Supervision Audit August 2025 (Final)

(FOB and ISB)

Report # S082025
Submitted by PSAB: 09/26/2025
Initial Responses from Districts: 10/3/2025
Final Report: 10/15/2025

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB).

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Supervision Audit beginning August 18, 2025. The Supervision audit is conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) supervisors are providing the close and effective supervision necessary to direct and guide officers in accordance with the Consent Decree and NOPD policies and procedures. Per the Consent Decree paragraph 306 supervisors shall: respond to the scene of felony arrests; review each arrest report; respond to the scene of uses of force; investigate each use of force (except those investigated by FIT – Force Investigation Team); review the accuracy and completeness of officers' Daily Activity Sheets; respond to each complaint of misconduct ; ensure that officers are working actively to engage the community and increase the public's trust and safety; and provide counseling, redirection, and support to officers.

The audit consists of 7 sections: Paragraph 306 (General Duties & Reports), Technology, Video Review, Scheduling, Detective Selection, Forms and Reports, and Insight. The protocol covers the Consent Decree paragraphs 169 through 170, 306 through 312, and 327 through 331. The source data, February 1, 2025, through July 31, 2025, was reviewed and analyzed using the Supervision Audit Protocol developed by Federal Consent Decree Monitors.

Data was collected from all eight (8) districts and the Special Operations Division (SOD). To analyze the data for compliance, auditor(s) utilized a twenty (20) point Consent Decree Supervision checklist.

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

The overall scores of the 5 sections of the Supervision Audit are as follows:
Overall – 98%
Paragraph 306 (General Duties & Reports) – 99%
Technology – 99%
Scheduling – 99%
Video Review – 89%
Detective Selection – 100%
Reports and Forms Available at FOB Districts – 98%
Insight- General Navigation and Usage – 99%

More detailed results are in the Scorecards and Conclusion sections.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Supervision audit starting on August 18, 2025, to ensure compliance with Consent Decree (CD) and New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) policies for supervision of subordinates.

Purpose

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

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

This list is not all inclusive.

Objectives

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

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

6. Supervisors took corrective action (redirection, counseling, training, discipline) when necessary.
7. Supervisors ensured officers reported non-working recording equipment (ICC – In-Car Camera, BWC - Body Worn Camera, CEW - Conducted Energy Weapon), hand-held recorders, etc.
8. Supervisors ensured required vehicles had operable recording devices.
9. Supervisors ensured there were recordings of required police actions.
10. Supervisors ensured proper testing of all recording devices.
11. Supervisors ensured non-working equipment was reported and repaired.
12. Supervisors ensured officers used recording equipment (CEW, MVR (Mobile Video Recorder), and BWC)
13. Supervisors reviewed recordings.
14. Supervisors possess a handheld recording device.
15. Supervisors use handheld recording devices to record use of force investigations and misconduct investigations.
16. Supervisors ensured the proper level of supervision was provided daily in the districts (one supervisor to 8 officers)
17. Supervisors ensured patrol officers reported to the same supervisor(s)
18. Supervisors ensured detectives regularly reported to the same supervisor (except during training, annual leave, or sick leave)

Background

Supervision audits have been conducted, whole or in part since May of 2016. No Supervision Audits were not conducted in 2020 because of Consent Decree priorities, and the December 2019 cyber-attack disabled the technology infrastructure of the City of New Orleans. In January 2021, a new Supervision Audit Protocol was developed and has been used for all Supervision Audits since then.

Methodology

Auditor(s) qualitatively and quantitatively assess supervision using the forms for each of the 5 sections of the Supervision Audit (see Appendix A). Auditor(s) analyze the following data sources for the period of **February 1, 2025, through Jul 31, 2025**:

1. Officer Daily Activity Sheets (trip sheets)
2. Supervisor's Daily Activity Sheets
3. Daily lineups
4. Felony arrest reports
5. Use of force reports
6. After action reports for specialized units
7. List of misconduct complaints reported to an officer or a supervisor either in the police station or in the field.
8. Counseling/Redirection files or SFL (Supervisor Feedback Log) entries
9. INSIGHT data

10. List of disciplinary actions
11. List of all vehicles assigned to the district/unit.
12. List of vehicles with AVL (Automatic Vehicle Location)
13. Record of testing for AVLs
14. List of vehicles with ICCs
15. Record of testing for ICCs
16. Record of recording equipment failures and repairs
17. BWC recordings
18. CEW recordings
19. ICC recordings
20. Equipment repair records
21. Log of supervisor reviews of recordings, if available
22. Documentation that supervisors used information learned from the reviews of recordings for officer performance evaluations.
23. Evidence officers reported non-working recording equipment – possible sources include:
    a) Log of officers reporting non-working equipment
    b) Activity sheets (trip sheets)
24. Evidence supervisors ensured non-operating equipment was repaired– possible sources include:
    a) Log of supervisors reporting non-working equipment for repairs
    b) List of repairs to recording equipment
    c) Other documented evidence of supervisors ensuring recording equipment was repaired (i.e., email correspondence between EMD (Equipment Maintenance Division)/NOPD tech and DSA's (District System Administrator's)/Fleet Managers and ICC repair logbook)
25. Evidence supervisors have a hand-held recording device.
26. Evidence supervisors use the devices for use of force and misconduct investigations.

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

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

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

Initiating and Conducting the Supervision Audit

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

1. A week prior to the audit, districts/units were notified of the audit to ensure the duty location was prepared for the audit and all documentation was available for review.
2. Auditor(s) conduct an internal review of all the applicable documentation accessible digitally via NOPD's departmental share drive. A site visit is conducted at each district/division to review all documentation not digitally accessible to the auditor(s). Below is a list of dates of the site visits for each district/division:

    Monday August 18, 2025: District 8
    Wednesday August 20, 2025: District 6
    Thursday August 21, 2025: District 1
    Friday August 22, 2025: District 4
    Monday August 25, 2025: District 5
    Tuesday August 26, 2025: District 2
    Wednesday August 27, 2025: District 3
    Thursday August 28, 2025: District 7
    Tuesday September 2, 2025: SOD

3. The auditor used a digital version of the audit form to verify the existence of the required documentation.
4. The auditor inspected the selected documents provided by the district/unit as evidence of compliance.
5. If documentation/data was unavailable at the time of the site visit or review of audit, the district/unit was to provide the necessary material for audit within one business day.
6. **Audit Criteria**
    A. **Review Approved vs. Pending arrest reports –** Review all pending and approved arrest reports online generated through Power BI.
    B. **Daily Activity Reports**
        i. Auditors reviewed one randomly selected month of officer's daily activity reports for a randomly selected platoon for the district/unit in question.
        ii. Compliance included:
            a. Indications by the officer that an event was not recorded, or a recording device malfunctioned.
            b. Completed technology check boxes.
            c. The supervisor's signature, indicating his/her review.
        iii. Auditor recorded:
            a. The randomly selected month and platoon
            b. The total number of activity sheets reviewed.
            c. The date and unit number of activity sheets missing a signature.
            d. The date and unit number of activity sheets with incomplete "technology" checkboxes.
    C. **Misconduct/civilian complaints**

      i.   Each auditor requested a list of all civilian complaints filed at the duty location for the audit period.

      ii.   Compliance occurred if complaints were assigned PIB control numbers.

      iii.   Auditor recorded:

          a. The total number of civilian complaints filed at the duty locations for the time.

          b. Number of complaints without a PIB control number.

