



Auditing and Review Unit
Professional Standards and Accountability
Bureau

Child Abuse Section Audit (SVD) June 2026 Report

Report #CA062026

Sample Period: July 1, 2025 – May 31, 2026

Draft submitted by PSAB: June 7, 2026

Response by SVD Child Abuse: July 13, 2026

Final Report Published: September 2, 2026

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau, individuals listed below:

Matthew Segraves – Innovation Manager

Jovan M. Berry - Auditor

Christopher J. Porter – Auditor

Danta L. Lewis – Auditor

Melinda C. Foy – Auditor

Taneva Bowers – Auditor

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Child Abuse Section Checklist Audit in June of 2026. The Child Abuse checklist audits ensure that the Child Abuse Section is operating in compliance with the most up-to-date New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) policies and Standard Operating Guidelines covering Chapter 42.19 regarding “Child Abuse”. The audit also focuses on ensuring that each detective

works actively to engage the victims and provides guidance on how to get counseling, assistance, and support from available social services.

The June 2026 audit included 86 randomly selected child abuse case files that were assessed with a twenty-nine **(29)** question checklist and a double-blind auditing process.

Of the twenty-nine **(29)** questions, twenty-six **(26)** scored at or above 95%.

The following questions were scored below 100%:

Question 15 – Is there a medical, forensic, CAC, and/or SANE report in the Case File? – Score **90%**

Question 20 – Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured/recorded, as appropriate? – Score **93%**

Question 23 – If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented? – Score **50%**

More detailed results are embedded in the [Scorecards](#) and [Conclusion](#) sections.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Table of Contents.....3

Introduction.....4

Child Abuse Scorecard.....5

Conclusion 9

Recommendations 10

Re-evaluation Requests and Response 12

Appendix A – Report Distribution 14

Introduction

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau audited the Child Abuse Section's case files for investigations, covering the period from July 2025 to May 2026. The audit occurred from June 10, 2026, to June 26, 2026, and was a double-blind review.

Purpose

The purpose of the Child Abuse Section case file audit was to verify Department compliance with the NOPD Operations Manual, Chapter 42.19 “Child Abuse” and Child Abuse Standard Operating Guidelines. NOPD policies can be found at nola.gov/next/nopd/topics/policies

Scope

This audit will determine and document whether investigators and supervisors of the New Orleans Police Department Child Abuse Section provided an accurate and thorough response in conducting follow-up investigations. The auditors are responsible for verifying that each response is proactive, victim-centered, and professional. Upon completion, the audit manager will submit a report to the Captains of the Child Abuse Section and the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB), pointing out any deficiencies or confirming that thorough investigations occurred. The submission of audit reports will assist in maintaining accurate and complete Child Abuse Section investigations in the future.

Methodology

Population – All Child Abuse Section case files (945) from July 2025 through May 2026.

Sample size – The unit used a sample size calculator to determine a sample of 86 case files was needed for a one-tailed test with a 95% degree of confidence 95 and a 4% error rate. The unit randomly selected the 86 case files by using the case file tracker received from the Child Abuse Section supervisor.

Testing Instrument(s) –The auditors completed a twenty-nine (29) point checklist for each randomly selected case file and used a double-blind process.

