



PUBLIC INTEGRITY BUREAU AUDIT REPORT MAY 2025

This Audit was managed and conducted by PSAB Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Executive Summary

The Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau started conducting a Public Integrity Bureau Audit in February 2025. The audit period covers the first three quarters of 2024: January 1, 2024, to September 30, 2024. The Public Integrity Bureau audit was performed to ensure that all allegations of misconduct are received and are fully and fairly investigated consistently with NOPD policy covering Chapters: 52.1 Complaint Intake and Investigation (former Chapters 52.1.1 and 52.1.2), 52.2 Negotiated Settlement Agreements. 52.3 Community- Police Mediation (former Chapter 24.2), 52.4 Adjudication of Misconduct and Suspensions of Members (former Chapter 26.2), and 52.5 Disciplinary Matrix/ Penalty Schedule (former Chapter 26.2.1) and the Federal Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs 375-426 (amended 382, 403, 407, and 416), 430-431, and 454. Further, all investigative findings are supported using the preponderance of the evidence standard and documented in writing; and that all identified officers who commit misconduct are held accountable pursuant to a disciplinary system that is fair and consistent.

The newly revised Misconduct Complaint Intake, Investigation, and Adjudication audit protocol was developed by PSAB and approved by the Office of the Consent Decree Monitor (OCDM) as well as DOJ. This modified protocol was used to complete this 2025 audit. The complete audit consists of a total of 26 sections, containing 163 sub sections. The audit was divided into two sections: Misconduct and Administrative.

The Misconduct audit analyzed a random sample of cases to measure compliance in the following sections and sub-sections:

4. Complaint Intake: a-g
5. LEP Comments: a-c
6. Complaints received in the filed: a-e vi
7. Complaints from Judges/Attorneys: a
9. Complaints: a-f
10. Misconduct observed in the field/ reported to the supervisor: a-c
11. LEP: a
12. Person Investigation other than officer/supervisor involved: a-d
13. Investigation Timelines: a-e
14. Thoroughness: a-p
15. Criminal Conduct/ Investigation: a-i
16. Evidence/ Credibility Determination: a-e
17. Evidence/ Documentation: a-b
18. Exonerated and Unfounded Dispositions: a-b
19. NFIM: a-b iv
20. Sustained Cases and Discipline: a-c
21. Findings: a-i
22. PIB Deputy Chief: a-b

23. Follow-up: a-i

26. Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations: a- g

The Administrative audit analyzed PIB internally to measure compliance in the following sections and sub-sections:

1. Preventing Retaliation: a-f
2. Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements: a-s
3. Complaint Information: a-i
8. Case Tracking: a-e vi
23. Follow-up: j-k
24. Annual Report: a-b
25. United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group: a-b

Data was collected from the Public Integrity Bureau and analyzed for compliance. Scores of 95% and higher are deemed to be substantially compliant.

The overall compliance score for the Public Integrity Bureau is **88%** for the **administrative audit** and **95%** for the **misconduct audit**. Below is the breakdown by audit section:

Summary Table

Sections: CD Paragraph(s)	Audit Score	Outcome
1- Preventing Retaliation: 377	100%	Compliant
2-Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements: 378-383	84%	Not Compliant
3- Complaint Information: 384-387	89%	Not Compliant
4- Complaint Intake: 375-376, 389-390	100%	Compliant
5- LEP: 387, 390	0/0	NA
6- Complaints received in the field: 391, 395, 397	89%	Not Compliant
7- Complaints from Judges/ Attorneys: 392	0/0	NA
8- Case Tracking: 393-396	87%	Not Compliant
9- Complaints: 393, 395, 398-399	88%	Not Compliant
10- Misconduct observed in the field/ reported to supervisor: 375	98%	Compliant
11- LEP: 390	0/0	NA
12- Person investigating other than officer/ supervisor involved: 401	100%	Compliant
13- Investigation Timelines: 402-403	95%	Compliant
14- Thoroughness: 404-410	95%	Compliant
15- Criminal Conduct/ Investigation: 411-412	100%	Compliant
16- Evidence/ Credibility Determination: 413	97%	Compliant
17- Evidence/ Documentation: 418-419	100%	Compliant
18- Exonerated and Unfounded dispositions: 400	100%	Compliant

Sections: CD Paragraph(s)	Audit Score	Outcome
19- NFIM: 400	100%	Compliant
20- Sustained cases and Discipline: 403	43%	Not Compliant
21- Findings: 414-415	98%	Compliant
22- PIB Deputy Chief: 416	100%	Compliant
23- Follow-up: 417, 420-423	97%/ 100% (admin)	Compliant/ Compliant
24- Annual Report: 426	100%	Compliant
25- United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group: 430-431	0/0	NA
26- Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations: 454	100%	Compliant

Contents

Executive Summary	2-3
Summary Table.....	3-4
Introduction	6-8
<i>Purpose</i>	6-7
<i>Scope</i>	7
<i>Methodology</i>	8
Audit Scorecard.....	8-29
Review Analysis.....	30-44
Overall Recommendations/ Corrective Actions	45-46
Public Integrity Bureau Re-evaluation Requests and PSAB Responses	47-56
Appendix A – PIB Compliance Guidance Table	57-89

Introduction

Purpose

According to *Section XVII. Misconduct Complaint Intake, Investigation, and Adjudication* “NOPD and the City agree to ensure that all allegations of officer misconduct are received and are fully and fairly investigated; that all investigative findings are supported using the preponderance of the evidence standard and documented in writing; and that all officers who commit misconduct are held accountable pursuant to a disciplinary system that is fair and consistent. To achieve these outcomes, NOPD and the City agree to implement the requirements set out below:”

- A. Reporting Misconduct 375.
- B. Non-Investigative Responses to Allegations of Misconduct 376.
- C. Preventing Retaliation 377.
- D. Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements 378.-383.
- E. Complaint Information 384.-387.
- F. Complaint Intake, Classification, Assignment, and Tracking 388.-401.
- G. Investigation Timeframe 402.-403.
- H. Collection of Evidence 404.-412.
- I. Analysis of Evidence 413.-417.
- J. Integrity of Investigative File and Evidence 418.-419.
- K. Communication with Complainant 420.
- L. Discipline Process and Transparency 421.-424.
- M. Annual Report 426.

According to *Section XVIII. Transparency and Oversight* “To ensure comprehensive, effective, and transparent oversight of NOPD, NOPD and the City agree to develop, implement, and maintain systems that are meant to be sustained after the completion of this Agreement. To facilitate effective and constitutional policing and increase trust between NOPD and the broader New Orleans community, these oversight systems shall ensure that proper incidents, practices, or trends are identified and corrected in an equitable and timely manner. To achieve these outcomes, NOPD and the City agree to implement the requirements set out below:”

- B. United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination 430.-431.

According to *Section XIX: Agreement Implementation and Enforcement* “Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations:”

- E. Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations 454.

Further, the following NOPD Policy Chapters of the NOPD's Operations Manual also regulate this process:

Chapter 52.1: Complaint Intake and Investigation (Former Chapters 52.1.1 and 52.1.2)

Chapter 52.2 Negotiated Settlement Agreements

Chapter 52.3 Community-Police Mediation (Former Chapter 24.2)

Chapter 52.4 Adjudication of Misconduct and Suspension of Members (Former Chapter 26.2)

Chapter 52.5 Disciplinary Matrix/ Penalty Schedule (Former Chapter 26.2.1)

In addition, the following NOPD Rules were used to conduct this audit:

Rule 1: Operations Manual

Rule 2: Moral Conduct

Rule 3: Professional Conduct

Rule 4: Performance of Duty

Rule 5: Restricted Activities

Rule 6: Official Information

Rule 7: Department Property

Scope

This audit assesses and documents NOPD's adherence to the policies and procedures outlined in the following:

- Public Integrity Bureau Standard Operating Procedures Manual,
- NOPD's adherence to the misconduct policies and procedures outlined in the NOPD's Operation Manual: 52.1, 52.2, 52.3, 52.4, and 52.5.
- NOPD Rules: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Furthermore, this audit measures compliance with the requirements set forth in Section XVII: Misconduct Complaint Intake, Investigation, and Adjudication paragraphs 375-426, Section XVIII: Transparency and Oversight paragraphs 430-431, and Section XIX: Agreement Implementation and Enforcement paragraph 454 of the NOPD Consent Decree.

Methodology

Administrative audit:

The Public Integrity Bureau agreed that all proofs of compliance should be uploaded to the designated folders for the administrative questions in the audit. The following administrative sections are as follows: Section 1: Preventing Retaliation 1a-1f, Section 2: Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements 2a-2s, Section 3: Complaint Information 3a- 3i, Section 8: Case Tracking 8a-8e vi, Section 23: Follow-up 23j-23k, Section 24: Annual Report 24a-24b, and Section 25: United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group 25a-25b. Each folder is labeled with each section number and then a sub-folder with each sub-section letter. All supporting documentation provided by the Public Integrity Bureau was placed into the electronic folders in the PIB Drive, specifically: *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025*.

Misconduct audit:

The random sample was chosen from all misconduct investigations that are documented in IAPro for the first three quarters (Q1-Q3) from date of occurrence from January 1, 2024- September 30, 2024, which includes the following:

- A. Majority of cases should be citizen-initiated complaints (80-70%)
- B. Rank-initiated complaints (10-15%)
- C. Complaints closed as NFIM (10-15%)

A random sample of 40 misconduct investigations were generated and split between the auditors using a randomizer. Additionally, the results of the Misconduct audit were verified through an auditor double blind and internal audit review and resolution process.

The one hundred and sixty-three (163) item Public Integrity Bureau Audit Scorecard and the PIB Compliance Guidance Table was used as a rubric to assess and quantify the data to determine whether all allegations of misconduct are received, fully and fairly investigated consistently with the requirements of NOPD policy and the corresponding paragraphs of the Federal Consent Decree.

Audit Scorecard

Check-List Questions		Score	Y	N	U	NA	Measurement/ Informational Type	+ Rating	Consent Decree #
1	Preventing Retaliation	-	-	-	-	-			377
1a	Has NOPD's anti-retaliation policy and implementation been reviewed annually?						I	YES	377
1b	Has the review considered alleged incidents of retaliation that occurred or were investigated during the reporting period?						M	YES	377
1c	Has the review considered the discipline imposed for retaliation?						M	YES	377
1d	Has the review considered the supervisor's performance in addressing and preventing retaliation?						M	YES	377
1e	Have any policies or practices been modified from retaliation for reporting misconduct?						I	YES	377
1f	Have any grounds of discipline been administered, up to and including termination of employment for retaliation for reporting misconduct or cooperating with an investigation of misconduct?						M	YES	377
2	Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements	-	-	-	-	-			378-383
2a	Is a civilian serving as PIB Commander?						I	YES	378
2b	Is PIB adequately staffed, including the Quality Assurance Unit?						M	YES	379
2c	Does PIB consistently conduct timely investigations?						M	YES	379
2d	Is PIB provided with sufficient resources and equipment to ensure thorough and timely criminal and administrative misconduct investigations are conducted?						M	YES	379

2e	Has the staffing of PIB been reviewed to ensure that misconduct investigators and commanders possess excellent investigative skills, reputation for integrity, the ability to write clear reports, and the ability to be fair and objective in determining officer misconduct?						I	YES	380
2f	Officers that have a sustained complaint of who have been disciplined for excessive use of force, false arrest, unlawful search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty have been deemed ineligible for assignment to PIB.						I	YES	380
2g	Have officers recently promoted to Lieutenant served in a rotation in PIB?						I	YES	381
2h	Have all personnel conducting NOPD officer misconduct investigations assigned to PIB received at least 40 hours of initial training in conducting misconduct training within a year of being assigned?						I	YES	382
2i	Have all personnel conducting NOPD officer misconduct investigations assigned to Districts received at least 40 hours of initial training in conducting misconduct training within a year of being assigned?						I	YES	382
2j	Have all personnel conducting NOPD officer misconduct investigations assigned to PIB also received at least eight hours of training each year?						I	YES	382
2k	Have all personnel conducting NOPD officer misconduct investigations assigned to Districts also received at least eight hours of training each year?						I	YES	382

2l	Has the plan for conducting regular, targeted, and random integrity audit check or sting audits to identify and investigate officers engaging in at -risk behavior?							M	YES	383
2m	Was an integrity check conducted for unlawful stops?							M	YES	383
2n	Was an integrity check conducted for searches and seizures (including false arrest)?							M	YES	383
2o	Was an integrity check conducted for discriminatory policing?							M	YES	383
2p	Was an integrity check conducted for use of excessive force?							M	YES	383
2q	Was an integrity check conducted for secondary employment abuse?							M	YES	383
2r	Was an integrity check conducted for failure to take a complaint?							M	YES	383
2s	Was an integrity check conducted for failure to report misconduct or complaints or other patterns of misconduct or potentially criminal behavior?							M	YES	383
3	Complaint Information	-	-	-	-	-				384-387
3a	Does the program ensure broad knowledge throughout the New Orleans community about how to make misconduct complaints?							I	YES	384
3b	Is there availability of effective mechanisms for making misconduct complaints?							I	YES	384
3c	Has complaint forms and informational materials, brochures and posters, been made available at appropriate properties?							I	YES	385
3d	Are individuals able to submit misconduct complaints through NOPD and City websites?							I	YES	385