D.   Officers are engaged with the community.

      i.   Auditors reviewed compliance with this requirement, such as:

          a. Community policing records

          b. Problem solving activities with the community.

          c. Attendance at community event (documentation required the officer(s) positively interacted with community members).

          d. Instruction provided to officers at roll call or during the shift.

      ii.   Auditors determined:

          a. If Supervisors ensured officers worked actively to engage the community and increase public trust. Failure to provide documentation was recorded as evidence of non-compliance.

E.   Redirection/Counseling

      i.   Auditors reviewed the reporting function of the SFL application.

      ii.   All counseling and redirection for the time-period and district were noted as evidence of compliance.

F.   Support

      i.   Auditors requested evidence of compliance with this requirement.

      ii.   Evidence of compliance can be:

          a. Referrals for "officer assistance"

          b. Officer peer support provided.

          c. Officer commendations (not all evidence should be in this area)

          d. Evidence of positive reinforcement at roll call and during the shift

          e. Other documentation of evidence of support

G.   Patrol officers assigned the same supervisors.

      i.   Auditors reviewed the monthly schedule of one randomly selected month for each shift.

      ii.   Evidence of compliance was line-ups that showed each officer consistently worked with the same lieutenant and sergeants assigned to that platoon.

          a. An officer regularly assigned to report to a supervisor who is not assigned to the platoon is evidence of non-compliance.

          b. If no lineup or other evidence is provided for any day, the shift was marked non-compliant.

H.   Officer/Supervisor ratio – this review was completed independent of this audit. See the separate scorecards for details.

I.   District investigators and their assigned supervisors

      i.   Auditors reviewed the monthly schedule for each detective squad for the period.

a. Compliance was noted if detectives generally reported to a detective (DIU) supervisor (Sgt./Lt.) on the day of the audit period.

   b. Non-compliance was noted if the detectives reported to a platoon supervisor (Sgt./Lt.) on the day of the audit period.

J.   **AVL –** reviewed via Mobile Data Terminals at the District.

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

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

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

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

O.   **Supervisors' handheld digital recording devices**
   i.   Auditors choose an available Sergeant.
   ii.   Evidence of compliance was demonstrated if the available Sergeant has an audio recording device, can record a test recording, and knows when they are required to use the device.

P.   **Supervisors Review Video as Required (CD 328 E)**
   i.   Auditors should review the Evidence.com audit trail of the video for a random sample of:
      a.   EPRs documenting injuries to "person in custody".
      b.   Vehicle pursuits
      c.   First report of injury reports
      d.   Misconduct Complaints
      e.   Level 2-4 Uses of Force

Q.   **Detective Selection**

       i.   Auditor(s) selected the last available selected KSA packet(s) from each district/unit to ensure the following attachments are present: Form 184, Experience level (Resume), Writing Sample, Supervisor Recommendations, and IPro PIB Short Form.

       ii.   Auditor(s) verified with the DIU (District Investigative Unit) supervisors that all detectives currently assigned to the district/unit had required new or annual detective training.

       iii.   Auditor(s) choose two random detectives.
            a.   Detectives should have knowledge of the available actions (Authorized Interpreter/Mobile Phone app) to interrogate a subject whose primary language is not English.

R.   **Forms and Reports**
       i.   Auditor(s) reviewed the front desk of each district/unit to ensure the district/unit has the following documents available to the public in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese:
            a.   Filing a Complaint Brochure
            b.   New PIB Complaint Form
            c.   Language Assistance Plan

S.   **Insight**
       i.   Auditor(s) interviewed an available Sergeant or Lieutenant to verify that ranked officers understand the navigation and utilization of Insight.

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

Audit Review Results – Scorecards

Below is the audit review results via Excel Spreadsheet. The spreadsheet results are shown by district and overall, for each of the 49 questions representing 20 category items.

Supervision Review Check-List Scorecard - (Single-Review)

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for supervision audit conducted August.

Check-List Questions		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	Overall Score	CD¶
1b	Approve Arrest Reports - EPR Approval Timeliness (<=72 Hrs)	98%	99%	98%	99%	97%	100%	93%	98%	99%	98%	306
1c	Approve Arrest Reports - EPR Approval Timeliness (<=30 Days)	100.0%	99.8%	99.2%	100.0%	99.2%	100.0%	99.6%	99.2%	100.0%	100%	306
2c	Approve Activity Reports - Missing Signatures	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	93%	100%	100%	100%	99.0%	306
2d	Approve Activity Reports - Self-reported Unrecorded Events (info only)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	7	306
2e	Approve Activity Reports -Technology Boxes Unchecked	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	306
3b	Public Misconduct Complaints - w/o PIB Control Number	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	306
4	Officers Engaged with the Community	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	306
5	Redirection and Counseling	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	306
6	Support for Officers by Supervisors	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	306
7c	Patrol Officers Assigned to Same Supervisors - Daily Line-ups	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	82%	100%	98%	309
8c	Officer/Supervisor Ratio - Daily Line-ups	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	310
9c	Detectives & Assigned Supervisors - Reporting to a DIU Supervisor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-		100.0%	308
10	District captains & Platoon Lieutenants provided close and effective Supervision	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	312
11b	Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) - Vehicles in Use is Visible on AVL Map	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-		100%	327
12b	Vehicles are Equipped with ICC - with Video	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	329,330
13a	Officers Notify Supervisors of Recording Failures	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-		100%	329,330
13b	Recording failures noted on officer trip sheets	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-		100%	329,330
13c	Recording Devices are Inoperable > 1 Week	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-		100%	329,330
14	Supervisors Ensure Officers Use Recording Devices	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-		100%	330
x 15c	Recordings Maintained For 3 Years - If Videos Deleted Per Policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	328
x 16	Supervisor's handheld digital recording devices	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	331
17a	Supervisors Review Video as Required - In Custody Injuries	50%	-	-	-	50%	50%	0%	100%	-	53%	328
17b	Supervisors Review Video as Required -Vehicle Pursuits	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	328
17c	Supervisors Review Video as Required - 1st Report of Injuries	-	-	100%	-	86%	-	-	100%	-	90%	328
17d	Supervisors Review Video as Required - Misconduct Complaints	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	100%	328
17e	Supervisors Review Video as Required - Level 2-4 UoF	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	328
18a	Detective Applicant Packet Includes Required Documents	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	80%	-	-	95.0%	169
18b	Detectives Received Formal New or Annual Training	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	170
18c	Detectives Know to Use Phone App for LEP Investigations	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	168/189 h
19.1-3	Filing a Complaint Brochure – English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	385
19.4-6	New PIB Complaint Form – English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	385
19.7-9	Language Assistance Plan - English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	385
19.10-12	Immigration Status Policy - English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	385
19.13	Monitor's Report - Most Recent Available	0%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	83%	385
19.14	Domestic Violence Annual Report - Most Recent Available	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	385
19.15	Cosent Decreee NOPD Audits and Reports - Available	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	-	-	100%	385
20.1	Supervisors can review basic information of all officers under their command in Insight	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 321
20.2	ADP Correct	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 321
20.3	Supervisors can use Insight to compare their officers to peer groups	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 324
20.4	Supervisors determine if a pattern is developing when responding to alerts	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	50%	100%	91%	316, 319, 324
20.5	Supervisors can give an example of a pattern	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 324
20.6	Supervisors know how to identify patterns	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 324
20.7	Looking for patterns helps prevent officers from losing their job or hurting themselves or hurting others	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 324
20.8	Review Insight for new transfers	100%	100%	100%	-	50%	100%	-	100%	100%	91%	316, 319
20.9	319 monitoring	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319
20.10	319 Action Plan	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319
20.11	UoF with Resisting Arrest	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 320
20.12	Criminal Proceedings	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319, 320
20.13	No Pending Tasks Over 30 Days Old	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 319
20.14	Supervisors Navigate Insight with Ease	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	316, 317, 319
	Overall Score	**95%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**98%**	**98%**	**96%**	**99%**	**100%**	**98%**	