Child Abuse Scorecard

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	NA	NA Explanations	Policy
1 If there Is BWC video applicable to this case, is it documented	100%	58	0	28	(28) No BWC exists	Ch. 42.19 p42
2 Was there an on-scene response by an Investigator	95%	40	2	44	Of the 44 N/A Scorings:(15) Victim relocated from the scene (14) Crime reporting delayed (10) Case referred by DCFS (3) Incident out of parish (1) Victim currently out of parish (1) Victim unknown	Ch. 42.19 p2
3 Is there an Incident Report in the case file	100%	86	0	0	None	CASOG p71
4 Is there a MORF in the case file	99%	85	1	0	None	CASOG p72
5 Is there an Investigators Supplemental Report	99%	83	1	2	(2) Case is open and active	CASOG p79-80
6 Is there a victim statement (video, audio, or transcribed)	100%	36	0	50	Of the 50 N/A scorings: (21) Forensic interview not conducted (7) No crime determined (6) Victim is an infant (5) Victim not reached or located (4) Victim unknown (4) Incident out of parish(1) Victim currently out of parish (1) Vicitm refused to cooperate (1) Statement unobtainable due to age	CASOG p79
7 Is there evidence of attention to the victim's needs	98%	44	1	41	Of the 41 N/A scorings: (18) Victim not interviewed (10) No crime determined (7) Victim not located (6) Incident out of parish	Ch. 42.19 p39
8 Did the initial responding officer record an Exigent Statement	100%	14	0	72	(72) No exigent statement necessary	Ch. 42.19 p14
9 Was there a CAC interview after the initial on-scene investigation	100%	17	0	69	Of the 69 N/A Scorings: (35) No CAC scheduled (9) Victim not known or located (7) Refusal by parent/guardian (7) Incident out of parish (6) CAC results pending	CASOG p25

	Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	NA	NA Explanations	Policy
						(5) Victim is an infant	
10	Are there documented witness (video, audio, or transcribed) statements	100%	59	0	27	Of the 27 N/A Scorings: (26) No known witness (1) Witness departed the scene	CASOG p28; p79
11	Is there a communications log	100%	86	0	0	None	CASOG p79
12	Is there a 911 recording available	100%	58	0	28	(28) No 911 call made	CASOG p79
13	If there is evidence of a drug-facilitated sexual assault with force	100%	1	0	85	(85) No drug-facilitated sexual assault involved/reported.	Ch. 42.19 p25
14	Is there a medical, forensic CAC and/or SANE report	90%	18	2	66	Of the 66 N/A Scorings: (30) CAC cancelled or not scheduled (13) No crime determined (8) Incident out of parish (7) Victim not located (4) Victim a no show (2) Victim unknown (1) CAC results pending (1) Victim refused medical services	Ch. 42.19 p22
15	Is there documentation of a CODIS hit notification in the file	-	0	0	86	Of the 86 N/A Scorings: (70) No CODIS hit for the suspect (16) No crime occurred	CASOG p87-88
16	Is there arrest or search warrant documentation	100%	11	0	75	(75) No search or arrest warrant application submitted.	CASOG p79
17	Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, or transcribed)	93%	26	1	59	Of the 59 N/A Scorings: (17) No crime determined (12) Case is ongoing/active (9) Suspect not located (8) Suspect unknown (6) Incident out of parish (4) Victim uncooperative (2) Cleared by arrest (1) Suspect incapable of providing a statement	Ch. 42.19 p20

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	NA	NA Explanations	Policy
18 Are there crime scene photos?	93%	13	1	72	Of the 72 N/A Scorings: (33) No scene present for photos (17) No crime occurred (10) Crime reporting delayed (8) Incident out of parish (4) No on-scene response	Ch. 42.19 p31
19 Is evidence collection documented in a report	100%	75	0	11	Of the 11 N/A Scoring: (7) No applicable evidence collected (4) Incident out of parish	Ch. 42.19 p28
20 Were the evidence and property receipts included in Case file	100%	75	0	11	Of the 11 N/A Scoring: (7) No applicable evidence collected (4) Incident out of parish	CASOG p79
21 If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented	50%	1	1	84	Of the 84 N/A Scoring: (80) No evidence collected required lab submission (4) Evidence submitted to lab	CASOG p48
22 Are there crime lab reports	100%	1	0	85	Of the 85 N/A Scoring: (84) No evidence submitted to the crime lab (1) Report pending	Ch. 42.19 p32
23 Is there documentation of a search of surveillance video?	100%	7	0	79	(79) No surveillance video relevant to the case.	CASOG p79
24 Is there documented evidence of a witness canvas?	96%	26	1	59	Of the 59 N/A Scorings: (26) No crime determined (16) No witness located (8) Incident out of parish (6) Incident occurred in a private setting (2) Victim relocated (1) Case referred by out of state DCFS	CASOG p27
25 Are there composite sketches relative to the case?	100%	1	0	85	(85) No relative sketches composed.	Ch. 42.19 p31
26 Did the Detective complete the Case File Index as needed	99%	85	1	0	None	CASOG p78
27 Was the incident appropriately classified?	99%	85	1	0	None	CASOG p83
28 Was there documented authorization for a Signal change if required	100%	8	0	78	(78) No signal change occurred.	Ch. 42.19 p44
29 Is there documented supervisory review of	100%	86	0	0	None	CASOG p98