3e	Do these websites include complaint forms and information regarding how to file misconduct complaints?							I	YES	385
3f	Has a permanent placard been posted and maintained at all police facilities describing the external complaint process?							I	YES	386
3g	Have the officers immediately informed his or her supervisor when an individual indicates that he or she would like to make a complaint or request a complaint form?							M	YES	386
3h	Has the policy been revised annually?							I	YES	388
3i	Have all officers and supervisors been trained to ensure that they properly handle complaint intake?							I	YES	388
4	Complaint Intake	-	-	-	-	-				375-376, 389-390
4a	Is there evidence of a refusal to accept a misconduct complaint?							M	NO	375/389
4b	Is there evidence of intake personnel providing false or misleading information about filing a misconduct complaint?							M	NO	389
4c	If so, was disciplinary action initiated that included a penalty of up to and including termination?							M		389
4d	For any disciplinary or non-disciplinary corrective action initiated by a supervisor, was the infraction and the supervisor's response reported to PIB within five business days?							M	YES	376
4e	For any disciplinary or non-disciplinary corrective action initiated by a supervisor, did PIB review the report and supervisory response to determine whether additional investigation is required?							M	YES	376

4f	For any disciplinary or non-disciplinary corrective action initiated by a supervisor, did PIB evaluate the imposed discipline or corrective action to determine whether the supervisory response was fair and consistent with NOPD disciplinary protocols?						M	YES	376
4g	Were all misconduct complaints accepted, including anonymous and third-party complaints, for review and investigation?						M	YES	390
5	LEP (If the complainant spoke English, skip this section)	-	-	-	-	-			387/390
5a	For any LEP individual who wished to file a complaint was the complainant provided with a complaint form in their preferred language, as appropriate?						M	YES	387/390
5b	If yes, what was their preferred language?						M		387/390
5c	For any LEP individual filing a complaint, were the appropriate translation services provided to file a complaint?						M	YES	390
6	Complaints received in the field (If not received in the field, skip this section)	-	-	-	-	-			391,395, 397
6a	Is there evidence that all officers and employees who received a misconduct complaint in the field immediately informed a supervisor of the misconduct complaint so that the supervisor was able to ensure proper intake of the complaint.						M	YES	391
6b	Were all misconduct complaints received outside of PIB documented and submitted to PIB by the end of the shift in which it was received?						M	YES	391
6c	If the complaint was received in the field, did a supervisor obtain the unique numerical identifier and provide this identifier to the complainant?						M	YES	395

6d	Did a supervisor receiving a misconduct complaint in the field gather all relevant information and evidence and provide this information and evidence to PIB?							M	YES	397
6e	If a supervisor received a complaint in the field, does the information obtained include the following?							M		397
i	i. Names and contact information for all complainants and witnesses?							M	YES	397
ii	ii. Names of all NOPD officers and employees involved in or witnessing the alleged misconduct?							M	YES	397
iii	iii. All available physical evidence?							M	YES	397
iv	iv. Any voluntarily provided video or audio recordings?							M	YES	397
v	v. Documentation of the existence of such recordings where the witness chooses not to provide the recording?							M	YES	397
vi	vi. Supervisor photographs of apparent injuries, or the absence thereof, (unless the complainant/subject objects or declines)?							M	YES	397
7	Complaints from Judges/Attorneys	-	-	-	-	-				392
7a	Upon notification by the City Attorney's Office, the DA, judges, or magistrates, did PIB ensure allegations of officer misconduct were identified and investigated as misconduct complaints?							M	YES	392
8	Case Tracking (This section requires review on one case)	-	-	-	-	-				393-396
8a	Are cases tracked as a separate category for allegations that an officer has in any way interfered with a civilian's First Amendment right to observe, record, and/or verbally comment on the performance of police duties in an area open to the public, or where the individual has a right to be, such as a person's home or business?							M	YES	393

8b	Does PIB track, as a separate category of misconduct complaints, allegations of discriminatory policing, along with characteristics of the complainants?							M	YES	394
8c	Are PIB complaints of discriminatory policing captured and tracked in compliance?							M	YES	394
8d	Does the PIB have a centralized numbering and tracking system for this misconduct complaint?							M	YES	395
8e	Does the centralized numbering and tracking system maintain accurate and reliable data regarding?							M	YES	396
i	The number?							M	YES	396
ii	Nature?							M	YES	396
iii	Status of the misconduct complaint from initial intake to final disposition?							M	YES	396
iv	Investigation timeliness?							M	YES	396
v	Notification to the complainant of the interim status?							M	YES	396
vi	Final disposition of the investigation?							M	YES	396
9	Complaints	-	-	-	-	-				393,395,398-399
9a	Is there evidence of detaining or arresting an individual for interfering with a law enforcement investigation, disorderly conduct, or similar charges for a civilian's First Amendment right to observe, record, and/or verbally comment on the performance of police duties?							M	NO	393
9b	Was the complaint assigned a unique numerical identifier upon receipt?							M	YES	395
9c	Was the numerical identifier provided to the complainant at the time the complaint was made?							M	YES	395
9d	Did PIB investigate all allegations upon receiving a completed complaint form or other allegations of misconduct to							M		399

	determine the proper classification of the allegation into the appropriate categories?								YES	
9e	Did PIB decide within three business days of receipt of a complaint whether the complaint was assigned to an ICO or supervisor, retained by PIB for investigation or referred to the appropriate outside agency?							M	YES	398,399
9f	Did PIB decide within three business days of receipt of a complaint whether the complaint would be investigated criminally?							M	YES	398
10	Misconduct observed in the field/reported to supervisor	-	-	-	-	-				375
10a	Did all employees observing or becoming aware of any act of misconduct by another employee report the incident to a supervisor or directly to PIB for review and investigation?							M	YES	375
10b	Where an act of misconduct is reported to a supervisor, did the supervisor immediately document and report this information to PIB?							M	YES	375
10c	If there was a failure to report or document an act of misconduct or criminal behavior, did it lead to discipline up to and including termination of employment?							M	YES	375
	If yes, please note the disciplinary action taken below:							M		375
11	LEP	-	-	-	-	-				390
11a	For any LEP individual filing a complaint, was the case investigated with the use of the appropriate translation services?							M	YES	390
12	Person Investigating other than officer/supervisor involved	-	-	-	-	-				401

12a	A misconduct complaint investigation was conducted by an officer other than the officer who used force during the incident.							M	YES	401
12b	A misconduct complaint investigation was conducted by an officer other than the officer whose conduct led to the injury of a person.	-	-	-	-	-		M	YES	401
12c	A misconduct complaint investigation was conducted by an officer other than the officer who authorized the conduct that led to the reported incident or complaint?				-	-		M	YES	401
12d	A misconduct complaint investigation was conducted by an officer other than the officer who witnessed or was involved in the accident leading to the allegation of misconduct?				-	-		M	YES	401
13	Investigation Timelines	-	-	-	-	-				402-403
13a	Was the administrative investigation conducted and completed by PIB within the time limitations mandated by state law and within 90 days of the receipt of the complaint including assignment, investigation, review, and final approval unless an extension was granted?				-	-		M	YES	403
13b	Was the administrative investigation conducted and completed by PIB within the time limitations mandated by state law and within 120 days of the receipt of the complaint, including assignment, investigation, review, and final approval when an extension was granted as provided for under state law or Civil Service exemption?				-	-		M	YES	403

13c	Have all administrative investigations been subject to appropriate interruption (tolling period) as necessary to conduct a concurrent criminal investigation or as provided by law?							M	YES	403
13d	Did this case exceed the timeline by state law of 75 days from the date of cognizance?							M	NO	402
13e	Was the administrative investigation conducted and completed by PIB within the time limitations mandated by state law and within no more than 135 days of the Complaint Cognizance Date?							M	YES	403
14	Thoroughness	-	-	-	-	-				404-410
14a	Were officer misconduct investigations as thorough as necessary to reach reliable and complete findings?				-	-		M	YES	404
14b	Did the investigator interview each complainant in person? (Absent extenuating circumstances)				-	-		M	YES	404
	If yes, please note the documented extenuating circumstances below:							I		404
14c	Was each interview recorded in its entirety? (Absent specific, documented objection by the complainant)				-	-		M	YES	404
14d	Did all witnesses, including officers witnessing or involved in an incident, provide a written statement regarding the accident? (Statements are required from all witnesses in all cases.)				-	-		M		405

								YES	
14e	Where the alleged misconduct is particularly serious or interviews of the subject officer(s) or other witnesses may be necessary to sufficiently investigate the allegation, did the investigator conduct an in-person interview?	-						YES	406
14f	Where alleged misconduct is particularly serious was the interview recorded in its entirety? (Unless non-officer witnesses objected, and the objection was documented.)				-			YES	406
14g	Was each officer, witness, and complainant interviewed separately?			-	-			YES	407
14h	Was a NOPDAI not involved in the underlying complaint used when taking statements or conducting interviews of any Vietnamese or Spanish speaking LEP complainant or witness?			-	-			NO	407
14i	Did the investigator seek to identify all persons at the scene giving rise to a misconduct allegation, especially all NOPD officers?			-	-			YES	408
14j	Did the investigator note in the investigative report the identities of all officers and other witnesses who were on the scene but asserted they did not witness and were not involved in the incident?							YES	408
14k	Did the investigator conduct further investigation of any such assertions that appear unsupported by the evidence?							YES	408
14l	Were all interview recordings available from a secure location within PIB?	-	-	-	-	-		YES	409

14m	Did all officers cooperate with the administrative investigations?							M	YES	410
14n	Did all officers appear for an interview when requested by an NOPD or Inspector General investigator?	-	-	-	-	-		M	YES	410
14o	Did all officers provide all requested documents and evidence?							M	YES	410
14p	Did supervisors facilitate the officer's appearance, absence extraordinary and documented circumstances?							M	YES	410
15	Criminal Conduct/ Investigation	-	-	-	-	-				411-412
15a	Did the investigator immediately notify the PIB commander if the investigator determined there was criminal conduct on the part of any officer or employee?							M	YES	411
15b	Did the PIB commander immediately notify the Superintendent, the DA, and/or USAO, and the Monitor of the initiation of a criminal investigation?							M	YES	411
15c	If a criminal investigation was completed, did the subject officer provide a statement to administrative investigators following the conclusion of the criminal investigation?							M	YES	411
15d	If a criminal and administrative investigation was completed, were both conducted in parallel as appropriate as well as kept separate after a subject officer has provided a compelled statement?							M	YES	411
15e	Is there evidence of an officer refusing to provide a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity?							M	NO	412
15f	If yes, does this refusal comply with department policy?							M	YES	412
15g	If yes, did officers have proper department training.							M	YES	412

15h	If yes, was disciplinary action initiated? List disciplinary action							M	YES	412
16	Evidence/ Credibility Determination	-	-	-	-	-				413
16a	Is there evidence that all relevant evidence was considered including circumstantial, direct, and physical evidence?							M	YES	413
16b	Was a credibility determination made based upon that evidence?							M	YES	413
16c	Was the officer's statement provided automatic preference over a non-officer's statement?							M	NO	413
16d	Did the investigator disregard a witness' statement merely because the witness has some connection to the complainant or because of any criminal history?							M	NO	413
16e	Did the investigator make efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements?							M	YES	413
17	Evidence/ Documentation	-	-	-	-	-				418-419
17a	Were Division/District-Level investigation reports and all related documentation and evidence provided to PIB within three business days?							M	YES	418
17b	Are the investigation reports and related documentation and evidence securely maintained in a central and accessible location? (Until the officer who was a subject of the complaint has severed employment with NOPD)							M	YES	419
18	Exonerated and Unfounded dispositions	-	-	-	-	-				400
18a	Was an "exonerated" or "unfounded" disposition free of any misconduct?							M	YES	400
18b	Was an "exonerated" or "unfounded" disposition noted that it was a complaint regarding service or otherwise contained no allegations of misconduct?							M	YES	400

19	NIMS	-	-	-	-	-			400
19a	Was this case closed as "No Violation Observed," "NMIS," or similar dispositions of misconduct allegations?						M	YES	400
19b	If a finding of "No Formal Investigation Merited" was used to resolve a case, did it involve only the following types of complaints?						M	YES	400
i	Complaints disputing traffic citations, except those allegations of misconduct contained in such complaints (e.g., racial profiling, illegal search, excessive force) will be classified and investigated according to its merits?						M	YES	400
ii	Complaints alleging a delay in police service such as patrol response or detective follow-up, where the preliminary investigation demonstrates that the delay is due to workload. However, if the preliminary investigation discloses that misconduct such as negligence rather than workload caused the delay, the complaint will be classified according to its merits.						M	YES	400
iii	Complaints regarding off-duty officer conduct of a civil nature unless the alleged conduct or its effects constitute misconduct or have a substantial nexus to the officer's employment?						M	YES	400
iv	Complaints in which the preliminary investigation demonstrates that the subject officer does not work for NOPD or where the identity of the subject officer cannot be determined, despite the best efforts of PIB?						M	YES	400
20	Sustained cases and Discipline	-	-	-	-	-			403