General Comments

ARS audited a defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decreee.

For an explanation of the procedure and scoring system for this review, see the associated "protocol " document.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Supervision Review Check-List Scorecard

Review Period: August, 2025

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for supervision audit conducted August.

	Check-List Questions	Score	CD¶
1b	Approve Arrest Reports - EPR Approval Timeliness (<=72 Hrs)	98%	306
1c	Approve Arrest Reports - EPR Approval Timeliness (<=30 Days)	100%	306
2c	Approve Activity Reports - Missing Signatures	99%	306
2d	Approve Activity Reports - Self-reported Unrecorded Events (info only)	7	306
2e	Approve Activity Reports -Technology Boxes Unchecked	100%	306
3b	Public Misconduct Complaints - w/o PIB Control Number	100%	306
4	Officers Engaged with the Community	100%	306
5	Redirection and Counseling	100%	306
6	Support for Officers by Supervisors	100%	306
7c	Patrol Officers Assigned to Same Supervisors - Daily Line-ups	98%	309
8c	Officer/Supervisor Ratio - Daily Line-ups	100%	310
9c	Detectives & Assigned Supervisors - Reporting to a DIU Supervisor	100%	308
10	District captains & Platoon Lieutenants provided close and effective Supervision	100%	312
11b	Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) - Vehicles in Use is Visible on AVL Map	100%	327
12b	Vehicles are Equipped with ICC - with Video	100%	329,330
13a	Officers Notify Supervisors of Recording Failures	100%	329,330
13b	Recording failures noted on officer trip sheets	100%	329,330
13c	Recording Devices are Inoperable > 1 Week	100%	329,330
14	Supervisors Ensure Officers Use Recording Devices	100%	330
x 15c	Recordings Maintained For 3 Years - If Videos Deleted Per Policy	-	328
x 16	Supervisor's handheld digital recording devices	100%	331
17a	Supervisors Review Video as Required - In Custody Injuries	53%	328
17b	Supervisors Review Video as Required -Vehicle Pursuits	100%	328
17c	Supervisors Review Video as Required - 1st Report of Injuries	90%	328
17d	Supervisors Review Video as Required - Misconduct Complaints	100%	328
17e	Supervisors Review Video as Required - Level 2-4 UoF	100%	328
18a	Detective Applicant Packet Includes Required Documents	95%	169
18b	Detectives Received Formal New or Annual Training	100%	170
18c	Detectives Know to Use Phone App for LEP Investigations	100%	168/189h
19.1-3	Filing a Complaint Brochure – English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	385
19.4-6	New PIB Complaint Form – English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	385
19.7-9	Language Assistance Plan - English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	385
19.10-12	Immigration Status Policy - English, Spanish, Vietnamese	100%	385
19.13	Monitor's Report - Most Recent Available	83%	385
19.14	Domestic Violence Annual Report - Most Recent Available	100%	385
19.15	Cosent Decreee NOPD Audits and Reports - Available	100%	385
20.1	Supervisors can review basic information of all officers under their command in Insight	100%	316, 319, 321
20.2	ADP Correct	100%	316, 319, 321
20.3	Supervisors can use Insight to compare their officers to peer groups	100%	316, 319, 324
20.4	Supervisors determine if a pattern is developing when responding to alerts	91%	316, 319, 324
20.5	Supervisors can give an example of a pattern	100%	316, 319, 324
20.6	Supervisors know how to identify patterns	100%	316, 319, 324
20.7	Looking for patterns helps prevent officers from losing their job or hurting themselves or hurting others	100%	316, 319, 324
20.8	Review Insight for new transfers	91%	316, 319
20.9	319 monitoring	100%	316, 319
20.10	319 Action Plan	100%	316, 319
20.11	UoF with Resisting Arrest	100%	316, 319, 320
20.12	Criminal Proceedings	100%	316, 319, 320
20.13	No Pending Tasks Over 30 Days Old	100%	316, 319
20.14	Supervisors Navigate Insight with Ease	100%	316, 317, 319
	Overall Score	**98%**	

General Comments

ARS audited a defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decreee.

For an explanation of the procedure and scoring system for this review, see the associated "protocol " document.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below **95%** are highlighted in **red.**

Conclusion

The results of this audit were verified through an Audit Supervisor Review. Once this process was finished, the districts/units had an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. If the Districts/Units identified any discrepancies or had any concerns, an Audit Re-Evaluation Request Form could have been submitted to PSAB documenting their concerns.

