A Assigned to a…clearly-defined supervisor (307)

DIU schedule says who detectives report to when the DIU Sgt. is out. (Other documentation can demonstrate compliance)

Detective Assigned as Needed

Yes
No
NA

1B TF/GA Daily Line-ups list a supervisor (Sgt. or Lt.)

Randomly Selected Week

# of Line-ups with SGT/LT	# Line-ups Reviewed
0	0

2 TF Supervisors work the same days

TF/GA schedule shows the supervisor and his/her unit work the same days (in blocks). The only exceptions must be training, sick leave, and vacation.

Supervisor Works Same Time

Yes
No
NA

3 Can Show Complete Schedules

Show the following complete schedules for the month in review. Complete schedules have off-days entered for each employee on the schedule.

# Reviewed	Total Complete
0	0

- ☐ A
- ☐ B
- ☐ C
- ☐ DIU Persons
- ☐ DIU Property
- ☐ SOD Fatality
- ☐ SOD VOWS
- ☐ SOD MC1
- ☐ SOD MC2
- ☐ SOD MC2
- ☐ SOD Traffic
- ☐ SOD K9
- ☐ SVS-CA A
- ☐ SVS-CA B

Previous Page **Next Page**

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

Auditor
Comments
Custodial

Reviewer
Comments
Custodial

Previous Page   **First Page**

Supervison - Detective Selection Audit Form

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

Created By

Tim Lindsey
Faith Thornton
Charmel Peterson
Betty Johnson
Michael Sarver

Reporting Year

2019
2020
2021
2022
2023

Reporting Month

Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec

District

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
ISB
MSB
Other
SOD
*
Homicide

Next Page

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

1   Applicant Packet Incldudes Requirements

Most recent new/transfer detective applicant packet includes:

New Form 184, if after June 26, 2018

Yes
No
NA

Experience Level (Resume)

Yes
No
NA

Writing Sample

Yes
No
NA

Supervisor Recommendations (105)

Yes
No
NA

IAPro Short Form

Yes
No
NA

2   Detectives have Received Formal New Detective or Annual Detective Training

District can show that ALL (Property and Persons) detectives have received new detective training or annual training

Total Detectives in District	Total Trained or Scheduled
0	0

3   Detectives Know to Use NOPDAI for LEP Interrogations
Two randomly chosen detectives when asked:
"When you interrogate a subject whose primary language is not English, what method do you use to communicate?"
Answer: "NOPDAI" (anything else, or any combination is wrong)

Total Detectives Interviewed	Total Correct on NOPDAI
0	0

ID Info | 1-3 | Review

Auditor
Comments
Custodial

Reviewer
Comments
Custodial

Previous Page   **First Page**

Supervision Insight
Audit Form

ID Info | 1-9 | Review

Created By
- Tim Lindsey
- Faith Thornton
- Charmel Peterson
- Betty Johnson
- Michael Sarver
- Matt Segraves
- FBT-TAL
- TAL-CAP
- CAP-FBT

Reporting Year
- 2019
- 2020
- 2021
- 2022

District
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- ISB
- MSB
- Other
- SOD
- *
- Homicide
- Sex Crimes
- Child Abuse
- SVS
- DIU Property
- DIU Persons

Reporting Month
- Jan
- Feb
- Mar
- Apr
- May
- Jun
- Jul
- Aug
- Sep
- Oct
- Nov
- Dec

Supervisor Rank
- SGT
- LT
- Captain

Supervisor Selection No.
- 1st Supervisor
- 2nd Supervisor

Supervisor Platoon
- A
- B
- C
- GA
- Promenade
- Mounted
- DWI
- K9
- MC1 MC2
- VOWS
- TIGER
- GANG
- Other

#	Requirement	Description	
1	Supervisors can review basic information of all officers under their command in Insight	Auditor asks: "In Insight, show me all the officers that you supervise or all the officers in your platoon?" If the supervisor is a Sgt on a platoon with multiple Sgts, he or she runs the Organizational Hierarchy report for his/her Lt. If the supervisor is a Lt, he or she runs the report for him/herself. The random supervisor may manually find each employee that reports to them and score "Yes" for this requirement.	Yes No
2	ADP Correct	The org hierarchy report reflects ADP. Ask the supervisor if the org hierarchy report (ADP) appears correct for their LT. If it's a LT, ask them if the correct people are assigned to them. If they say "No" choose "No."	Yes No
3	Supervisors can show CEW Assignments	Auditor asks: "Can you show me an officer who has a taser assigned to him or her?" A random supervisor shows the Assigned Property section of the Employee Summary Report.	Yes No
4	Supervisors can use Insight to compare their officers to peer groups	Auditor asks: "Can you show me how one of your officers compares to his/her peer group on injuries to persons in-custody (or Vehicle Pursuits or "Non-disciplinary corrective action")?" A random supervisor shows how one of his/her officer's "In-custody Injuries" (or "Pursuits" or "Supervisor Feedback", respectively) count in the Employee Activity Report or Supervisor Dashboard Report shows how the officer is doing better or worse than	Yes No
5	Supervisors determine if a pattern is developing when responding to	Auditor asks: "What should you do when you receive an alert for one of your officers?" The list of actions the supervisor takes when responding to an alert includes reviewing every data point available for the officer's activity to determine if a pattern is developing. The supervisor does not focus only on the type of activity that led to the alert.	Yes No
6	Supervisors can give an example of a pattern	Auditor asks: "Can you give me an example, hypothetical or real, of a pattern of conduct that should prompt a discussion with the officer?" A random supervisor gives an example that compares multiple activity types and explains that sort of activity might indicate the officer needs assistance with [insert possible issue].	Yes No
7	Supervisors know how to identify patterns	Auditor asks: "Do you know how to identify a pattern in Insight?" A random supervisor knows to review all of an officer's activity in the Employee Activity Report or the Supervisor Dashboard Report.	Yes No
8	No Pending Tasks Over 30 Days Old	Ask the supervisor to click on "Threshold Response," then on "Task Manager." If there tasks older than 30 days, choose "No." Then ask the supervisor to click on "Quarterly Review," then on "Task Manager." If there tasks older than 30 days, choose "No."	Yes No
9	Supervisors Navigate Insight with Ease	If the supervisor can find things in Insight quickly, choose "Yes." If he/she takes a while, choose "No."	Yes No

ID Info | 1-9 | Review

Auditor
Comments

Reviewer
Comments

Previous Page

First Page

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent Shaun D. Ferguson

Chief Deputy Superintendent John Thomas – Filed Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Otha Sandifer – Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Arlinda Westbrook- Public Integrity Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Christopher Goodly- Management Services Bureau

City Attorney Sunni LeBeouf – City Attorney's Office

Assistant City Attorney Isaka Williams – Superintendent's Office