20a	Has NOPD ensured all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings and notifications to the accused of the discipline are completed within 90 days of the conclusion of an admin investigation unless extended by 30 days by Superintendent written approval?							M	YES	403
20b	Did the notification to the accused include the date of imposition of punishment commence, if applicable?							M	YES	403
20c	Was the imposition date not more than 45 days following the date of notification unless the justification for the delay is documented in writing by the Superintendent?							M	YES	403
21	Findings	-	-	-	-	-				414-415
21a	Was the resolution based upon the preponderance of the evidence?							M	YES	414
21b	Was the investigation closed only because the complaint was withdrawn or because the alleged victim was unwilling or unable to provide additional information beyond the initial complaint?							M	NO	414
21c	Did the investigation continue if the complainant withdrew the investigation or was unwilling to provide additional information?							M	NO	414
21d	Was the fact that a complainant pled guilty or was found guilty of an offense the deciding factor as to whether an NOPD officer committed the alleged misconduct or used to justify discontinuing the investigation?							M	NO	414

21e	Was this case closed as either a) unfounded, b) sustained, c) not sustained, or d) exonerated?						M	YES	415
21f	If the case was closed as “unfounded”, was it due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer?						M	YES	415
21g	If the case was closed as “sustained”, was it due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged misconduct did occur?						M	YES	415
21h	If the case was closed as " <u>not sustained</u> " was it due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, the investigator was unable to determine whether the alleged misconduct occurred?						M	YES	415
21i	If the case was closed as “exonerated”, was it due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged conduct did occur but did not violate NOPD policies, procedures, or training?						M	YES	415
22	PIB Deputy Chief	-	-	-	-	-			416
22a	Did the PIB Deputy Chief or proxy accept or approve the investigator's recommended disposition unless the disposition was unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence or						M	YES	416

	additional investigation was necessary to reach a reliable finding within the timelines?								
22b	Where the disposition was unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence, did the PIB Deputy Chief or proxy correct the disposition or order additional investigation, as necessary						M	YES	416
23	Follow-up	-	-	-	-	-			417,420-423
23a	Did the investigator assess and document whether: (a) the police action was in compliance with training and legal standards; (b) the incident indicates a need for additional training, counseling, or other non-disciplinary corrective measures; and (d) the incident suggests that NOPD should revise its policies, strategies, tactics, or training?						M	YES	417
23b	Did PIB personnel share with and document the commander's disagreement or agreement with follow up measures concerning policy, tactics, training, counseling, or non-disciplinary corrective measures?						M	YES	417
23c	Did PIB receive documentation from the appropriate person that recommended changes were implemented?						M	YES	417
23d	Was the complainant kept informed periodically regarding the status of the investigation?						M	YES	420
23e	Was the complainant notified of the outcome of the investigation, in writing,						M		420

	within 10 business days of the completion of the investigation?									
									YES	
23f	Was the complainant notified whether any disciplinary or non-disciplinary action was taken?							M	YES	420
23g	Is there evidence that discipline for sustained allegations was based on the nature of the allegation and consistent with mitigating and aggravating factors rather than the identity of the officer?							M	YES	421
23h	Are all disciplinary decisions documented?							M	YES	423
23i	Was the rationale behind any decision to deviate from the level of discipline set out in the disciplinary matrix documented?							M	YES	422,423
23j	Has NOPD and the City upheld their policies and procedures to ensure that the City Attorney's Office provides close guidance to NOPD at the disciplinary stage to ensure that NOPD's disciplinary decisions are as fair and legally defensive as possible?							M	YES	424
23k	Has the City requested the Civil Service Commission to, within 90 days of the Effective Date, post online its full decisions related to NOPD discipline in a timely manner?							M	YES	425
24	Annual Report	-	-	-	-	-				426

24a	Does the PIB annual report include a summary of each misconduct complaint including the following: description of the allegation, the final approved disposition, and any discipline imposed?						I	YES	426
24b	Does the PIB annual report also include aggregate misconduct complaint data showing the number of each type of complaint and the number and rate of sustained cases after final approval, and shall provide an analysis of this data that identifies and documents NOPDs response to trends and concerns?						I	YES	426
25	United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group								430-431
25a	In the quarterly criminal justice coordination group meetings have any referred specific allegations of misconduct for investigation been shared?						I	YES	430
25b	Have NOPD command-level officials provided updates each month to the USAO-convened criminal coordination group regarding the status of investigations of previously referred allegations of misconduct and the status of possible operational changes from group feedback?						I	YES	431

26	Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations	-	-	-	-	-			454
26a	Have the monitors been provided each investigation of serious use of force or use of force that is the subject of a misconduct investigation and each investigation report of a serious misconduct complaint investigation before closing the investigation or communicating the recommended disposition to the subject of investigation?						M	YES	454
26b	For the serious misconduct complaint investigations reviewed by the monitors and determined to be incomplete or for which the findings are not supported by a preponderance of the evidence was the further investigation recommended executed?						M	YES	454
26c	Did the monitor provide written instructions for completing any investigation determined to be incomplete or inadequately supported by the evidence?						M	YES	454
26d	Did the superintendent determine whether the additional investigation or modification recommended by the Monitor should be executed?						M	YES	454
26e	If the Superintendent determined not to order the recommended additional investigation or modification, were the reasons for this determination set out in writing?						M	YES	454

26f	Did the monitor provide recommendations so that any further investigation or modification could be concluded within the timeframes mandated by state law?						M	YES	454
26g	Did the monitor coordinate with the IPM in conducting these uses of force and misconduct investigation reviews?						M	YES	454

Review Analysis

1. Preventing Retaliation: (sub-sections a-f) CD paragraph 377

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The Preventing Retaliation section of the administrative audit, sub-sections A-F were all deemed compliant.

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections C, D, and F are not applicable since there were no sustained dispositions resulting in discipline for the retaliation allegations as well as any review of the supervisor's performance in addressing and preventing retaliation. Further, no grounds of discipline have been administered, up to and including termination of employment for retaliation for reporting misconduct or cooperating with an investigation of misconduct.

Proof of compliance for all sub-sections can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025\1. Preventing Retaliation\ A-F*.

2. Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements: (sub-sections a-s) CD paragraphs 378-383

Compliance Status: 84%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: The Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements section of the administrative audit, sub-sections A, and E-S were all deemed complaint.

The following sub-sections of the administrative audit were not deemed compliant:

- Sub-sections B regarding whether PIB is adequately staffed, including the Quality Assurance Unit, is not complaint. The audit protocol states to assess the following to determine if PIB is adequately staffed: timelines, thoroughness, and assess PIB overtime. The misconduct audit corresponding sections for thoroughness and timelines scored the following:
 - Section 13: Investigation Timelines – 95%
 - Section 14: Thoroughness – 95%
 - Section 20: Sustained Cases and Discipline – **43%**

Further, a new measure added was to assess any PIB overtime. The total number of PIB overtime hours for 2024 was 5149.7 in comparison to 2023, which was 5272.12. The assessment of all items deems that PIB is not adequately staffed, including the Quality Assurance unit.

- Sub-section C regarding whether PIB consistently conducts timely investigations was deemed to be not compliant. Section 13: Investigation Timelines of the Misconduct audit scored 95%, and section 20: Sustained Cases and Discipline scored **43%**. These two scores collectively demonstrate that PIB does not consistently conduct timely investigations.

- Sub-section D regarding whether PIB is provided with sufficient resources and equipment to ensure thorough and timely criminal and administrative misconduct investigations are conducted is also not deemed to be in compliance. In addition, a new assessment was added and evaluated to gather feedback on whether adequate resources are present within PIB. PIB presented requests to fill vacancies as well as background request forms for positions. All these items, assessed together, presented evidence that PIB is not provided with sufficient resources and equipment to ensure thorough and timely criminal and administrative misconduct investigations.

The following sub-sections of the administrative audit were deemed complaint. The following provides more in-depth details on the compliance:

- Sub-section L/ M/N/O/P/R/ S regarding the plan for conducting regular, targeted, and random integrity audit check or sting audits to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior was substantially improved. PSAB worked with PIB to develop a randomized, representative sample of BWC videos created by officers assigned to Field Operations Bureau (FOB) Districts 1-8, the FOB Special Operations Division (SOD), and the rest of the Department. The PIB unit will review at least 150 BWC videos per year. The unit will review videos every month and will combine monthly reviews for annual reporting purposes. Therefore, annual reporting will reflect a sample that is representative of one year of NOPD BWC activity. This process was initiated in December of 2024.

Additionally, the Public Integrity Special Investigations Section has conducted other integrity checks such as reviewing BWC footage of incidents with the specific purpose of identifying deficiencies in the following areas: unlawful stops, search and seizure, discriminatory policing, excessive force, secondary employment, and misconduct compliant reporting. The Special Investigations Section has also conducted several integrity stings relative to the proper handling of found property and secondary employment. The Public Integrity Special Investigations Section used an excel sheet to track PIB Personnel Integrity Checks from January 2024 to November 2024. The breakdown is as follows for each quarter, type of check, and district of check:

- January -March (9 stings)
 - Sixth District - 4 stings:
 - 2 Secondary Employment
 - 2 Found Property
 - Eighth District - 5 stings
 - 3 Secondary Employment
 - 2 Found Property
 - The officers failed both found property stings. The following complaints were initiated: 2024-0096-R and 2024-0097-R.
- April -June (35 BWC review / 21 stings)
 - First District:
 - 2 stings
 - 1 Secondary Employment

- 1 Misconduct Complaint
 - The officer failed misconduct complaint sting and was documented with an SFL counseling entry by his supervisor, SFL # 202401298.
 - 5 BWC reviews
 - 1 Unlawful Stop
 - 3 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - Second District:
 - 1 sting
 - 1 Secondary Employment
 - 2 checks:
 - 1 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Failure to take complaint
 - Third District:
 - 2 stings:
 - 2 Secondary Employment
 - 4 checks:
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - 1 Search and Seizure
 - 2 Unlawful Stops
 - Fourth District:
 - 1 sting:
 - 1 Secondary Employment
 - 3 checks:
 - 1 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Unlawful Stops
 - 1 Failure to take Complaint
 - Fifth District:
 - 5 checks:
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - 1 Misconduct Complaint Reporting
 - 2 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Use of Force
 - Sixth District:
 - 11 stings:
 - 11 Secondary Employment
 - 1 check:
 - 1 Failure to Take Complaint
 - Seventh District:
 - 3 stings:
 - 2 Secondary Employment
 - 1 Misconduct Complaint
 - 9 checks:
 - 4 Unlawful stops
 - 2 Bias Free Policing

- 1 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Procedural / Targeted
 - 1 Failure to Take Complaint
 - Eighth District:
 - 1 sting:
 - 1 Misconduct Complaint
 - 6 checks:
 - 2 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Discriminatory Policing
 - 1 Failure to Take Complaint
 - 2 Unlawful Stop
- July -September (21 BWC review checks)
 - First District -2 checks:
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - 1 Unlawful Stop
 - Second District – 2 checks:
 - 2 Search and Seizure
 - Third District– 3 checks:
 - 1 Unlawful Stops
 - 2 Bias Free Policing
 - Fifth District –1 check:
 - 1 Unlawful Stop
 - Sixth District – 3 checks:
 - 1 Misconduct Complaint Reporting
 - 1 Search and Seizure
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - Seventh District – 6 checks:
 - 2 Bias Free Policing
 - 1 Misconduct Complaint Reporting
 - 3 Use of Force
 - Eighth District – 4 checks:
 - 1 Bias Free Policing
 - 1 unlawful stop
 - 2 Use of Force
 - One officer failed the use of force review. The following complaint was initiated: 2024-0440-R.
- October- December (16 BWC review checks for all areas)
 - First District -3 checks
 - Second District – 1 check
 - Third District– 1 check
 - Fourth District – 1 check
 - Fifth District –1 check
 - Sixth District – 1 check
 - Seventh District – 3 checks
 - Eighth District – 5 checks

Proof of compliance for sub-sections A, and E-S can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025\ 2. Staffing, Selection, and Training Requirements Total \ A-S.*

Recommendations: Ensure PIB is devoted the resources to ensure PIB acquires the adequate staff needed to consistently conduct timely investigations. In addition, any specific resources or equipment needs necessary should be expedited to ensure that PIB is equipped with all the staff and resources needed to guarantee that both administrative and criminal misconduct investigations are conducted thoroughly and in a timely manner. Lastly, ensuring that PIB has the cooperation from other bureaus to ensure that hearings are conducted timely and efficiently. This requires that all members of NOPD are participating and complying with their requirements to ensure that hearings are conducted timely to ensure that timely discipline is imposed.

3. Complaint Information: (sub-sections a-i) CD paragraphs 384-387

Compliance Status: 89%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: The Complaint Information section of the administrative audit, sub-sections A-F, H-I were all deemed complaint.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section G regarding all officers immediately informing his or her supervisor when and individual indicates that he or she would like to make a complaint or request a complaint form was not deemed compliant. PIB reported four allegations of failure to report misconduct:
 - 2024-0303-R
 - Sustained-NSA
 - 2024-0355-R
 - Sustained-NSA
 - 2024-0398-R
 - Not Sustained
 - 2024-0669-R
 - Not Sustained

Proof of compliance for sub-sections of the administrative audit A-I can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025 \ 3. Complaint Information \ A-I.*

Recommendations: Confirm all officers are aware that they are required to immediately inform his or her supervisor when an individual indicates that he or she would like to make a complaint or request a complaint form. This can easily be facilitated through a monthly Daily Training Bulletin, DTB.

4. Complaint Intake: (sub-sections a-g) CD paragraphs 375-376, 389-390

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The complaint intake requirements in sub-sections A-G were upheld for all complaints in the sample.

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section C is not applicable since there was no evidence of intake personnel providing false or misleading information about filing a misconduct complaint, therefore no disciplinary action.