The Overall New Orleans Police Department's score was **98%**. The previous audit score was **96%.** The compliance results are as follows:

1. Approved Arrest Reports – this requires the district/unit to show that there are no "pending" incident reports older than 72 hours nor 30 days. The auditor used the internal EPR Application to view a list of EPRs, filtered by date range, district, incident or supplemental, and status. All districts and divisions reviewed had at least one unapproved EPR older than 72 hours and four of the nine divisions had at least one unapproved EPR older than 30 days. The overall aggregated (1b,1c) score was **99%**, whereas the previous audit score was **98%**. District 7 scored non-compliance on arrest report approvals within 72 hours (93%), however the district was compliant (99%) with arrest report approvals within 30 days. District 7 has the most arrest reports throughout all districts/divisions.

2. Approved Activity Sheets – this requires that a supervisor review and approve all activity sheets (trip sheets) for the district being audited. The auditor reviewed the trip sheets of a random platoon for the period. Compliance was determined by counting the number of unsigned trips sheets compared to the number of approved trip sheets. The overall aggregated (2c and 2e) score of **99%**, which is unchanged from the previous audit. District 6 was non-compliant with missing signatures on activity reports (93%); however, all the activity reports were completed correctly (100%).

3. Responded to Misconduct Complaints – this requires that supervisors respond to citizen-initiated complaints appropriately. The auditor reviewed all citizen complaints filed at the duty location. Compliance was determined if the complaint was assigned a PIB control number. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the previous audit.

4. Engaged Community/Increased Public Trust – The auditor reviewed daily lineups or other documentation that showed roll calls pertained to bias-free policing, procedural justice, or community engagement for the time-period. Failure to provide documentation was recorded as non-compliance. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the previous audit.

5. Redirection/Counseling – this section pertains to non-disciplinary counseling or redirection. When needed, supervisors are required to give guidance to an officer to correct a problem or inappropriate behavior. These interactions are documented in the Supervisor Feedback Log (SFL). The auditor reviewed SFL entries to determine compliance. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the previous audit.

6. Support – this section pertains to whether officers have access to support services. The auditor(s) reviewed examples of compliance, such as referrals to the Officer Assistance

Program; documentation of peer support; commendations; and documentation of positive reinforcement during roll calls. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit.

7. Patrol Officers Assigned to Same Supervisors – this section is to ensure that supervisors are supervising the same platoon. The auditor reviewed the daily lineups for a random month and platoon within the audit period and documented any day when a platoon supervisor not assigned to that platoon was supervising. The overall score of **97%,** whereas the previous audit score was **100%.** District 8 was non-compliant with a score of 82%. The district had supervisors of the C platoon supervise the D platoon. It is to be noted that both platoons are night shift supervisors and NOPD officers work 12 hours shifts. This was not a one-off situation.

8. Officer/Supervisor Ratio – this section is to ensure that districts are not exceeding the policy ratio for supervisors to subordinates daily. The auditor reviewed the daily lineups of a random month and platoon and compared the total number of officers on duty that given day to the number of supervisors on duty. Any day where the officer to supervisor exceeds 8:1, the auditor marked noncompliance for that day. The overall score was **100%,** whereas the previous audit score was **99%.**

9. Reporting to a DIU Supervisor: DIU/Detectives and Assigned Supervisors – this section requires DIU detectives to be assigned to DIU supervisors daily. The auditor reviewed monthly schedules to determine if detectives reported to DIU supervisors. The overall score for this category was **100%,** whereas the previous audit score was **99%.**

10. Captains and Lieutenants close and effective Supervision – this section is to ensure that captains and lieutenants provide close and effective supervision to all subordinates. The auditor reviewed daily lineups, emails, SFLs, etc. to ensure a Captain or Lieutenant of the district has authored or led any of those events/reports. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit.

11. AVL – Supervisors are required to ensure that officers maintain and operate the AVL system. The auditor reviewed the daily lineup on the day of the site visit to analyze which vehicles were active and available at the time of visit. The auditor then asked the supervisor to pull the AVL system and locate all available vehicles. If a vehicle was not present on the system, a receipt of the malfunction or explanation of inactivity (vehicle parked at station) should be available. If not available, the vehicle was marked as non-compliant. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit.

12. Cars have ICC Videos with Working External Mic – The auditor reviewed an updated fleet report and selected all working patrol vehicles that are required to have an MVU/ICC. The ICC system (Axion or L3) was checked to ensure the vehicle had a video with external sound within the last week. The overall score for this category was **100%,** whereas the previous audit score was **93%.** The auditor focus was on vehicles assigned to the patrol officers and not of the pool vehicles. Pool vehicles are available to officers only if their assigned take home vehicle is not operable.

13. Examples of When Officer Notes Events are not Recorded – Officers are required to note on the activity sheet or in an email when events are not recorded or of technology failures.

The auditor reviewed examples of this documentation to determine compliance. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit. As of 2023, NOPD has a MVU log that tracks ICC malfunctions and timeframe of the repair. The auditor reviewed the log and pulled trip sheets for the corresponding unit number to confirm the notification or requested the correspondence between officer and supervisor stating an ICC malfunction.

14. Supervisors Ensure Technology is Working and is Used – The auditors reviewed fleet reports, section of the activity sheet that highlights the equipment testing checkbox, 105s relevant to the proper activation of technology, or roll call topics relevant to the proper use of technology. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit.

15. Recordings Maintained for 3 years – this section is to ensure that all video recordings are stored for a minimum of 3 years and if deleted prior to 3 years the deletion is within policy. The auditor requested a list of all deleted recordings within the last 3 years. No recordings have been deleted by the districts within the prior 3 years. The overall score of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit. Patrol Officers nor supervisors are prohibited from deleting any recordings from evidence.com.

16. Supervisors are Prepared to Take Statements – The auditor met with a random supervisor and verified that the supervisor could display the digital recording device, record a statement, and play it back, and know that statements are required to be recorded for Misconduct Complaints and Use of Force investigations. The overall score for this category of **100%** remained unchanged from the last audit.

17. Supervisors Review Video as Required – this section is to ensure that supervisors are reviewing their subordinates' recordings when required per policy. The auditor reviewed data received regarding in custody injuries, vehicle pursuits, Use of Force, and misconduct complaints to ensure the supervisors reviewed the videos if required. The overall aggregated (17a through 17e) score was **89%**, whereas the previous audit score was **95%** All incidents related to the scenarios were reviewed except for use of force. The non-compliance scores pertained to supervisors reviewing video regarding injuries while in custody **(53%)** and 1st report of injuries **(90%).** Districts 1, 5, 6, and 7 were non-compliant in supervisor review of in custody injuries. Each District had at least one EPR where the officer selected that the subject was injured while in custody and the EPR was approved without video review of the incident.

