

AUDIT REPORT

Portland Police Bureau Training Division

October 2017



Produced by
Lieutenant Craig Dobson, Inspector
Auditors Shannon Smith, Kate Bonn, and Heidi Busche

Professional Standards Division
Portland Police Bureau





Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Criteria 85a.....	4
<i>Needs Assessment</i>	
Criteria 85b.....	6
<i>Training Plan</i>	
Criteria 85c.....	8
<i>Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Training</i>	
Criteria 85d & 85e.....	10
<i>Maintenance and Accessibility of Training Records</i>	
Criteria 85f.....	13
<i>Training on Specific Areas of Officer Responsibilities</i>	
Criteria 85g.....	16
<i>Directives</i>	
Appendix 85a-1.....	19
<i>Source Material Used in the Needs Assessment</i>	
Appendix 85d-1.....	20
<i>Officer Record Review</i>	
Appendix 85f-1.....	22
<i>Probationary Officer Assignment and Phase Requirements</i>	
Acronym Dictionary.....	23



Executive Summary

Between April 2017 and October 2017, auditors Shannon Smith, Kate Bonn, and Heidi Busche, along with Lieutenant Craig Dobson of the Professional Standards Division (PSD), conducted an audit of the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) Training Division.

The Training Division administers a comprehensive training program that provides for the professional growth and continued development of all sworn members. It is under the direction of a Training Manager (Captain) and the Assistant Chief of Services.

The audit presents an assessment of the Training Division's ability to meet the requirements outlined by the USDOJ Settlement Agreement paragraph 85.

USDOJ Settlement Agreement Paragraph 85 states:

"In consultation with the COCL, the Inspector shall audit the training program using the following performance standards to ensure that PPB does the following:

- a. Conducts a comprehensive needs assessment annually;*
- b. Creates a Training Strategic Plan annually;*
- c. Within 180 days of the Effective Date, develops and implements a process for evaluation of the effectiveness of training;*
- d. Maintains accurate records of Training delivered, including substance and attendance;*
- e. Makes Training Records accessible to the Director of Services, Assistant Chief of Operations, and DOJ;*
- f. Trains Officers, Supervisors, and Commanders on areas specific to their responsibilities;*
- g. Ensures that sworn PPB members are provided a copy of all PPB directives and policies issued pursuant to this Agreement, and sign a statement acknowledging that they have received, read, and had an opportunity to ask questions about the directives and/or policies, within 30 days of the release of the policy."*

During the audit process, the Team observed that the Training Division is responsible for many tasks outside the direct scope of this audit, all of which contribute to the training of Portland Police officers. The Audit Team would like to take this opportunity to extend our appreciation to the Training Division staff for their professionalism, cooperation, and candor during the audit engagement.



Executive Summary

The following is a summary of the Training Division audit:

- 85a** *The source materials included in the Needs Assessment (NA) are comprehensive. Currently, the NA, while thorough, is too cumbersome to be utilized in the formal Training Plan development process.*
- 85a** *PPB and Training Division command structures lack formalized processes for acknowledging review of the NA.*
- 85b** *The development of the Training Plan is an ad-hoc process rather than the formalized process outlined by PPB Directive 1500.00.*
- 85b** *The Training Plan development process is hobbled by last minute changes made at the direction of third parties on topics not shown by PPB analysis to be immediately necessary.*
- 85c** *The Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) demonstrated that they have built the foundation for the evaluation of training and have plans to expand where gaps exist.*
- 85c** *Due to the incorporation of third party feedback, the evaluation tool provided less actionable information at the expense of context rich, officer-need driven survey data.*
- 85d-e** *For In-service and Advanced Academy, training materials, lesson plans, training delivered, attendance records, and individual scores are well tracked, maintained and accessible.*
- 85d-e** *Generally, training records for sworn officers, supervisors and probationary officers are well maintained and accurate.*
- 85f** *Due to the high turnover of Recruit Training Sergeants (RTSs) at the precincts, communication between FTEP and RTSs is inconsistent.*
- 85g** *With regard to policy acknowledgement, the current directive notification process does not provide for a notification of directives outstanding beyond 30 days.*
- 85g** *Reserve Officers make up a disproportionate number of members with unsigned directives.*
- 85g** *Currently there is no consequence for failure to sign and acknowledge directives.*

Submitted to the Training Division with this audit is a follow-up document to be used for the collection of responses to the recommendations outlined in this report. We expect this document to be completed and returned in May of 2018. Questions regarding recommendations can be submitted to the Inspector. A follow-up audit will be conducted in October 2018.