5. LEP: (sub-sections a-c) CD paragraphs 387, 390

Compliance Status: 0/0, NA

Summary of results: All complainants in the sample spoke English, therefore there was no LEP cases to assess. Furthermore, according to PIB, there was only one misconduct complaint made by an LEP individual in the year 2024 received on 1/12/2024, CTN # 2024-0026-P.

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections A-C are not applicable since there were no LEP individuals who filed a misconduct complaint in the sample.

6. Complaints received in the field: (sub-sections a-e) CD paragraphs 391, 395, 397

Compliance Status: 89%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: The sample size for complaints received in the field was 6 out of the total sample of 40 cases. The complaints received in the field requirements in sub-sections A, D, and E i-iii were deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section B regarding whether all misconduct complaints were received outside of PIB were documented and submitted to PIB by the end of the shift in which it was received, scored **83%**. The following case was deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0039-P

Note: This complaint was initiated during the snowstorm event that occurred on January 18, 2024, which PIB members were working remotely. The district failed to send via email.

- Sub-section C regarding complaints received in the field, if the supervisor obtained the unique numerical identifier and provided it to the complainant received a score of **50%**. This score could possibly be low since this information is not frequently captured in the narrative, audio of cases, or in the bodycam footage. Further, the new intake forms with the checkbox ensuring the complainants received their CTN # was not implemented until late fall of 2024. Therefore, most cases did not specify whether the complainant was provided with the complaint number at the time the complaint is made. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0039-P
 - 2023-0179-P
 - 2023-0238-P

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections E iv-vi are not applicable since for all complaints received in the field, no information obtained including the following: any voluntary provided video or audio recordings, documentation of the existence of such recordings where the witness chooses not to provide the recording, and supervisor photographs of apparent injuries, or the absence thereof, unless the complainant or subject objects or declines.

Recommendations: Educating all officers in Districts and Bureaus that all misconduct complaints received in the field must be documented and submitted to PIB by the end of the officer's shift. PIB should also ensure that all districts and bureaus have the updated 230 form and stress the importance of checking the box that the officer provided the complainant with the CTN# at the time the complaint is received in the field. This information can be highlighted through a Daily Training Bulletin, DTB.

7. Complaints from Judges/Attorneys: (sub-section a) CD paragraphs 392

Compliance Status: 0/0, NA

Summary of results: No complaints in the sample were complaints notified to PIB by the City Attorney's Office, the DA, Judges, or Magistrates.

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section A is not applicable since there were no complaints notified to PIB by the City Attorney's Office, the DA, Judges, or Magistrates.

8. Case Tracking: (sub-sections a-e: i-vi) CD paragraphs 393-396

Compliance Status: 87%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: Case tracking in sub-sections A-B, D-E i-vi were deemed to be compliant.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section C regarding whether PIB complaints of discriminatory policing are captured and tracked is not in compliance and received a **71%** score. There were 7 complaints related to discriminatory policing and two cases were deemed not compliant because those are still awaiting hearing. The following two cases do not comply with the clause that NOPD will ensure all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings, and notifications to the accused of the appropriate discipline via a disciplinary letter are completed within ninety (90) days of the conclusion of an administrative investigation:
 - 2024-0243-P
 - 2024-0363-R

Recommendations: PIB should closely monitor the ninety-day timeline after the Notice of Disposition is issued to ensure all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings, and notifications to the accused of the appropriate discipline via a disciplinary letter are completed within the allotted timeframe.

9. Complaints: (sub-sections a-f) CD paragraphs 393, 395, 398-399

Compliance Status: 88%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: Complaints in sub-sections B, D, E and F were deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section C regarding whether the numerical identifier was provided to the complainant at the time the complaint was made, scored **41%**. Once again, this score could possibly be low since this information was not frequently captured in the narrative or audio of cases. Most cases did not specify whether the complainant was provided with the complaint number at the time the complaint is made. Further, the new intake forms with the checkbox ensuring the complainants received their CTN # was not implemented until late fall of 2024. The following 20 cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0010-P
 - 2024-0065-P
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0120-P
 - 2024-0139-P
 - 2024-0193-P
 - 2024-0472-P
 - 2024-0488-P
 - 2024-0461-P
 - 2024-0483-P
 - 2024-0519-R
 - 2024-0342-N
 - 2024-0353-P
 - 2024-0367-N
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0372-P
 - 2024-0396-P
 - 2024-0225-P
 - 2024-0361-P

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section A is not applicable since there were no First Amendment allegations in the sample.

Recommendations: PIB should issue refresher training on complaint intake procedures internally. The training should include the requirement of providing the complainant with the complaint tracking number at the time the complaint is made for complaints made over the phone, walk-ins, and submitted online as well as updating the form to reflect accordingly. In addition, PIB needs to clearly indicate on the determination form the date the complaint was assigned to a supervisor,

retained by PIB, or referred to an outside agency as well as whether it is to be investigated criminally. Both tasks are to be decided within three business days of receipt of a complaint.

10. Misconduct observed in the field/ reported to supervisor: (sub-sections a-c) CD paragraph 375

Compliance Status: 98%, Compliant

Summary of results: Case tracking in sub-section A was deemed to be compliant.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section B, regarding if an act of misconduct is reported to a supervisor, did the supervisor immediately document and report this information to PIB received an **83%** score. The case was deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0039-P

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section C was not applicable since there were no failures to report or document an act of misconduct or criminal behavior as well as any disciplinary action taken.

11. LEP: (sub-section a) CD paragraphs 390

Compliance Status: 0/0, NA

Summary of results: No LEP individuals filed a complaint in the sample. Further, according to PIB, there was only one misconduct complaint made by an LEP individual in the year 2024 received on 1/12/2024, CTN# 2024-0026-P.

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section A is not applicable since there were no LEP individuals who filed a misconduct complaint in the sample.

12. Person Investigating other than officer/supervisor involved: (sub-sections a-d) CD paragraph 401

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The misconduct complaint is to be investigated other than the officer who used force during the incident, whose conduct led to the injury of a person, who authorized the conduct that led to the reported incident or complaint, and who witnessed or was involved in the accident leading to the allegation of misconduct requirements in sub-sections A-D were all met.

13. Investigation Timelines: (sub-sections a-e) CD paragraphs 402-403

Compliance Status: 95%, Compliant

Summary of results: Investigation timelines in sub-sections A, and C-E were deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section B regarding administrative investigations being conducted and completed within the time limitations mandated by state law and within 120 days of receipt of the complaint, including assignment, investigation, review, and final approval when an extension was granted as provided for under state law or Civil Service exemption totaled **90%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0524-P
 - 2024-0334-P

Sections A and B were not factored into the total scores because state law is 75 days from the date of cognizance or 135 days from the date of cognizance with an extension granted. These sections were left in the audit for informational purposes.

14. Thoroughness: (sub-sections a-p) CD paragraphs 404-410

Compliance Status: 95%, Compliant

Summary of results: Misconduct investigations thoroughness in sub-sections A, C -P were deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section B regarding whether the investigator interviews each complainant in person (absent extenuating circumstances) resulted in **48%** compliance. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0010-P
 - 2024-0039-P
 - 2024-0065-P
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0139-P
 - 2024-0179-P
 - 2024-0225-P
 - 2024-0238-P
 - 2024-0307-P
 - 2024-0332-R
 - 2024-0353-P

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections H is not applicable since there was no NOPDAI or approved translation service provider involved in the underlying complaints used when taking statements or conducting interviews of LEP complainants or witnesses.

Recommendations: According to paragraph 404 of the Consent Decree, “The misconduct complaint investigator shall interview each complainant in person, absent extenuating circumstances”. Most interviews are conducted over the phone and recorded. PIB should request an amendment to the CD to allow interviews to be held over the phone.

15. Criminal Conduct/ Investigation: (sub-sections a-h) CD paragraphs 411-412

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: Criminal Conduct/ Investigations in sub-sections A-H were deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections F-H are not applicable since there were no known officer refusals of providing a public safety statement to assess.

Lastly, per the audit protocol, question 15b, “Was there any apparent criminal activity that should have been identified that was not?” was not properly transferred to the PowerApps form used while conducting the Misconduct audit. This oversight led to the data not being collected for this specific question in Section 15. However, this oversight will be corrected for the 2026 PIB Audit.

16. Evidence/ Credibility Determination: (sub-sections a-e) CD paragraphs 413

Compliance Status: 97%, Compliant

Summary of results: Evidence and Credibility Determination in sub-sections A-E were deemed to be in compliance.

17. Evidence/ Documentation: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraphs 418-419

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: Evidence and documentation requirements in sub-sections A- B were deemed to be in compliance.

18. Exonerated and Unfounded dispositions: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraph 400

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The sample size of exonerated and unfounded charge dispositions was 20 out of the total sample of 40 cases. The Exonerated and Unfounded disposition requirements in sub-sections A-B are all rated compliant.

19. NFIM: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraph 400

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The sample size of NFIM charge dispositions was 4 out of the total sample of 40 cases. The NFIM requirements in sub-sections A-B i-iv are deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section B -i is not applicable since there were no complaints disputing traffic citations.
- Sub-section B-iii is not applicable since there were no complaints regarding off-duty officer conduct of a civil nature.

20. Sustained Cases and Discipline: (sub-sections a-c) CD paragraph 403

Compliance Status: 43%, **Not Compliant**

Summary of results: The sample size of Sustained Cases and Discipline was 9 out of the total sample of 40 cases. The Sustained Cases and Discipline section, sub-section B, is deemed to be compliant.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section A ensures that all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings and notifications to the accused of the discipline were completed within 90 days of the conclusion of an administrative investigation unless extended by 30 days by Superintendent written approval, which received a score of **13%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0136-P
 - 2024-0193-P
 - 2024-0290-P
 - 2024-0307-P
 - 2024-0332-R
 - 2024-0372-P
 - 2024-0472-P
- Sub-Section C determines whether the imposition date is not more than 45 days following the date of notification unless the justification for the delay is documented in writing by the Superintendent, resulting in a score of **67%**. The following case deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0290-P

Recommendations: NOPD should ensure all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings, and notifications to the accused of the appropriate discipline via a disciplinary letter are completed within ninety (90) days of the conclusion of an administrative investigation. The scheduling of hearings should be initiated at the time the Notice of Disposition is being administered to ensure the hearing will be timely as well as the discipline imposed.

21. Findings: (sub-sections a-i) CD paragraphs 414-415

Compliance Status: 98%, Compliant

Summary of results: Findings in sub-sections A- F, and H-I are deemed to be in compliance.

- Sub-section G determines whether a case was closed as sustained was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of evidence, that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer resulted in a score of 89%. The following case was not deemed compliant:
 - 2024-0322-R

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

Sub-section D is deemed not applicable since there were no cases that a complainant pled guilty or was found guilty of an offense the deciding factor as to whether an NOPD officer committed the alleged misconduct or used to justify discontinuing the investigation.

Recommendations: Ensure all investigators interview all witnesses and officers to base their investigation on all the evidence and assess it based on the standard of preponderance of evidence.

22. PIB Deputy Chief: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraph 416

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The PIB Deputy Chief requirements in sub-sections A-B were upheld for all complaints in the sample.

23. Follow-up: (sub-sections a-k) CD paragraphs 417, 420-423

Compliance Status: 97%, Compliant

Summary of results: Follow-up requirements in sub-sections A-B, D-I are deemed to be in compliance.

The following sections were below a 95% score:

- Sub-section C regarding whether PIB received documentation from the appropriate person that recommended changes were implemented received a score of **50%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0238-P
 - 2024-0353-P
- Sub-section E regarding whether the complainant was notified of the outcome of the investigation in writing within 10 business days of the completion of the investigation scored **100%**. The following cases were deemed unknown:
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0334-P

The following sections were deemed not applicable:

- Sub-section I is not applicable since there were no decisions to deviate from the level of discipline set out in the disciplinary matrix documented.

Recommendation: A meeting with PIB and PSAB as well as the Academy to streamline the process of the reviews and the classification of valid recommendations concerning policy, tactics, training, counseling, or non-disciplinary corrective measures is recommended. Additionally, implementing a process to ensure the recommendations are implemented and that PIB is provided with proper documentation that the recommended changes are implemented.

(sub-sections j-k) CD paragraphs 424-425

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The Follow-up section of the administrative audit, sub-sections, J-K are in compliance.

Proof of compliance for all sub-sections can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025 \23. Follow-up \J-K.*

24. Annual Report: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraph 426

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The Annual Report section of the administrative audit, sub-sections A-B, were compliant. The 2024 Public Integrity Bureau Annual Report has not yet been published, but the draft report of 2023 PIB Annual Report was assessed for compliance regarding the following format requirements.

Proof of compliance for all sub-sections can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025 \24. Annual Report\A-B.*

25. United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group: (sub-sections a-b) CD paragraphs 430-431

Compliance Status: 0/0, NA

Summary of results: There were no referred specific allegations of misconduct that have been shared in the quarterly United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group meetings.

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections A-B are not applicable since there were no referred specific allegations of misconduct that have been shared in the quarterly criminal justice coordination group meetings. Additionally, no updates have been shared back regarding misconduct allegations since none were introduced.

Proof of compliance for all sub-sections can be found in *G:\PIB\PSAB\PIB Audit 2025 \25. United States Attorney Criminal Justice Coordination Group \A-B.*

26. Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations: (sub-sections a-g) CD paragraph 454

Compliance Status: 100%, Compliant

Summary of results: The sample size of serious use of force or serious misconduct investigations was 5 out of the total sample of 40 cases. Three criminal cases: 2024-0276-P, 2024-0361-P, and 2024-0492-P, one level 4 use of force: 2024-0372-P, and one retaliation: 2024-0193-P.