18. Detective Selection (application packet, training, LEP investigations) – this section is to ensure that detectives have complete KSA packets, required new/annual detective training, and understand the means of communication during LEP investigations. Auditors reviewed the application packet for the most recently assigned detective(s), including sergeants. The packets are required to include the following: applicant's writing sample; resume; a supervisor's recommendation; and the applicant's IPro Short Form. The score for this category was **95%**, whereas the previous audit score was **100%.** Districts 1, 2, 3, and 7 selected a detective within the audit period. The auditor reviewed each selected candidate's KSA packet. District 7 selected a detective within the audit period and a review of the candidate's KSA packet resulted in the auditor being unable to locate the recommendation letter for the candidate. The auditor reviewed documentation that showed a list of all assigned detectives (including sergeants and lieutenants) and the date

of their most recent detective training. The score for this category was **100%**, which is unchanged from the previous audit. The auditor measured compliance by independently asking 2 random detectives, "When you interrogate a subject whose primary language is not English, what method do you use to communicate?" Answer: NOPDAI. The score for this category was **100%**, which is unchanged from the previous audit. The overall aggregated (18a through 18c) score was **100%.**

19. Forms and Reports – this section is to ensure that each district has the correct and accurate reports and forms available and accessible to the public. The auditor reviewed the form and reports on site and ensured that the correct forms were available and, in each language, required (English, Spanish, and Vietnamese). The overall aggregated (19.1 through 19.15) score was **98%,** whereas the previous audit score was **88%.** District 6 did not have a desk officer on duty at the time of the site visit. District 1's desk officer did not know how to find the Monitor's Reports. The auditor guided the officer to find the reports and explained what was all available on the page, therefore the officer was able to find the ARS reports and other reports.

20. Insight – Two supervisors from each district and division audited were interviewed for this portion of the audit. The auditor asked the supervisor 15 questions (14 measurable and 1 information only) regarding understanding and navigation of NOPD's Early Warning System (EWS), Insight. The overall aggregated (20.1 through 20.14) score was **99%**, whereas the previous audit was **96%**. Districts 4 and 7 had supervisors available that were previously audited therefore the auditor did not conduct this portion of the audit within those districts. District 5 supervisor did not understand the first time you should review someone's insight. District 8 supervisor did not understand how to review all activity within the employee activity report when receiving an alert from the officer.

Recommendations

1. All daily lineups should be saved in PDF format. Saving the daily lineup in word or excel format allows for manipulation of the lineup which can lead to fraudulent activities if hard copies are not available.

2. If lineups are completed in excel format the daily lineups for Day watch and Night watch should be in one excel workbook per month and the entire workbook can be saved as PDF.

3. DIU Persons and Property should be treated as one division. DIU daily lineup should include both Persons and Property Crimes detectives and supervisors on duty.

4. The district's detective unit lineup should mimic the platoon lineup. This would give the department a uniform standard for recording attendance and availability.

5. All activity reports for all districts/divisions should be saved on the server in the PSAB folder. Instead of separation by platoon the documents should be separated by Day watch/Night watch. All reports should be saved in PDF format. This recommendation is to ensure that no data on the server is manipulated and is accurate with the paper form.

6. PSAB continues to advocate for a unified universal fleet report. An implementation of unified universal fleet report would eliminate error within fleet reports. The report would also give real time updates of fleet progress. This recommendation would give management and district supervisors the ability to analyze fleet data (i.e., cars in service, 20x vehicles per district, take home vehicles, etc.).

7. District Fleet Managers need to ensure that the district fleet report is accurate on a weekly to bi-weekly basis to ensure accuracy of the report. Note that reason for many District responses is because the fleet reports aren't being kept up in a timely manner to better inform the district prior to the audit taking place.

8. Supervisors should continue to ensure that all the applicable signatures are completed for activity reports and trip sheets. While the overall score is compliant, missing signatures for some districts should be addressed.

9. Any officers assigned to the front desk should be trained in where to find all publicly published Monitor and NOPD PSAB audit reports electronically. All patrol officers should know where to find public audit reports. The information should be readily available to anyone at the desk at the time.

10. PSAB continues to test supervisors' understanding that Insight is not an application for discipline, rather an early warning system. As Insight system continues to develop, supervisors should continue learning and understanding how to analyze **ALL** data points within Insight to detect if a pattern of behavior is developing regarding the subordinate in order allow the supervisor to intervene before an issue becomes a problem or mitigate the issue for the officer and department.

11. PSAB will continue to work with Policy Standards Section as needed to develop DTB's to address the training issues identified in this report.

District Re-evaluation and PSAB Responses

Throughout the Supervision Audit, the districts/divisions and the ARS auditor are in communications regarding non-compliance with checklist items. Below is the correspondence between PSAB and Districts/Divisions:

District 3

The Third District received 0% for Question 17a-Supervisors Review video as required in custody injuries for the listed item. This incident occurred in the Third, however the officer who was involved and authored the report was assigned to the VCAIT unit.

PSAB Response: After reviewing the incident. The auditor confirmed that the incident was handled by VCAIT which is under FOB ADMIN. The auditor will adjust the score of 0% to N/A.

District 8

Question 17C Supervisors review video as required First Report of Injury

The raw data shows that the Audit looked at the reports below:

In Custody Injuries Videos=7

In Custody Videos not reviewed by supervisor =2

Response: After reviewing the below BWC videos the district discovered that only one incident showed via the audit trail of BWC that a supervisor didn't review the video. The district could not locate the second video that was listed in the raw data as not been reviewed. The raw data had no comments that specified what videos were in violation. The district believes that they should be given credit for six of the seven incidents.

PSAB Response: After reviewing the 2 non-compliant "In Custody" items, it confirmed a video associated with item one was reviewed by a supervisor. The auditor will give credit for this incident. No further action will be taken for the second item due to the district's confirmation of no video review by supervisor. ARS recommends that the district conducts verbal counseling with the supervisor regarding reviewing BWC related to injuries while in custody.

Injury Report Videos=4

Number of injury report videos not reviewed=1

Injury Reports with no video=2

Response: After reviewing the videos all the videos except for one had audit trails showing that a supervisor reviewed the video. That Item was a first report of injury for a 3rd district officer where the location of occurrence was in the 8th District. The incident was handled by the 3rd District supervisors. This item should be removed from the 8th District and reassigned to the 3rd District, which would put the 8th District 100% in this category.

PSAB Response: After reviewing the incident where noncompliance occurred, the auditor confirmed through NOPD rosters that the officer is in fact a 3rd district officer and the 1st report of injury should be handled by the 3rd district this incident was handled by 3rd district. ARS has eliminated the incident from the 8th district's sample count and will be added to the 3rd district sample.

Question 20.4 Supervisors determine if a pattern is developing when responding to alerts

8th District score = 50%

In reviewing the raw data for the 8th District all the responses are marked yes in the raw data. The Raw data contains no comments to clarify why the district received 50%. Due to the comments in the raw data the district should be given 100% in this category.