Check-List Questions		Score	Y	N	NA	NA Explanations	Policy
	reports and dispositions						

Conclusion

Results

The overall results of the June 2026 Child Abuse Audit revealed compliance threshold scores of **above 95%** in most areas. The following checklist items revealed threshold scores **below 95%**:

Question 15. Is there a medical, forensic, CAC and/or SANE report in the Case File?

- **H-19131-25**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective included a forensic report in the case file, despite documentation indicating the victim's forensic interview was conducted on September 12, 2025.
- **D-12987-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective included a medical report in the case file, despite documentation indicating the victim received medical attention.

Question 19. Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, transcribed)?

- **A-23214-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors noted the case file was incomplete. The written documentation yielded minimal information, including only the incident report, which indicates that the detective was notified of possible neglect.
- **B-27329-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the detective interviewed the suspect. The suspect's identity is known.

Question 20. Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured/recorded, as appropriate?

- **H-31378-25**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective included photos in the case file, despite documentation indicating the victim's injuries were photographed.
- **A-23214-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors noted the case file was incomplete. The written documentation yielded minimal information, including only the incident report, which indicates that the detective was notified of possible neglect.
- **D-02447-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective included photos in the case file, despite documentation indicating the victim had visible signs of injuries.
- **D-12987-26**
 - Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective included photos in the case file, despite documentation indicating the victim's injuries were

photographed.

Question 23. If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented in a report?

- **D-12987-26**

- Upon review, the auditors found no evidence that the Detective documented a rationale for not submitting evidence for testing, despite documentation indicating that a sexual assault kit was collected.

Recommendations

The audit results should be reviewed by Departmental leadership or their designee(s). Scores below 95% should be addressed with corrective action. The ARU will provide the raw data for the audit, which allows the reviewer to see the specific incidents and individuals involved in any non-compliance. Corrective action could include:

- Modifying/enhancing training, whether it be Academy courses, roll call training, and/or DTBs
- Policy revisions for requirements that are overly burdensome and lead to non-compliance

Specifically, the ARU recommends the following:

1. The 85% compliance score for documented referrals to outside resources has been removed from the current audit results. Upon review of the applicable policy and standard operating guidelines, the ARU determined that the parameters for this checklist question are not clearly defined, making it difficult to evaluate compliance consistently and without bias. The ARU recommends removing this checklist question from the audit until the policy or standard operating guidelines are updated to clearly establish whether referrals to outside resources are required and define what constitutes an “outside resource” for purposes of compliance.
2. The 93% compliance score for crime scene photos should be addressed. The Child Abuse Section should strengthen internal controls to ensure photographs of reported injuries are obtained and retained in accordance with departmental policy. Supervisory personnel should conduct periodic reviews of case documentation to verify compliance.
3. The 50% compliance score for whether evidence not submitted for testing included documented reasoning should be addressed. The Child Abuse Section should ensure that evidentiary samples collected during investigations are submitted for testing in accordance with departmental policy. When a decision is made not to submit collected evidence, investigators should document the justification in the case file to support the investigative decision and should include supervisory review.
4. The ARU recommends establishing and consistently applying documentation standards for detectives. During the audit and subsequent reevaluation, the ARU identified instances in which required or relevant case information was documented directly in the case file by some detectives, while other detectives documented the same information in external systems, such as Mark43 or Evidence.com. As a result, information necessary to evaluate compliance may not be readily

identifiable within the case file and may only be discovered during the reevaluation process. Additionally, the ARU does not currently have access to supplemental documentation maintained in Mark43, which may contain information relevant to the audit criteria. The ARU recommends establishing clear guidelines specifying what information must be documented in the case file and what information may be maintained in external systems to ensure consistency, facilitate effective auditing, and provide a complete and readily accessible record of investigative activity. Adding these guidelines to the CA SOP should suffice.