The following section was deemed not applicable:

- Sub-sections B-E, and G were deemed not applicable since no investigation was deemed to be incomplete or for which the findings were not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. Further, the monitors did not recommend any additional investigations. Lastly, the monitors' coordination with the IPM was not applicable in conducting these uses of force and misconduct investigation reviews.

Overall Recommendations / Corrective Action Measures

The following recommendations were identified:

- Ensure PIB is devoted the resources to ensure PIB acquires the adequate staff needed to consistently conduct timely investigations. In addition, any specific resources or equipment needs necessary should be expedited to ensure that PIB is equipped with all the staff and resources needed to guarantee that both administrative and criminal misconduct investigation are conducted thoroughly and in a timely manner. Lastly, ensuring that PIB has the cooperation from other bureaus to ensure that hearings are conducted timely and efficiently. This requires that all members of NOPD are participating and complying with their requirements to ensure that hearings are conducted timely to ensure that timely discipline is imposed.
- Confirm all officers are aware that they are required to immediately inform his or her supervisor when an individual indicates that he or she would like to make a complaint or request a complaint form. This can easily be facilitated through a monthly Daily Training Bulletin, DTB.
- Educating all officers in Districts and Bureaus that all misconduct complaints received in the field must be documented and submitted to PIB by the end of the officer's shift. PIB should also ensure that all districts and bureaus have the updated 230 form and stress the importance of checking the box that the officer provided the complainant with the CTN# at the time the complaint is received in the field. This information can be highlighted through a Daily Training Bulletin, DTB.
- PIB should closely monitor the ninety-day timeline after the Notice of Disposition is issued to ensure all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings, and notifications to the accused of the appropriate discipline via a disciplinary letter are completed within the allotted timeframe.
- PIB should issue refresher training on complaint intake procedures internally. The training should include the requirement of providing the complainant with the complaint tracking number at the time the complaint is made for complaints made over the phone, walk-ins, and submitted online as well as updating the form to reflect accordingly. In addition, PIB needs to clearly indicate the determination form the date the complaint was assigned to a supervisor, retained by PIB, or referred to an outside agency as well as whether it is to be investigated criminally. Both tasks are to be decided within three business days of receipt of a complaint.
- According to paragraph 404 of the Consent Decree, "The misconduct complaint investigator shall interview each complainant in person, absent extenuating circumstances". Most interviews are conducted over the phone and recorded. PIB should request an amendment to the CD to allow interviews to be held over the phone.
- NOPD should ensure all supervisory reviews, disciplinary hearings, and notifications to the accused of the appropriate discipline via a disciplinary letter are completed within ninety (90) days of the conclusion of an administrative investigation. The scheduling of hearings should be initiated at the time the Notice of Disposition is being administered to ensure the hearing will be timely as well as the discipline imposed.
- Ensure all investigators interview all witnesses and officers to base their investigation on all the evidence and assess it based on the standard of preponderance of evidence.
- A meeting with PIB and PSAB as well as the Academy to streamline the process of the reviews and the classification of valid recommendations concerning policy, tactics, training, counseling, or non-disciplinary corrective measures. Additionally, implementing a process to ensure the

recommendations are implemented and that PIB is provided with proper documentation that the recommended changes are implemented.

Public Integrity Bureau Re-evaluation Requests and PSAB Responses

Section 9 Complaints

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section C regarding whether the numerical identifier was provided to the complainant at the time the complaint was made, scored **38%**. The following 23 cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0010-P
 - 2024-0039-P
 - 2024-0065-P
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0120-P
 - 2024-0139-P
 - 2024-0179-P
 - 2024-0193-P
 - 2024-0472-P
 - 2024-0488-P
 - 2024-0461-P
 - 2024-0483-P
 - 2024-0238-P
 - 2024-0519-R
 - 2024-0342-N
 - 2024-0353-P
 - 2024-0367-N
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0372-P
 - 2024-0396-P
 - 2024-0225-P
 - 2024-0361-P

The following cases were classified in Section 6c, complaints received in the field, as not complaint for not providing the complainant's the numerical identified at the time of the complaint:

- 2024-0039-P
- 2024-0179-P
- 2024-0238-P

Upon review, the following cases were scored as NA for this section since the complaints were scored as complaints received in the field, in Section 6c. This review increased the score of sub-section C to **41%**.

- Sub-section E regarding whether PIB decided within three business days of receipt of a complaint whether the complaint was assigned to an ICO or supervisor, retained by PIB for

investigation or referred to the appropriate outside agency, scored **93%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:

- 2024-0079-P
- 2024-0342-P
- 2024-0353-P

The following case was classified within 3 business days

- 2024-0079-P

Upon review, the transmittal was used to verify the classification date. This review increased the score of sub-section E to **95%**.

- Sub-section F regarding whether PIB decided within three business days of receipt of a complaint whether the complaint would be investigated criminally, scored **93%**. Additionally, since the following cases' determination forms were not filled out appropriately, the following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0342-P
 - 2024-0353-P

The following case was decided within three business days of receipt of a complaint whether the complaint would be investigated criminally.

- 2024-0079-P

Upon review, the transmittal was used to verify whether the complaint was to be investigated criminally. This review increased the score of sub-section F to **95%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 9 Complaints from not compliant, **85%**, to not compliant, **88%**.*

Section 13 Investigation Timelines

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section C regarding whether all administrative investigations have been subject to an appropriate tolling period as necessary to conduct a concurrent criminal investigation or as provided by law concluded to a **0%** rate of compliance. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0276-P
 - 2024-0361-P
 - 2024-0492-P

Upon review, there was evidence of the criminal investigations becoming administrative investigations for the following cases: 2024-0361-P and 2024-0492-P. Further, case 2024-0276-P is pending in St. Tammany regarding its criminal investigation, so it was scored as NA. Therefore, this review increased the score of sub-section C to **100%**.

- Sub-section D regarding cases exceeding the timeline established by state law of 75 days from the date of cognizance totaled **86%**. The following case was deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0139-P

The following case was deemed not applicable.

- 2024-0139-P

Upon review, the case had an approved agreement for civil service extension pending mediation for a sixty-day extension. This review increased the score of sub-section D to **100%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 13 Investigation Timelines from not compliant, **88%**, to complaint, **95%**.*

Section 14 Thoroughness

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section A regarding the officer misconduct investigations being as thorough as necessary to reach a reliable and complete finding score is **74%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0039-P
 - 2024-0136-R
 - 2024-0226-P
 - 2024-0334-P
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0226-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. Additionally, two cases had approved representatives in their interview. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **96%**.

- Sub-section B regarding whether the investigator interviews each complainant in person (absent extenuating circumstances) resulted in **44%** compliance. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0010-P
 - 2024-0039-P

- 2024-0065-P
- 2024-0079-P
- 2024-0120-P
- 2024-0139-P
- 2024-0179-P
- 2024-0225-P
- 2024-0226-P
- 2024-0238-P
- 2024-0307-P
- 2024-0332-R
- 2024-0353-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0226-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. In addition, the investigator went to the complainant's home to conduct the interview for 2024-0120-P, which classifies as an in-person interview. This review increased the score of sub-section B to **48%**.

- Sub-section D regarding all witnesses, including officers witnessing or being involved in an incident, provides a written statement regarding the accident, totaled **85%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0226-P
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0226-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **100%**.

- Sub-section G regarding whether officers, witnesses, and complainants were interviewed separately as necessary to sufficiently investigate the allegation totaled **93%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0039-P
 - 2024-0334-P

The following cases were deemed complaint regarding whether officers, witnesses, and complainants were interviewed separately as necessary to sufficiently investigate the allegation:

- 2024-0039-P
- 2024-0334-P

Upon review, the following cases have approved, supporting representatives in their interviews per their requests. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **100%**.

In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 14 Thoroughness from not compliant, 90%, to complaint, 95%.

Section 15 Criminal Conduct/ Investigation

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section A regarding if the investigator immediately notified the PIB commander of the potential criminal conduct on the part of any officer or employee received scored a **0%**.

The following cases were deemed not compliant:

- 2024-0276-P
- 2024-0334-P
- 2024-0361-P
- 2024-0492-P

The following cases were deemed not applicable.

- 2024-0276-P
- 2024-0334-P
- 2024-0361-P
- 2024-0492-P

Upon review, the cases: 2024-0276-P, 2024-0334-P, and 2024-0361-P were deemed to be criminal investigations and were scored as not applicable since this section applies to administrative cases. Further, case 2024-0334-P was deemed NA since PIB was recused on this case and outsourced to TLG for investigation. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **100%**.

- Sub-section B regarding if the PIB commander immediately notified the Superintendent, the DA, and/or USAO, and the Office of Consent Decree Monitor of the initiation of a criminal investigation scored a **75%**. The following case was deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0276-P

The following case was deemed not applicable.

- 2024-0276-P

Upon review, this case was deemed to be a criminal investigation and is scored as not applicable since this section applies to administrative cases. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **100%**.

- Sub-section C regarding whether a criminal investigation was completed, did the subject officer provide a statement to demonstrative investigations following the conclusion of the criminal investigation score is **0%**. The following cases did not have an administrative investigation and therefore were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0276-P
 - 2024-0361-P
 - 2024-0492-P

Upon review, case 2024-0276-P is still a pending criminal investigation in St. Tammany and was updated to NA. Case 2024-0492-P was updated to NA since the officer was deemed unknown after investigation. Further, case 2024-0334-P was deemed NA since this case was outsourced to Transcendent Law Group (TLG) for investigation and the investigation was limited to administrative review only. Additionally, the criminal allegations were referred to the Department of Justice on August 6, 2024, by TLG. Lastly, case 2024-0361-P was deemed complaint since the officer provided an administrative statement on 3/11/2025. This review increased the score of sub-section C to **100%**.

- Sub-section D regarding whether a criminal and administrative investigation were completed, were both conducted in parallel as appropriate as well as kept separate after a subject officer has provided a compelled statement received scored a **0%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant because no administrative investigations were completed:
 - 2024-0276-P
 - 2024-0334-P
 - 2024-0361-P
 - 2024-0492-P

Upon review, case 2024-0276-P was updated to NA since it is still pending a criminal investigation in St. Tammany. Also, case 2024-0492-P was updated to NA since the officer was deemed unknown after criminal investigation. Further, case 2024-0334-P was deemed NA since this case was outsourced to TLG for investigation and the investigation was limited to administrative review only. The criminal allegations were referred to the Department of Justice on August 6, 2024, by TLG. Lastly, case 2024-0361-P was deemed complaint since both investigations were completed in parallel after subject officer provided his compelled statement on 3/11/2025. This review increased the score of sub-section D to **100%**.

- Sub-section E regarding whether there is evidence of an officer refusing to provide a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity received a score of **67%**. The following case was deemed not compliant because no evidence of providing a public safety statement was found:
 - 2024-0372-P

The following case was deemed compliant, which states the officer provides a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity:

- 2024-0372-P

Upon review, PSAB confirmed that the officer provided a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity. This review increased the score of sub-section E to **100%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 15 Criminal Conduct/ Investigation from not compliant, **28%**, to compliant, **100%**.*

Section 16 Evidence/ Credibility Determination

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section A regarding whether all relevant evidence was considered including circumstantial, direct, and physical evidence scored **85%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0332-R
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases in total were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **96%**.

- Sub-section B regarding whether the credibility determination made was based upon that evidence scored **85%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0332-R
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases total were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section B to **96%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 16 Evidence/ Credibility Determinations from not compliant, **91%**, to complaint, **97%**.*

Section 21 Findings

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section A regarding whether the resolution was based upon a preponderance of the evidence scored **85%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0007-P
 - 2024-0332-R
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0007-P
- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases total were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **96%**.

- Sub-section F regarding if the case was closed as “unfounded” was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by the preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer scored **82%**. The following case was not deemed compliant:
 - 2024-0388-P
 - 2024-0402-P

The following cases were cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0388-P
- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PSAB deemed four cases total were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section F to **100%**.

- Sub-section G regarding if the case was closed as “sustained” was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by the preponderance of evidence, that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer scored **89%**. The following case was not deemed complaint:
 - 2024-0332-R

Upon review, PIB did not provide any evidence of compliance that the investigation was determined by the preponderance of evidence that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. Therefore, the score did not change.

- Sub-section I regarding if cases were closed as exonerated was it due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged conduct did occur but did not violate NOPD policies, procedures, or training scored **86%**. The following case was deemed not compliant:
 - 2023-0007-P

The following case was cleared by BWC:

- 2024-0402-P

Upon review, PIB deemed four cases total were cleared by BWC, therefore no full investigations were conducted. This review increased the score of sub-section I to **100%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 21 Findings from not compliant, **91%**, to complaint, **98%**.*

Section 22 PIB Deputy Chief

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section A regarding whether the PIB Deputy Chief (or proxy holding the rank of Deputy Chief) accepted the investigators recommended disposition unless the disposition was unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence or additional investigation was necessary to reach a reliable finding within the timelines received a score of **93%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0193-P
 - 2024-0332-R

Upon review, PSAB re-scored the cases as complaint since the investigations were supported by preponderance of evidence. This review increased the score of sub-section A to **100%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 22 PIB Deputy Chief from not compliant, **93%**, to complaint, **100%**.*

Section 23 Follow-Up

The following were reassessed:

- Sub-section C regarding whether PIB received documentation from the appropriate person that recommended changes were implemented received a score of **0%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant.
 - 2024-0238-P
 - 2024-0334-P
 - 2024-0353-P
 - 2024-0372-P

The following cases provided evidence that the recommended changes were implemented.