PSAB Response: The district did not receive all yes responses in the Raw data. The No response is marked is circled below. The sergeant received a "No" for the question ""What should you do when you receive an alert for one of your officers?". This is due to the sergeant only stating he would review the alert only and not review the officer's entire employee activity report and/or summary report as well as any other outside factors. 2 supervisors were interviewed, and the answers are 100% or 0% but averaged between the supervisors. ARS score of 50% will remain unchanged.

Timothy A. Lindsey
   Innovation Manager
   Auditing and Review Section,
   Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Cardell Silas
Performance Auditor
Audit and Review Section,
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – Supervision Audit Form

When relevant, the Supervision Protocol requires all or 30 incidents to be reviewed for each audit procedure. For each District, review all or 4 incidents, whichever is fewer

* District/Division Audited

Find items ⌄

Auditor

Find items ⌄

Reporting Year

Find items ⌄

Reporting Month

Find items ⌄

---

1. Approve arrest reports

a) How many arrest reports did this district have for the time period?

The auditor should review the "Pending EPR Incident Reports" and the "Pending EPR Supplemental reports" dashboards available on the Management Dashboard. The auditor should filter both dashboards by district, offender status is arrested, and time period.

Total Incident Reports

Total Supplemental reports

b) How many arrest reports does this district have for the time period that are older than 72 hours and are pending?

Pending Incident Reports >72hrs

Pending Supplemental Reports > 72 hrs

c) How many arrest reports does this district have for the time period that are older than 30 days and are pending?

Pending Incident Reports > 30 days

Pending Supplemental Reports > 30 days

d) When did you check the EPR and Supplemental Dashboards (date and time)?

Date of EPR Check

12/31/2001 🗓   00 ⌄ : 00 ⌄

2. Approve Activity Sheets

a) What month and platoon did you pick)?

Auditor should review one randomly selected month of officer's daily activity reports for a randomly selected platoon for the district in question. The time period should not include weeks of the Mardi Gras or dates immediately prior to or following the Mardi Gras.

Trip sheet review month

Find items ⌄

Trip sheet platoon selected

Find items ⌄

b) How many trip sheets did your review?

Number of trip sheets reviewed

c) Record the date and unit number of any trip sheets missing a signature.

Missing trip sheet signature narrative

Number of trip sheets missing signature

d) Record the date and unit number of up to three activity sheets on which the officer self-reported unrecorded events.

Unrecorded events narrative

 # Self-reported unrecorded events

e) Record the date and unit number of trip sheets with incomplete technology checkboxes.

Incomplete technology narrative

 # Incomplete tech checkboxes

3. Public misconduct complaints

a) Record the total number of public-initiated complaints filed at the district for the time period

 # Public complaints filed at location

The auditor should ask for a list of all public-initiated complaints filed at the duty location. The auditor will ask PIB for complaints for "Rule 2: Moral Conduct, Paragraph 8: Failure to Report Misconduct

 # Public complaints w/o ctrl#

b) Record the number and details of public complaints filed at the district that do not have a PIB control number.

Public complaints narrative

 # "Rule 2" complaints filed

Record the number of Rule 2:Moral Conduct Paragraph 8: Failure to Report Misconduct complaints filed for officers assigned to the district for the time period

4. Officers engaged with the community

a) Did the district show evidence of officers engaging with the community?

b) Record the number and types of evidence provided, in the narrative below.

Community engagement evidence

Officers engaged community

Find items ⌄

Auditors should also review the Community Policing Forms in NOPD Web Applications under 'Forms'.

5. Redirection and counseling.

5) Record the number of SFLs for redirection or counseling by the district for the time period.

 # Redirection/Counseling SFLs

Auditors should review the reporting function of the SFL application. Evidence of compliance will be all counseling's and redirections for the time period and district. None will be considered non-compliance.

6. Support

a) Did the district show evidence of supervisors supporting their subordinates?

b) Evidence in narrative below may be in form of SFLs, email, video, roll call, supervisor trip sheets, etc.

District support examples

District supports their subordinates

Find items ⌄

7. Patrol officers (PO) assigned to the same supervisors

a) Record the randomly selected month

Assigned same supervisor month

Find items ⌄

b) Record the number of line-ups reviewed for each platoon.

Assigned same supervisor # of line-ups

b) Record the number of line-ups indicating officers did not work with the supervisor assigned to that platoon. (A supervisor from another platoon is listed on the line-up.

Supervisor from another platoon

8. Officer/Supervisor (O/S) ratio

a) Record the randomly selected month

O/S Ratio selected month.

Find items ⌄

b) Record the number of days in the selected month

O/S Days in selected month

O/S Number of daily lineups reviewed

c) Record the number of daily line-ups reviewed for the selected month

O/S Officers from another platoon/unit included

Find items ⌄

d) Record whether officers from another platoon/unit were added to the ratio

9. District investigators and their assigned supervisors

a) Record the randomly selected month

Detective line-ups month

Find items ⌄

Number of Detective line-ups reviewed

b) Record the number of days of detective line-ups reviewed

Days Detectives did not report to DIU Supervisor

c) Record the number of detective line-ups indicating detectives did not report to a detective supervisor

10. District captains and platoon lieutenants provide close and effective supervision.

Capt/Lt provided supervision?

Find items ⌄

If district captain and lieutenant provided close and effective supervision and there is evidence of compliance, pick "yes" and describe the evidence.

Evidence may include the following:
·   Roll calls given or ordered by lieutenants or the captain
·   Number of PIB investigations requested by lieutenants or the captain
·   Number of supervisor feedback log entries authored or ordered by lieutenants or the captain
·   Timely review of subordinates' INSIGHT records
·   Number of incidents documented for later use in performance evaluations of supervisors
·   Other documentation of interventions by lieutenants and/or captains

Capt/Lt close and effective supervision evidence

11. AVL (automatic vehicle locator).

 # vehicles in use on daily line-up

[ ]

a) Record the number of vehicles listed on the daily line-up as being in use for the current shift.

 # vehicles in use on daily line-up showing on AVL Map

[ ]

b) Record the number of vehicles listed on the daily line-up as being in use for the current shift.

 # vehicles AVL repair requested

[ ]

c) Record the number of vehicles on the daily line-up that are not showing on the MDT and for which a supervisor has requested an AVL repair.

12. Vehicles are equipped with ICC (In-car cameras).

 # vehicles where ICC required & are operational

[ ]

a) Record the number of vehicles required to have ICC and are in service.

 # operational vehicles where ICC required & have ICC w/in week

[ ]

b) Record the number of vehicles required to have ICC and are in service and have an ICC recording within one week of the date the fleet report was updated.