5. The ARU recommends that the policy establishes clear and reasonable timelines for obtaining the information necessary to conduct a complete and accurate investigation. This should include, as appropriate, timelines for initiating an investigation, contacting the victim, obtaining a statement from a known suspect, and completing other necessary investigative steps. Clearly defined timelines would provide detectives with consistent expectations for the timely progression of investigations and establish objective criteria for evaluating compliance.
 - a. In following, when detectives are unable to complete investigative steps, documented attempts to complete the step should meet timeliness requirements. ARU recommends policy allow documented thorough attempts to complete an investigative step to meet the requirement. For example, the ARU was unable to give CA detectives credit for documented attempts to interview suspects.

Re-evaluation Requests and Response

Section Response to PSAB

1. Section Deficiency: Is there a medical, forensic, CAC, and/or SANE report in the Case File?
 - a. Section Response: H-19131-26: The auditors noted that the medical report was not documented in the case file. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file, noting that the medical report will be obtained.
PSAB Response: No change, as the Child Abuse Section concurred with the audit results.
 - b. Section Response: D-12987-26: The auditors noted that the medical report was not documented in the case file. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file, noting that the medical report will be obtained.
PSAB Response: No change, as the Child Abuse Section concurs with the audit results.
2. Section Deficiency: Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, transcribed)?
 - a. Section Response: A-23214-26: The auditors noted that there is no suspect statement in the case file. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and located a CD labeled with the suspect's statement.
PSAB Response: Score updated to reflect compliance with the audit question.
 - b. Section Response: B-27329-26: The auditors noted that there is no suspect statement documented in the case file. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and noted that although the detective did not speak with the suspect, DCFS obtained a statement from the suspect.
PSAB Response: No score change, as statements obtained by DCFS are not evaluated in the audit. NOPD Detectives shall obtain or attempt to obtain a suspect statement during their investigation.
3. Section Deficiency: Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured/recorded, as appropriate?
 - a. Section Response: H-31378-25: The auditors indicated that no crime scene photos were captured. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and located the photos on Evidence.com. The CA Sgt noted that the photos are no longer printed and included in the physical case file.
PSAB Response: Score updated to reflect compliance with the audit question.
 - b. Section Response: A-23214-26: The auditors indicated that no crime scene photos were captured while noting the investigation yielded minimal information. The CA Sgt noted that the case was returned to the detective for further investigation.
PSAB Response: No score change, as the Child Abuse Section concurred with the audit results.
 - c. Section Response: D-02447-26: The auditors noted that no crime scene photos were captured. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and noted that the photos were uploaded as an attachment to Mark43.
PSAB Response: Score updated to reflect compliance with the audit question.
 - d. Section Response: D-12987-26: The auditors indicated that no crime scene photos were captured. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and located the photos on Evidence.com. The

CA Sgt noted that the photos are no longer printed and included in the physical case file.

PSAB Response: Score updated to reflect compliance with the audit question.

4. Section Deficiency: If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented in a report?
 - a. Section Response: D-12987-26: The auditors noted that the sexual assault kit was collected but not submitted for testing. The CA Sgt reviewed the case file and noted that the sexual assault kit will be submitted.

PSAB Response: No score change, as the Child Abuse Unit concurred with the audit results.

Attachments:

[Excel Raw Data Spreadsheet](#) for the July 2025 through May 2026 audit.

Jovan M. Berry

Auditor

Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – Report Distribution

Deputy Supt. ISB Bureau

Captain SVD

Lieutenant SVD

Report posted to nola.gov/next/nopd/audits-and-reports