- 2024-0334-P
- 2024-0372-P

Upon review, PIB provided evidence that the recommended changes were implemented. This review increased the score of sub-section C to **50%**.

- Sub-section E regarding whether the complainant was notified of the outcome of the investigation in writing within 10 business days of the completion of the investigation scored **88%**. The following cases were deemed not compliant:
 - 2024-0079-P
 - 2024-0193-P
 - 2024-0334-P

The following case was deemed compliant regarding whether the complainant was notified of the outcome of the investigation in writing within 10 business days of the completion of the investigation:

- 2024-0193-P

Upon review, the following cases had a close out letter in the files but had no indication of when it was sent. Therefore, these two cases were deemed unknown:

- 2024-0079-P
- 2024-334-P

This review increased the score of sub-section E to **100%**.

*In summary, the review increased the overall score for Section 23 Follow-up from not compliant, **91%**, to compliant, **97%**.*

A1. PIB Compliance Guidance Table

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
375	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All acts of misconduct reported to a supervisor ▪ All acts of misconduct reported to PIB ▪ Dates the supervisor immediately documented and reported this information to PIB ▪ Any failures to report or document an act of misconduct or criminal behavior led to discipline up to and including termination of employment.
376	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The infraction and supervisor’s response were reported to PIB in five business days ▪ PIB reviewed the report and supervisory response to determine if additional investigation was required ▪ PIB evaluated any disciplinary or non-disciplinary corrective action initiated by a supervisor to determine if the supervisory response was fair and consistent with NOPD disciplinary protocols <p>Procedure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the policy that requires supervisors to take appropriate disciplinary or non-disciplinary corrective action when the supervisor becomes aware of an infraction committed by an officer that is not reported from outside the Department and does not require an immediate PIB notification (e.g., improper use of sick leave, improper attire). 2. Review random cases of all DI1's and SFL entries for counseling and redirection to ensure PIB was notified within 5 days. 3. Review documentation that PIB reviewed the cases reported and that supervisory responses to determine whether additional investigation was required and to evaluate the imposed discipline or corrective action to determine whether the supervisory response was fair and consistent with NOPD disciplinary protocols.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
377	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Policies:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The current retaliation policy at PIB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 52.1.1 Misconduct Complaints and Investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6 ▪ 26.3 Workplace Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, and Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of retaliation • Section 2 • Section 9 ▪ <u>Cases:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A list of all retaliation complaints (Previously audited 2021 and 2022) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cases from PIB ▪ Check with Independent Police Monitor for other retaliation complaints ▪ Any additional cases subject in news reports that was not disclosed by PIB ○ A list of all discipline imposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disciplinary matrix for sustained findings of retaliation ▪ Including the discipline resulting from sustained retaliation investigations ▪ <u>Review:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentation of annual reviews completed considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the alleged incidents of retaliation that were investigated during the reporting period, ○ the discipline imposed for retaliation, ○ the supervisors' performance in addressing and preventing retaliation, and ○ any modifications of policy to protect individuals from retaliation for reporting misconduct <p>, which possibly led to policy recommendations or modifications or training requests.</p>
378	%	Confirm if the PIB commander is a civilian.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
379	%	<p>Evidence of Compliance should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of timely misconduct investigations including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The investigations are completed within timelines ● The investigations are thorough ● The Quality Assurance Unit is sufficiently staffed ● Sustained cases have timely disciplinary hearings ● Discipline is imposed within 30 days (60 days if documentation exists) ○ Compare compliance scores on the following paragraphs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 403, Investigations and discipline within timelines ● 404, Thorough investigations ● 413, Credibility ● 420, Complainant notified- end of investigation ● 423, Disciplinary decisions documented <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Review the list of complaints for the two prior years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Were the complaints completed within timelines? ii. Compare thoroughness of investigations with audit findings for paragraph 404 for the past two years. B. Determine the number of personnel assigned to the QAU to determine thoroughness of investigations. (High levels of non-compliance with thoroughness or timeliness of investigations indicate insufficient QAU personnel.)

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
380	%	<p>PIB evidence of compliance should consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List of all PIB investigators, and their supervisors, with the dates they were assigned to PIB 2. Documentation of all PIB investigators assigned during 2022 to determine: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The investigator had good investigative skills <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Supervisor recommendation, performance evaluation, etc. b) PIB short or long form indicating the investigator was not disciplined for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Excessive use of force ii. False arrest iii. Unlawful search/seizure iv. Sexual harassment v. Discrimination vi. dishonesty <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the list of all PIB investigators and their supervisors assigned to PIB and the dates they were assigned. ▪ Review all documentation related to the KSAs for those investigators assigned to determine if the supervisors had good investigative skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supervisor recommendation ○ Writing samples ○ Performance evaluations ○ interview ○ Lack of PIB sustained complaint history of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excessive use of force ● False arrest ● Unlawful search/seizure ● Sexual harassment ● Discrimination ● dishonesty

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
381	%	<p>Evidence of Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The names of lieutenants assigned to PIB since 2013 or as far back as PIB has maintained a list to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ date the lieutenant was assigned ○ date the lieutenant was transferred from PIB ▪ The names of currently assigned lieutenants along with the date of their assignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determine how long lieutenants currently assigned to PIB have been in place <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review a list of names of lieutenants assigned since 2013 or as far back as PIB has maintained a list. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determine how long lieutenants have been assigned to PIB ▪ Determine how long lieutenants currently assigned to PIB have been in place

382	%	<p>Evidence of Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A list of all investigators assigned to PIB ▪ Access to their training files through Insight, PIB training records, or another system to demonstrate investigators received: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 40 hours of initial training in conducting officer misconduct investigations 2. eight hours of 2022 training 3. investigative skills, including proper interrogation and interview techniques; gathering and objectively analyzing evidence; surveillance; and data and case management 4. identifying alleged misconduct that is not clearly stated in the complaint or that becomes apparent during the investigation 5. credibility 6. the preponderance of the evidence standard 7. state, local, and federal law, including state employment law related to officers and the rights of public employees, including but not limited to La. Rev. Stat. 40:2531, "Rights of Law Enforcement Officers While Under Investigation," and local Civil Service Commission requirements, as well as criminal discovery rules such as those set out in Garrity v. New Jersey, 385 U.S. 493 (1967), and Brady v. Maryland, 373 U. S. 83 (1963) 8. NOPD rules and policies 9. protocols related to criminal and administrative investigations of alleged officer misconduct <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review a list of all personnel assigned to PIB as investigators or supervisors ▪ Choose a percentage of personnel assigned ▪ Review the training records for those personnel to ensure it contained the following training <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 40 hours of initial training in conducting officer misconduct investigations b. eight hours of 2021 training c. investigative skills, including proper interrogation and interview techniques; gathering and objectively analyzing evidence; surveillance; and data and case management d. identifying alleged misconduct that is not clearly stated in the complaint or that becomes apparent during the investigation e. credibility f. the preponderance of the evidence standard g. state, local, and federal law, including state employment law related to officers and the rights of public employees, including but not limited to La. Rev. Stat. 40:2531, "Rights of Law Enforcement Officers While Under Investigation," and local Civil Service Commission requirements, as well as criminal
-----	---	--

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
		<p>discovery rules such as those set out in <i>Garrity v. New Jersey</i>, 385 U.S. 493 (1967), and <i>Brady v. Maryland</i>, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. NOPD rules and policies i. protocols related to criminal and administrative investigations of alleged officer misconduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A description of evidence of non-compliance should include similar statements as listed in finding narrative, see Review of PIB Administrative Investigations- March 2023 McNeilly Detailed Report
383	%	<p>Evidence of Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A list of random integrity checks (sting audits) including the number of investigations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Unlawful stops</u> 2. <u>Searches</u> 3. <u>Seizures (including false arrests)</u> 4. <u>Discriminatory policing</u> 5. <u>Use of excessive force</u> 6. <u>Secondary employment abuse</u> 7. <u>Failure to take a complaint</u> 8. <u>Failure to report misconduct or complaints</u> 9. <u>Other patterns of misconduct or potentially criminal behavior</u> <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Obtain the list of integrity checks conducted by the unit completing integrity checks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ # conducted per district ○ # conducted per month ▪ Determine how many are in the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlawful stops ○ Searches ○ Seizures (including false arrests) ○ Discriminatory policing ○ Use of excessive force ○ Secondary employment abuse ○ Failure to take a complaint ○ Failure to report misconduct or complaints ○ Other patterns of misconduct or potentially criminal behavior
384	%	<p>Provide evidence that the City and NOPD develops the program implemented that ensures the New Orleans community knows how to make misconduct complaints and that there are effective mechanisms for making misconduct complaints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revisions to current policy, Chapter 52.1.1, Misconduct Complaint Intake and Investigation

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
385	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of locations containing complaint forms and informational materials related to filing complaints to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NOPD headquarters, ○ All eight district stations, ○ City Hall, ○ Courthouse, and ○ Orleans Public Defenders. ▪ NOPD and City websites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demonstrate the ability to file a complaint through each Website ▪ See Narrative in Review of PIB Administrative Investigations- March 2023 McNeilly Detailed Report
386	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 52.1.1 Misconduct Complaints and Investigations, section 10, 20, 21, and 25 ▪ List of all complaints that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ an officer failed to notify a supervisor of a person desiring to file a complaint ○ a supervisor failing to assist a complainant desiring to file a complaint ▪ Evidence (i.e., photo) of placard (in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese) at each police facility to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NOPD Headquarters ○ All eight police districts ▪ See Narrative in Review of PIB Administrative Investigations- March 2023 McNeilly Detailed Report
387	%	<p>Confirm placards and forms are printed in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese at each police facility to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NOPD headquarters ▪ All eight police districts
388	%	<p>NOPD agrees to revise policy and train all officers and supervisors to ensure proper complaint intake processes. These include assessing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Department policy informing personnel how to provide complaint materials, which include consequences for failure to take complaints ▪ Training documents and/or instruction provided to newly assigned investigators and their supervisors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review 52.1.1 Misconduct Complaints and Investigations, section 9, 15, and 20

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
389	%	<p>All complaints (PIB/ IPM) reviewed were accepted for investigation. Ensure none of the following were found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ refusal to accept a misconduct complaint, ▪ discouraging the filing of a misconduct complaint, or ▪ providing false or misleading information about filing a misconduct complaint <p>If so, shall be grounds for discipline up to and including termination. Ensure if evidence of the above, the following are implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PIB investigation conducted ▪ IF PIB investigation concludes a sustained charge, specify discipline imposed <p>Audit Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A random sample of intake recordings should be reviewed to determine if intake personnel provided false or misleading information about filing a misconduct complaint

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
390	%	<p>All misconduct complaints (PIB/ IPM) were accepted. Including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Anonymous and third-party complaints ▪ Complaints in writing or verbally, ▪ in person or by mail, ▪ telephone (or TDD), ▪ facsimile, ▪ electronic mail, or ▪ LEP complaints <p>Procedure:</p> <p>NOPD agrees to accept all misconduct complaints, including anonymous and third-party complaints, for review and investigation. Complaints may be made in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone (or TDD), facsimile, or electronic mail. Any LEP individual who wishes to file a complaint about an NOPD officer or employee shall be provided with a complaint form in English, Spanish, or Vietnamese, as appropriate, and the appropriate translation services required to file a complaint, and such complaints will be investigated in accordance with this Agreement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check PIB complaints to determine if all misconduct complaints were accepted, including anonymous and third-party complaints including complaints made in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone (or TDD), facsimile, or electronic mail. 2. Check PIB complaints to ensure all LEP individual filing a complaint was provided with a complaint form in English, Spanish, or Vietnamese, as appropriate, and the appropriate translation services required to file a complaint. 3. Check with the Office of the Independent Police Monitor to verify their records indicated if all misconduct complaints were accepted, including anonymous and third-party complaints including complaints made in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone (or TDD), facsimile, or electronic mail. 4. Check with the Office of the Independent Police Monitor to verify their records indicated all LEP individual filing a complaint was provided with a complaint form in English, Spanish, or Vietnamese, as appropriate, and the appropriate translation services required to file a complaint.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
391	%	<p>All citizen complaints filed in the field and outside of PIB are required to be reported to PIB by the end of the shift. The following should be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All duty locations should provide evidence they accepted all misconduct complaints received in the filed on all officers and employees, and ▪ Dates of when misconduct complaints are documented and submitted to PIB <p>Procedure:</p> <p>PIB evidence of compliance should consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All duty locations should provide evidence they accepted all misconduct complaints and forwarded the complaint to PIB by the end of the shift it was received. 2. PIB should provide a list of all misconduct complaint cases initially reported outside of PIB. 3. A random sample of those cases should be reviewed to determine if they sent to PIB before the end of the shift it was received.
392	%	<p>Complaints received from the City Attorney’s Office, the DA, a judge, or a magistrate were investigated.</p> <p>The following should be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All civil suits forwarded from the City Attorney’s Office alleging misconduct by an NOPD officer to PIB ▪ A list of all allegations of officer misconduct that were identified and investigated as misconduct complaints received from the City Attorney’s Office, the DA, a judge, or a magistrate
393	%	<p>Cases are tracked separately for allegations of officers’ violation of a citizen’s first amendment rights. The following should be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A list of all complaints related to allegations an officer interfered with a civilian’s First Amendment rights to observe, record, and/or verbally comment on the performance of police duties ▪ Access to all files alleging an officer’s first amendment violations <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The list of all complaints related to allegations an officer interfered with a civilian’s First Amendment rights to observe, record, and/or verbally comment on the performance of police duties ▪ Choose random files alleging an officer’s first amendment violations to determine if this was a first amendment complaint, the thoroughness of the investigation, and the findings were reasonable.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
394	%	<p>Cases are tracked separately for allegations of discriminatory policing. The following should be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the list of all complaints related to allegations of discriminatory policing ▪ Choose random files alleging an officer’s discriminatory policing to determine this was a bias complaint, the thoroughness of the investigation, and the findings were reasonable. <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the list of all complaints related to allegations of discriminatory policing ▪ Choose random files alleging an officer’s discriminatory policing to determine this was a bias complaint, the thoroughness of the investigation, and the findings were reasonable.
395	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentation that the tracking system and explain the unique numerical identifier for each complaint. ▪ Also demonstrate how the supervisors in the field obtain the unique numerical identifier for a complaint and can present it to the complainant.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
396	%	<p>IAPro must satisfy all CD requirements as listed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Each complaint receives a number 2. Nature <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Classifications <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Administrative <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public 2. Rank 3. NFIM ii. Criminal 3. Status of all misconduct complaints (intake to final disposition) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Initial (Filed but not assigned) b. Active (open cases being investigated) c. Forwarded (returned from district or completed at PIB pending supervisory approval) d. Pending (although the investigation is closed, the disciplinary actions have not been completed) e. Completed (case is closed) 4. Investigation timeliness <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. IAPro ensures Investigations are timely by running a case update report weekly of cases due at PIB within twenty days. That report is disseminated to all Bureau liaisons and all PIB lieutenants. 5. Notification of the complainant of interim and final status <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The 45-day letter (interim letter sent to complainant 45 days into the investigation), which could be via US Mail or e-mail, and the final letter, which could be via US Mail or e-mail, is entered into IAPro. <p>PIB evidence of compliance should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A <u>review</u> of the list of complaints from the prior year and the current year to date complaints that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ status of all misconduct complaints to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. date of initial intake 2. investigation timelines 3. notification of complainant of the interim status 4. final disposition 5. Notification of the complainant of the final disposition of the investigation