 # vehicles with video after contact

[ ]

c) If a vehicle does not have an ICC recording, contact the district. If the district can record a video and upload it within two days, the vehicle is compliant. Record the number of these vehicles.

13. Officers notify supervisors of recording failures.

Recording failures & repairs documented

[Find items   ▼]

a) Record whether the district has documentation of recording device repairs listing the dates of failure and the dates repairs were requested.

Recording failures noted on officer trip sheets

[Find items   ▼]

b) Record whether all or 3, whichever is fewer, BWC or ICC repairs were listed on the officer's trip sheet.

Recording devices inoperable over 1 week

[Find items   ▼]

c) Record whether evidence exists showing multiple ICCs or BWCs were inoperable for more than a week.

14. Supervisors ensure officers use recording devices.

Supervisors ensured officers used recording devices

[Find items   ▼]

a) Does the evidence demonstrate compliance?

b) Describe the evidence that demonstrates compliance, if yes.

Supervisors ensuring officers use recording devices Evidence

[   ]

15. Recordings maintained for three years.

a) Record the number of videos deleted during the audit time period.

 # Videos deleted (denom)

[   ]

c) Record the number of videos that were deleted per policy.

 # Videos deleted per policy (num)

[   ]

b) Record the justifications for deleted videos.

Justification for the deleted videos

[   ]

16. Supervisor's handheld digital recording devices.

a) Record the name of the supervisor interviewed.

Supervisor interviewed

[   ]

b) Record whether the supervisor able to produce the handheld audio recording device.

Ask "Can you show me your audit recording device?" and record whether the Sgt had one.

Supervisor had recording device

[Find items | ∨]

c) Record whether the supervisor able to take a test recording on the handheld audio recording device.

Ask "Can you take a test recording and play it back to me?" and record whether the Sgt was able to.

Supervisor able to use device

[Find items | ∨]

Supervisor knows to use recording device for UoFs and FDIs

[Find items | ∨]

d) Record whether the supervisor is able to answer when to use the handheld audio recording device.

Ask "When are you required to use the device?" and record whether the Sgt said to take statements when investigating uses of force and misconduct complaints.

17 (a-e). Supervisors review video as required.

17a) EPRs documenting Injuries to persons in Custody
Use SQL to find EPRs with "Yes" checked for "Injured in custody" or "Died in custody" (found in the Offender section).

1. Record the random sample count.

In custody injuries sample

[   ]

2. Record the labelling of the videos corresponding with the random sample including items not reviewed or with video

In custody injuries video details

[   ]

3. Record the count of item numbers of the EPRs for which the Evidence.com audit trail does not show a supervisor reviewed the video.

In custody injuries videos NOT reviewed by supervisor

[   ]

4. Record the count of EPRs you deselected because there is no corresponding video.

In custody injuries EPRs with NO video

[   ]

17b) Vehicle Pursuits
Ask PSS for all vehicle pursuits for the time period
1. Record the random sample count.

1028P Sample

2. Record the labelling of the videos corresponding with the random sample.

1028P video details

3. Record the count of item numbers of the 1028Ps for which the Evidence.com audit trail does not show a supervisor reviewed the video.

1028P videos NOT reviewed by supervisor

4. Record the count of 1028Ps you deselected because there is no corresponding video.

1028Ps with NO video

17c) First report of injury reports

Check psab@nola.gov for first report of injury reports sent by HR. Reports indicating the officer was on scene when the injury occurred, must be included in the universe for the sample.

1. Record the random sample count.

Injury reports sample

2. Record the labelling of the videos corresponding with the random sample.

Injury reports video details

3. Record the count of injury reports for which the Evidence.com audit trail does not show a supervisor reviewed the video.

Injury reports videos NOT reviewed by supervisor

4. Record the count of injury reports you deselected because there is no corresponding video.

Injury reports with NO videos

17d) Misconduct Complaints

Ask PIB for- or use IAPro reports to get a list of all complaints for the time period.

1. Record the random sample.

FDI sample

2. Record the labelling of the videos corresponding with the random sample includimng CTRL# where no video reviewed or containing a video.

FDI video details

3. Record the count of CTRL#s of the complaints for which the Evidence.com audit trail does not show a supervisor reviewed the video.

FDI videos NOT reviewed by supervisor

4. Record the count of CTRL#s you deselected because there is no corresponding video.

FDIs with NO video

17e) Level 2-4 Uses of Force

Review the FTN list from PIB FIT.
1. Record the random sample count. Enter the count for level 2-4 UoF events

Level 2-4 UoF sample

2. Record the labelling of the videos corresponding with the random sample. Enter the FTN and Item number for each 2-4 UoF event below, including FTNs where supervisor never reviewed or FTN's without video.

Level 2-4 UoF video details

3. Record the FTN#s of the Level 2-4 uses of force for which the Evidence.com audit trail does not show a supervisor reviewed the video.

Level 2-4 UoF videos NOT reviewed by supervisor

4. Record the count of FTN#s you deselected because there is no corresponding video.

Level 2-4 UoF with NO video

Auditor Comments

Supervision - Insight: Edit Form

✕   ✓

Auditor   **District**   **Supervisor Platoon**   **Reporting Month**

| Find items ▼ | Find items ▼ | Find items ▼ | Find items ▼ |

Reporting Year   **Supervisor Selection**   **Supervisor Rank**

| Find items ▼ | Find items ▼ | Find items ▼ |

1. Auditor asks: "In Insight, show me all the officers that you supervise or all the officers on your platoon?"
If the supervisor is a Sgt on a platoon with multiple Sgts, he or she searches the Assignments tile for his/her Lt. If the supervisor is a Lt, he or she searches the tile for him/herself.

The random supervisor may manually find each employee in the Personnel Jacket tile that reports to them and score "Yes" for this requirement.

2. The Assignments tile reflects ADP. Ask the supervisor if the Assignments tile (ADP) appears correct for their LT.

If it's a LT, ask them if the correct people are assigned to them. If they say "No" choose "No."

3. Auditor asks: "Can you show me how one of your officers compares to his/her peer group on injuries to persons in-custody (or Vehicle Pursuits or "Non-disciplinary corrective action")?"

A random supervisor shows how one of his/her officer's "In-custody Injuries" (or "Pursuits" or "Non-disciplinary Corrective Action", respectively) count in the Employee Activity Report or Supervisor Dashboard Report shows how the officer is doing better or worse than his/her peer group. [OCDM may ask different data points.

Supervisor Can Review Basic Information

| Find items ▼ |

ADP Correct

| Find items ▼ |

Supervisors Use Insight for Peer Group Comparison

| Find items ▼ |

People should be familiar with every single data point on the Activity Report]

4. Auditor asks: "What should you do when you receive an alert for one of your officers?"

The list of actions the supervisor takes when responding to an alert includes reviewing every data point available for the officer's activity to determine if a pattern is developing.

The supervisor does not focus only on the type of activity that led to the alert.

Supervisors Determine Pattern Developing in Response to Alerts

Find items ⌄

5. Auditor asks: "Can you give me an example, hypothetical or real, of a pattern of conduct that should prompt a discussion with the officer?"

A random supervisor gives an example that compares multiple activity types and explains that sort of activity might indicate the officer needs assistance with [insert possible issue].

Supervisors can give an example of a pattern

Find items ⌄

6. Auditor asks: "Do you know how to identify a pattern in Insight?"

A random supervisor knows to review all of an officer's activity in the Employee Activity Report.

Supervisors know how to identify patterns

Find items ⌄

7. Auditor asks: "What is the purpose of looking for patterns?"

A random supervisor says something like "looking for patterns helps me identify officers that need intervention. Officers who are struggling need my attention more so than officers who aren't."

Officers who are struggling need my attention more so than officers who aren't."

Looking for patterns helps prevent officers from losing their job or hurting their job or hurting themselves or hurting others

Find items ⌄

8. Auditor asks "When is the first time you should look at an officer's Insight"

A random supervisor says "when they are first transferred to me or when I am first assigned as their supervisor."

Review Insight for new transfers

Find items ⌄

9. Auditor asks "If you or your rank decided one of your officers required monitoring, how would you do it?"

A random supervisor's answer covers: consistent review of Insight, showing up on calls, reviewing FICs, etc.

319 monitoring

Find items ⌄

10. Auditor asks "What is an action plan?"

A random supervisor describes a step-by-step plan to getting to a desired performance point.

319 Action Plan

Find items ⌄

11. Auditor asks "Can you find an officers data in Insight for uses of force where a subject is charged with obstructing or resisting an officers, interfering with a law enforcement investigation, or similar charges?"

Found in the Activity report, labelled "UoF with offense Against LEO Charge", or in the Summary report in the "Use of Force Information" table under the column "Citizen Charge"

UoF with Resisting Arrest

Find items ⌄

12. Auditor asks "Can you show where in Insight you can see criminal proceedings initiated against an officer?"

Found in the Activity report labelled "Charges and Citations." Found in the Summary report labelled "Charges and Citation information."

Criminal Proceedings

| Find items | ⌄ |

13. Ask the supervisor to click on "Task Dashboard."

If there are tasks older than 30 days, choose "No

No Pending Task Over 30 Days Old

| Find items | ⌄ |

14. If the supervisor can find things in Insight quickly, choose "Yes."

If he/she takes a while, choose "No."

Supervisors Navigate Insight with Ease

| Find items | ⌄ |

15. Auditor asks "Can you find the CEW assignments in Insight?"

Found in the Employee Personnel Jacket under Assigned Property.

Supervisors Can Show CEW Assignments

| Find items | ⌄ |

Auditor Comments

Reviewer Comments

✕ Supervision Detective Selection ✓

| **Auditor** | **District** | **Reporting Month** | **Reporting Year** |
| Find items ⌄ | Find items ⌄ | Find items ⌄ | Find items ⌄ |

1. Applicant Packet Incldudes Requirements.

Use the most recent new/transfer detective applicant packet which includes:

New Form 184 Used

| Find items | ⌄ |

Experience Level (Resume)

| Find items | ⌄ |

Writing Sample

| Find items | ⌄ |

Supervisor Recommendations

| Find items | ⌄ |

IAPro (Short Form)

2. Detectives have Received Formal New Detective or Annual Detective Training.

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

3. Detectives Know to Use NOPDAI or Phone for LEP Interrogations
   Randomly chose two (2) detectives then ask:
   "When you interrogate a subject whose primary language is not English, what method do you use to communicate?"
   Answer: "NOPDAI or Phone" (anything else, or any combination is wrong) [reference FOB Directive 44].

Find items ⌄

Number of Detectives on Staff

Number of Detectives Trained or Scheduled in Year

Detectives Interviewed for LEP Interrogations

Detectives Know to Use Phone App Only

Auditor Comments

Reviewer Coments

Supervision - Forms and Reports

✕   ✓

Auditor
Find items ⌄

District
Find items ⌄

Month
Find items ⌄

Year
Find items ⌄

Platoon
Find items ⌄

A hardcopy of Filing a Complaint Brochure - (English, Spanish, or Vietnamese) is available

nola.gov/nopd/citizen-services/ or nola.gov/nopd/about-us/

Complaint Brochure - Eng...
Find items ⌄

Complaint Brochure - Spa...
Find items ⌄

Complaint Brochure - Viet...
Find items ⌄

A hardcopy of New PIB Complaint Form - (English, Spanish, or Vietnamese) is available

nola.gov/nopd/citizen-services/ or nola.gov/nopd/about-us/

PIB Complaint Form - Engl...
Find items ⌄

PIB Complaint Form - Spa...
Find items ⌄

PIB Complaint Form - Viet...
Find items ⌄

A hardcopy of Language Assistance Plan - (English, Spanish, or Vietnamese) is available

https://nola.gov/nopd/policies/

Language Assistance Plan - English

Find items ▾

Language Assistance Plan - Spanish

Find items ▾

Language Assistance Plan - Vietnamese

Find items ▾

When asked for the "Immigration Status Policy - English, Spanish, or Vietnamese" , the desk officer knows to print from nola.gov or nopd.org.

NOPD.org > Rules & Regulations > NOPD Operations Manual - Chapters or nola.gov/nopd/policies

Immigration Status Policy - English

Find items ▾

Immigration Status Policy - Spanish

Find items ▾

Immigration Status Policy - Vietnamese

Find items ▾

When asked for the LEP policy (Limited English Proficiency Services, Ch. 55.4), the desk officer knows how to find it on nola.gov or nopd.org or has a hard copy.

LEP Policy

Find items ▾

When asked, "Do you have the most recent Monitor's Report?", the desk officer knows to print from nola.gov [CD 427].

nola.gov/nopd/nopd-consent-decree/

Monitor's Report

Find items ▾

When asked, "Do you have the most recent Domestic Violence Annual Report?", the desk officer knows to print from nola.gov [CD 427].

nola.gov/nopd/nopd-consent-decree/

Domestic Violence Annual Report

Find items ▾

When asked to show all NOPD audits and reports related to Consent Decree implementation, the desk officer knows to go to nola.gov [CD 427].

nola.gov/nopd/nopd-consent-decree/

CD Audits and Reports

Find items ▾

AuditorComments

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent

Chief Deputy Superintendent – Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Deputy Superintendent- Public Integrity Bureau

Deputy Superintendent- Management Services Bureau

City Attorney's Office

Assistant City Attorney – Superintendent's Office