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
397	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: Supervisors are required to gather all relevant information and evidence for any misconduct complaint received in the field. This includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Names and contact information of all complainants and witnesses, ▪ The names of all NOPD officers and employees involved in or witnessing the alleged misconduct, and ▪ Any available physical evidence, such as voluntarily provided video or audio recordings or documentation of the existence of such recordings where the witness chooses not to provide the recording ▪ Supervisors shall take photographs of apparent injuries, or the absence thereof, unless the complainant/ subject objects or declines <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor should be directed to have PIB provide the number of complaints received from the field and the auditor should then obtain a random sample of copies of the documents received from supervisors in the field to determine if each of the items listed in the next sections you have listed as 6e are all contained in the document. ▪ A compliance percentage should be provided for compliance with each of those subsections and an overall compliance percentage should be calculated for compliance with the paragraph.
398	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: PIB is required to decide assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assigned to an ICO or supervisor, ▪ Retained by PIB for investigation or ▪ Referred to the appropriate outside agency <p>within 3 business days and to determine whether the case is investigated criminally.</p> <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See tracking documents that capture the date the complaint was received and the date PIB determined whether the complaint would be investigated as an administrative complaint or as a criminal complaint. That date can be retrieved from the document to demonstrate compliance.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
399 v	%	<p>A random review of cases needs to be inspected to determine if the investigations are compliant with the allegations provided in the paragraph (and listed below).</p> <p>Review policy/protocol to ensure PIB or an authorized outside agency investigates allegations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) serious misconduct, including but not limited to criminal misconduct; unreasonable use of force; discriminatory policing; false arrest or planting evidence; untruthfulness/false statements; unlawful search; retaliation; sexual misconduct; domestic violence; and theft. b) misconduct implicating the conduct of the supervisory or command leadership of the subject officer; and c) subject to the approval by the Deputy Superintendent of PIB, allegations that any commander requests be conducted by PIB rather than the subject officer’s District/Division. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review the Misconduct Complaint Intake and Investigation Policy (Chapter 52.1.1) and the NOPD Public Integrity Bureau SOP ○ <u>Enhancements to specific policies within chapter 52.1 to ensure proper complaint intake based on citizen allegations and drafting new SOPs to allow investigators to conduct both (criminal/administrative) investigations concurrently</u> ○ <u>New policy draft requires Superintendent or her designee to authorize delay in the administrative investigation</u> ○ <u>Department should default to concurrent investigations unless specific circumstances exist which allow an exemption</u>

400	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Externally generated complaints that contain no allegations of misconduct, the complaint received a disposition of “exonerated” or “unfounded” and indicated if complaint was regarding service or contained no allegations of misconduct ▪ None of the following dispositions have been used for misconduct allegations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “No Violation Observed” ○ “NIMS” or ○ Similar dispositions ▪ “No Formal Investigation Merited” disposition is used to classify the following types of complaints: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Complaints disputing traffic citations, except allegations of misconduct contained in complaint such as racial profiling, illegal search, excessive force b) Complaints alleging a delay in police service where the preliminary investigation demonstrates delay is due to workload, except alleged misconduct such as negligence c) Complaints regarding off-duty officer conduct of a civil nature, unless alleged conduct or its effects constitute misconduct or have a substantial nexus to the officer’s employment, and d) Complaints in which the preliminary investigation demonstrates that the subject officer does not work for NOPD or where the subject officer cannot be determined, despite the best efforts of PIB <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have PIB provide a list of the various findings from all closed cases. They should only include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sustained ○ not sustained ○ exonerated ○ unfounded ▪ Other than these, cases should never be closed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No violation observed ○ NIMS ○ Other similar finding ▪ A case can be listed as NFIM. The auditor should determine how many cases are listed as NFIM and review a random sample of NFIM cases to ensure they are only closed due to: (10% NFIM/ 10% Rank) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A person’s complaint is due to having received a traffic complaint. ○ a complaint due to the time it took to respond to a call (not due to negligence) ○ a compliant regarding an off-duty officer (not having a nexus to the officer's employment)
-----	---	--

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the officer doesn't work for the NOPD, or an officer can't be identified ▪ The auditor should be directed to review the random sample of cases to ensure they are closed as NFIM if they adhere to these exceptions.
401	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: Misconduct Complaint Investigations must not be conducted by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any officer who used force during the incident, ▪ Whose conduct led to the injury of the person, ▪ Who authorized the conduct that led to the reported incident or complaint, or ▪ Who witnessed or was involved in the incident leading to the allegation of misconduct
402	%	<p>Review documentation of good faith efforts to have state law amended to permit a reasonable timeframe for the completion of administrative investigations of officer misconduct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New policy of the NOPD instituted with the assistance of PSAB regarding time limitation for a completed investigation against an accused law enforcement officer was amended from sixty to seventy-five days (40:2531 B (7)).

403 V	%	<p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <p>1) Investigation must be completed within timelines : The consent decree requires an investigation be completed within 90 days (or 120 days if Civil Service grants an exemption) of receipt of the complaint. <u>(A change in state law now requires investigations to be completed within 135 days but not implemented until policy is updated).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A list of complaints that include status of all misconduct complaints as well as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ date of initial intake ○ investigation timelines ○ notification of complainant of the interim status ○ final disposition ○ notification of the complainant of the final disposition of the investigation ▪ 109-An administrative investigation shall be completed within the time limitation mandated by LA RS 40:2531, which requires every investigation to be initiated within 14 days of the Cognizance Date. The date when a PIB investigation is initiated is known as the Classification Date. All due dates are calculated upon the Classification Date. ▪ 110. Every investigation must be completed within 60 days of the Classification Date unless an extension of 60 days is granted by Civil Service. The Civil Service extension extends the final due date to 120 days from the classification date. Within that time frame, the investigator’s written investigation (accompanied by exhibits), the various levels of supervisory review which may necessitate corrections/additions/clarifications, the final approvals at every level, and the verbal and/or written “Notice to Accused Law Enforcement Officer Under Investigation of a Pre-Disciplinary Hearing or a Determination of an Unfounded or Not Sustained Complaint” (NOPD Form 308) must be completed. ▪ 126-Investigations shall be completed within 60 days (La. R.S. 40:2531(B)(7)) of classification. Classification must occur within fourteen days of the cognizance date. The assigned investigator may request an extension from the New Orleans Civil Service Commission for an additional 60 days if the investigation reasonably requires such an extension ▪ 127-The investigation is considered complete upon written notice to the employee under investigation of a pre-disciplinary hearing or a determination of an unfounded or not sustained complaint (R.S. 40:2531(B) (7)). The member conducting the investigation should ensure his/her report is completed by the assigned due date so notification can be made in a timely manner <p>2) The discipline must be imposed within timelines : Imposition of discipline is required within 30 days (or 60 days where extenuating circumstances are shown) from the conclusion of the investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Monitor and DOJ point to the language of Paragraph 403 of the Consent Decree that provides the 30-day discipline timeline begins on the day an investigation is closed pursuant to the</u>
-------	---	--

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
		<p><u>LEOBOR and ends on the day the Superintendent imposes discipline on the accused officer.</u> <i>(A policy modification is being drafted to include timing regarding imposition of disposition)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PIB has consistently advised OCDM, since 2015, the conclusion of the investigation is the date when the Deputy Chief and the Superintendent’s signature appear on the final report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pending policy modification to NOPD Policy 52.1.1 at §136 regarding Superintendent signature concluding investigation. ▪ A list of the prior two-year sustained cases to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The date the complaint was filed ○ The date the investigation was completed ○ The date of the disciplinary hearing ○ The date discipline was imposed ○ For sustained cases where discipline was not imposed within 30 days, a copy of the documentation of the extenuating circumstances preventing imposition of discipline within 30 days <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The date of imposition of discipline beyond 30 days of the sustained finding
404	%	<p>Misconduct investigations must be thorough as necessary to reach reliable and complete findings and shall complete the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The investigator must interview each complainant in person, absent extenuating circumstances, and ▪ This interview must be recorded in its entirety absent specific, documented objection by the complainant. <p>Procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This can be determined during an audit of cases during the audit period. After reviewing the entire case file, the auditor needs to determine if everything that could have been done was done to reach a finding. If anything is missing, the case can't be listed as thorough. ▪ This paragraph also requires the investigator to interview each complainant in person, and the interview to be recorded in its entirety. ▪ Each one of these requirements needs to be met to determine compliance with this paragraph. ▪ It should be noted that if 1) all complainants were interviewed, and 2) all interviews were recorded, but there was no credibility determinations made, the entire case is not considered compliant. Every part of the paragraph requires compliance.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
405	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For all alleged misconducts that are particularly serious, or interviews of the subject officer(s) or other witnesses may be necessary to sufficiently investigate the allegation, has investigator conducted an in-person interview. ▪ Interview was recorded in entirety, unless non-officer witness objected, and the objection was documented. ▪ The cases selected should be reviewed to determine whether all witnesses and witnessing officers provided written statements or were interviewed. If not all, the case would not be compliant with this paragraph.
406	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor needs to determine where the alleged misconduct is particularly serious or interviews of the subject officer(s) or other witnesses may be necessary to sufficiently investigate the allegation, the investigator shall conduct an in-person interview. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The interview must be recorded in its entirety. ○ Absence of a recorded interview demonstrates non-compliance.
407	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each officer, witness, and complainant were interviewed separately ▪ When taking statements or conducting interviews of any Vietnamese or Spanish speaking LEP complainant or witness was a NOPDAI not involved in the underlying complaint.
408	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The investigator sought to identify all persons at the scene giving rise to a misconduct allegation, including all NOPD officers ▪ The investigator noted in the investigation report the identities of all officers and other witnesses who were on the scene but asserted they did not witness and were not involved in the accident ▪ The investigator conducted further investigations of any such assertions that appear unsupported by the evidence.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
409 V	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>Investigation interview recordings shall be stored and maintained in a secure location within PIB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor should ensure all the recordings were contained in the case file, or elsewhere in a secure location, within PIB.
410	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each case reviewed should contain the statements of involved officers. ▪ Any missing officer statements should have documentation of why there is no statement, and ▪ The documentation should include the name of the supervisor who notified, or attempted to notify, the officer.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
411 V	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>The auditor needs to review the case to decide whether the investigator deemed this case should be investigated as a criminal offense. If the investigator did not, there is no need to review the case any further.</p> <p>If the investigator did determine the case should be investigated as a criminal offense. There should be evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The investigator immediately notified the PIB Commander if the investigator determined there was criminal conduct on the part of any officer or employee ▪ The PIB Commander immediately notified the Superintendent, the DA, and/or USAO, and the Monitor of the initiation of a criminal investigation. ▪ If the criminal investigation was completed, the subject officer provided a statement to administrative investigators following the conclusion of the criminal investigation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The subject officer was not compelled to provide a statement to administrative investigators where there was a potential criminal investigation or prosecution of the officer until the remainder of the investigation was completed, unless after consultation with prosecuting agency (e.g., DA or USAO) and the PIB commander, such compulsion was deemed appropriate by the Superintendent. ▪ Protocols that ensure NOPD and the City agree to consult with the DA to ensure that the criminal and administrative investigations can be conducted in parallel as appropriate and are kept separate after a subject officer has provided a compelled statement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The auditor should also check to review the protocol to ensure that the criminal and administrative investigations can be conducted in parallel as appropriate and are kept separate after a subject officer has provided a compelled statement.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
412	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor needs to review the case to determine whether officers provided a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity. ▪ If the auditor were to find an instance of a refusal to provide a public safety statement, the auditor should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ check department policy to ensure it complies with this paragraph, ○ check department training to ensure officers have been trained, and ○ determine if disciplinary action was initiated ▪ Refer to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy directing officers to provide a public safety statement regarding a work-related incident or activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Public Safety Statement • Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force, section 5 & 7 ○ Policy directing officers that their statements are part of an officer’s routine professional duty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force, section 7

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
413 v	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: Double-blind random check of administrative cases closed from previous 3 months (skipping a month from the audit month)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It requires the auditor to review the entire case and to make a determination whether the case includes all relevant evidence. As the consent decree paragraph explains, evidence can come in the form of circumstantial, direct, and physical evidence. ▪ There are five parts of this paragraph requiring compliance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All relevant evidence must be considered including circumstantial, direct, and physical evidence. 2. Credibility determinations must be based upon the evidence. 3. Officer’s statements are not to be provided automatic preference 4. An investigator should not disregard a witness’ statement merely because the witness has some connection to the complainant or because of criminal history. 5. An investigator should make efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements. ▪ Although the investigator should not disregard a witness' statement due to a connection to the complainant or due to a criminal history, the connection may be a factor in influencing the person's perception of the incident. Also, as the investigator should not disregard a statement because of criminal history, any version of the incident, including the complainant and the officer(s) history of truthfulness, may be important in making a credibility determination. ▪ This paragraph is not compliant if any evidence is not considered. A lack of considering evidence can also affect the investigator's credibility determination and subsequently the thoroughness of the investigation. ▪ A case cannot be thorough if it is missing one of many parts of the investigation including, but not limited to, interviews of critical victims or witnesses (if they are available to interview), not considering physical evidence, or not completing reasonable credibility determinations.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
414 v	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>There are several requirements in this paragraph including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The resolution must be based upon the preponderance of the evidence. 2. The case must not be closed only because the complaint was withdrawn or because the alleged victim was unwilling to provide additional information 3. The investigation must continue if the complainant withdrew from the investigation or was unwilling to provide additional information. 4. The fact the complainant pled guilty or was found guilty was not the deciding factor as to whether an officer committed the alleged misconduct. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor will need training to understand the difference between "beyond a reasonable doubt" and "by a preponderance of the evidence". ▪ <u>NOPD Policy 51.1.2 aligns with the Consent Decree by requiring that misconduct investigators “reach a conclusion supported by the preponderance of the evidence and prepare a written recommendation.</u> ▪ <u>NOPD Policy 26.2 likewise aligns with the Consent Decree and defines the preponderance of the evidence standard as follows: “Preponderance of the evidence—Such evidence that when considered and compared with that opposed to it has more convincing force and produces in one’s mind the belief that what is sought to be proven is more likely true than not true.</u> ▪ <u>Preponderance of evidence standard resolved in new version of policy 52.1 in definitions and paragraph 137</u>

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
415 v	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>The proper findings of unfounded, sustained, not sustained, or exonerated were used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An “unfounded” finding was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ▪ A “sustained” finding was due to the investigation determining, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged misconduct did occur. ▪ A case closed as “not sustained” was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, the investigator was unable to determine whether the alleged misconduct occurred. ▪ A case closed as “exonerated” was due to evidence that the investigation determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alleged conduct did occur but did not violate NOPD policies, procedures, or training. ▪ <u>The Consent Decree is clear that PIB shall explicitly identify and recommend a disposition for each allegation of misconduct in an administrative investigation.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>In short, if there has been an allegation of misconduct, there must be an accompanying disposition.</u> ▪ <u>Policy enhancements giving guidance to violations investigated but not included in initial complaint (new draft 52.1 addresses concern)</u>
416	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>The PIB commander accepted and approved the investigator’s recommended disposition unless the disposition was unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence or additional investigation was necessary to reach a reliable finding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Superintendent shall approve the disposition <u>(A policy modification is being drafted to update superintendent approval)</u>

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
417	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>There are three parts of this paragraph that include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the investigator assessed and documented compliance with training and legal standards; Whether the investigator indicated a need for additional training, counseling, or other non-disciplinary measures; and, whether the investigator suggested revising policy, strategies, tactics, or training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One part of the final report lists this section. The auditor should review the final report to ensure this section is included. 2. PIB personnel shared with and documented the appropriate commander’s disagreement or agreement with follow-up measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The auditor should ensure this is included in the final report. 3. PIB received documentation from the appropriate person that recommended changes were implemented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The case file should have documentation that the recommendations made following the investigation were implemented.
418	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District level investigations were provided to PIB within three business days. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The PIB cover sheet listing all the required timelines should include this information. The date the complaint was received in the district should be listed along with the date the complaint was received in PIB. This is a simple paragraph to audit since the dates are contained in the case file.
419 V	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>Investigators reports, and related documentation and evidence are securely maintained in a central and accessible location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor should determine compliance by ensuring all case files requested were located and provided when requested. A look at the location they are contained will assist the auditor in determining if they are secured.

420 V	Part 1 – % Part 2 – % Part 3 – %	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <p>There are three parts of this paragraph.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The complainant should be kept informed periodically regarding the status of the investigation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Access to 2022 administrative investigations to review whether the complainant was kept informed of the statuses of the investigation b) Once the case has been assigned to an investigator, the investigator should send a letter or an e-mail indicating the investigator has been assigned to the case. The correspondence should include the investigator's name and method to contact the investigator if the complainant has questions. c) The case file should contain additional correspondence at intervals of about 1 1/2 months to keep the complainant updated that the investigation is continuing. The department has referred to this correspondence as a 45-day letter. 2. The complainant must be notified of the outcome of the investigation, in writing, within 10 business days of the completion of the investigation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Conclusion of the administrative investigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The case file should include a final letter sent to the complainant at the conclusion of the investigation. (The auditor should be aware that, during OCDM audits, the dates listed at the top of the final letter have never been when the letter was sent.) The investigator generally wrote those letters and dated the letter when the investigator wrote the letter which in many cases was weeks or months before the case was listed as being closed. The prior PIB deputy chief stated the case wasn't closed until the deputy chief's signature appeared on the final report. However, many times the signature was not dated. This prevented an auditor from determining the date the case was closed. b) Date the final letter was sent to complainant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The closing date is important to track timelines and to ensure the final letter to the complainant was sent within 10 days of the case being closed. OCDM auditors determined any notification to the complainant that was documented (date of the e-mail, a postmark with a date, or other U.S. mail documentation) of a letter being sent was acceptable.
-------	--	---

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
		<p>3. The complainant must be notified whether any disciplinary or non-disciplinary action was taken.</p> <p>a) Verify if the complainant was notified whether any disciplinary or non-disciplinary action was taken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final letter is required to have information as to the 1) findings of the case, 2) whether there was disciplinary action taken, and 3) whether there was non-disciplinary action taken (counseling, redirection, training, policy change, etc.)
421	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: (This audit can be completed during regular audit of PIB administrative cases.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discipline for sustained allegations was based on the nature of the allegation and consistent with mitigating and aggravating factors. ▪ Review cases where mitigating and aggravating factors were considered during discipline. ▪ Compliance with this paragraph should be checked two different ways. <p>1. This paragraph should be completed during the regular audit of PIB administrative cases. After a random selection of cases are selected for review of the auditing period, the cases selected should be reviewed to determine compliance with this paragraph.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All the selected cases which result in a sustained charge need to be reviewed to determine if the discipline was based on the nature of the allegation. Failure to implement discipline indicates non-compliance with this paragraph. <p>The auditor should review a list of all the sustained cases for the period being audited to ensure there was discipline implemented. Failure to implement discipline indicates non-compliance with this paragraph.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would be questionable whether a failure to implement discipline was due to a possibility of the identity of the officer without some documentation explaining why discipline wasn't implemented (such as an officer resignation, death, etc.).

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
422	%	<p>Compliance with this paragraph should be checked two different ways.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This paragraph should be completed during the regular audit of PIB administrative cases. After a random selection of cases are selected for review of the auditing period, the cases selected should be reviewed to determine compliance with this paragraph. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All the selected cases which result in a sustained charge need to be reviewed to determine if the discipline was implemented. Failure to implement discipline indicates non-compliance with this paragraph. 2. The auditor should review a list of all the sustained cases for the period being audited to ensure there was discipline implemented. Failure to implement discipline indicates non-compliance with this paragraph. <p>Compliance should consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Copy of disciplinary matrix ▪ A list of all administrative investigations with sustained findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Including the date of all 2022 disciplinary hearings ▪ Documentation from each disciplinary hearing describing the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ presumptive range of discipline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ review samples of randomly chosen disciplinary hearing cases and determined the presumptive range of discipline was adhered to ○ mitigating and aggravating factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ review cases where mitigating and aggravating factors were considered during discipline. ▪ Documented justification for any departure from the presumptive range of discipline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ examples of deviations from the Discipline Matrix with documentation of justification for a departure from the matrix range of discipline ▪ Evidence the City Attorney’s Office provided guidance at the disciplinary stage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation maintained by PIB of the disciplinary cases or ○ Documentation a city attorney attended the disciplinary hearing or ○ Other evidence the City Attorney’s Office provided guidance

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
423	%	<p>Conduct a review of random cases selected for the audit period: Compliance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish a unified system for reviewing sustained findings, and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter 52.1.1, Misconduct Complaint Intake and Investigation ▪ Assessing the appropriate level of discipline pursuant to NOPD’s disciplinary matrix to facilitate consistency in discipline imposition. <p>a) Chapter 26.2.1, Disciplinary Matrix/ Penalty Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All disciplinary decisions must be documented including ▪ The rationale behind any decision to deviate from the level of discipline set out in the disciplinary matrix must be documented. <p>This paragraph has two requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All disciplinary decisions must be documented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The documentation should be included in the administrative investigation case file or provided by PIB personnel during the audit. If it is not available during the audit, compliance was not met for this paragraph. 2. The rationale behind any decision to deviate from the level of discipline set out in the disciplinary matrix must be documented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The rationale for any deviation from the level of discipline must be contained in the documentation. If it is not available during the audit, compliance was not met for this paragraph
424	%	<p>Policy or procedure ensuring City Attorney’s Office guides NOPD through the disciplinary stage to ensure NOPD’s disciplinary decisions are fair and legally defensible as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The auditor will need to view the policy to ensure a policy has been established. ▪ After the auditor reviews the policy, the auditor needs to look further to determine if there is compliance with the policy.
425	%	<p>Sustained cases where the officers appealed the decisions to Civil Service were timely requested and posted its full decisions relating to NOPD discipline online within 90 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This Section only deals with “sustained” cases where the officers appealed the decisions to Civil Service. NOPD member appeals go directly to Civil Service; therefore, appeals are not kept in a database in PIB and there is no information to cross-check whether all decisions are posted. ▪ Auditors can check the PIB list prior to checking the list posted at the Civil Service Commission but it would be the same information they would obtain by viewing the Civil Service Commission posts on their website.

Paragraph	Compliance	Compliance Finding Notes
426	%	<p>PIB Annual Report includes the following required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of each misconduct complaint, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Description of the allegation b) Final approved disposition c) Discipline imposed ▪ Aggregate misconduct complaint data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Number of each type of complaint, and b) Number and rate of sustained cases after final approval ▪ Analysis of data that identifies trends and concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is also a requirement that PIB and IPM coordinate and confer with each other in collecting, analyzing, and reporting this data. ▪ NOPD's response to the identified trends and concerns
430	%	Evidence of any referred allegations of misconduct for investigation or issues shared in the quarterly criminal justice coordination group meetings.
431	%	If evidence of any referred allegations of misconduct or issues, the status of the investigation and status of potential operational changes from criminal justice coordination group feedback.
454	%	<p>Review of Use of Force and Misconduct Investigations compliance includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request all investigations of a use of force that is the subject of a misconduct investigation, and each investigation report of a serious misconduct complaint investigation (i.e., criminal misconduct; unreasonable use of force; discriminatory policing; false arrest or planting evidence; untruthfulness/ false statements; unlawful search; retaliation; sexual misconduct; domestic violence; and theft) ▪ Log of all the investigations of a use of force that is subject of a misconduct investigation that were sent to the monitors before closing the investigation or communicating the recommended disposition to the subject of the investigation or review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If applicable, note the investigations that were not reported timely ▪ The monitors along with coordinating with the IPM to conduct reviews of each serious misconduct complaint investigation. ▪ Further, the monitors recommendation for further investigation of serious misconduct investigations for incomplete, or the findings are not supported by a preponderance of the evidence ▪ The monitor's written instructions for completing any investigation determined to be incomplete or inadequately supported by the evidence. ▪ Superintendent's decision to carry out additional investigation or modification recommended by the Monitor ▪ If Superintendent decides not to carry out additional investigation or recommended modification, request written reasons for this determination ▪ Any further recommendations from Monitors to ensure that any further investigation or modification can be concluded within the timeframes mandated by state law.