Introduction

Paragraph 85 of the United States Department of Justice Settlement Agreement (USDOJ SA) charges the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) to conduct an audit of their training program. The audit was conducted between April- October 2017 and was performed based on generally accepted auditing standards. These standards require that we plan and perform the assessment and obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our objectives.

Objectives To audit the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) Training Division to assess compliance with the United States Department of Justice Settlement Agreement (USDOJ SA) Paragraph 85.

In developing the audit methodology, the Audit Team received feedback from the USDOJ and Compliance Officer and Community Liaison (COCL). The feedback was reviewed and compared to the scope of the audit defined in USDOJ SA paragraph 85. Therefore, information that was not directly related to the scope of the audit was not included.

Scope USDOJ Settlement Agreement Paragraph 85 (see page 1).

Methodology Auditors employed a mixed methodology approach to the assessment of the Training Division utilizing both quantitative and qualitative analyses to formulate findings and recommendations.

- Prior to developing the methodology, auditors evaluated PPB policies and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and conducted preliminary interviews.
- The Audit Team developed a preliminary methodology that was submitted to USDOJ in Q2 2017.
- An Audit Plan was delivered to the Training Division during Q2 2017, which included a request for various materials necessary for the audit.
- The Audit Team identified relevant members of the Training Division and scheduled interviews with those members. A sample of officer training records was selected to be reviewed for the assessment of USDOJ SA 85e.



CRITERIA 85A: Needs Assessment

Background

The Needs Assessment (NA) is an annual report developed to inform the PPB Annual Training Plan. The NA was designed to address each point required by USDOJ SA paragraph 79. The NA and its integration into the Training Plan is guided by PPB Directive 1500.1.2.¹

The Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) is a four-person unit within the Training Division. The unit includes two Training Development Analysts (TDAs), a Senior Management Analyst (SMA) and a Program Manager (PM). The analysts are supervised by the CDU Lieutenant who reports directly to the Training Manager. The NA is developed and delivered by the SMA.²

Observations and Findings

The Audit Team assessed the comprehensiveness of the source material used to develop the 2016 NA in two ways. First, the Audit Team identified each source listed in the document and verified its contribution to the NA. This review found the source material to be consistent with the applicable points of the Settlement Agreement.

The audit team interviewed the CDU on September 25, 2017. Additional interviews were conducted with the CDU Lieutenant and the Training Manager on October 10, 2017. The former Training Manager (who supervised the Training Division until June 2016) was interviewed on October 11, 2017. These interviews demonstrated that the sources used in the NA were all-inclusive.

In practice, the NA as a standalone document is too broad to guide training. As such, the Training Division must review, consolidate, and prioritize items listed in the NA in order to deliver appropriate (cont.)

¹ PPB Directive 1500.1.2 outlines that the Needs Assessment shall be reviewed by the Chief or designee during the Annual Training Plan development process. Policy defines the Annual Training Plan as "a document produced by the Training Division which details all training due to be delivered in the next year. It expressly identifies who will receive training, what course material the Training Division will present, when and where the training will occur, and the reason for the training".

² See Appendix 85a-1 for all general source material included in the 2016 NA.



CRITERIA 85A: Needs Assessment

Observations and Findings (cont.)

training. Additionally, due to time constraints around data collection, synthesis, and presentation, the data in the NA lags 18-24 months behind. Past and present Training Managers recommend that the NA be used to inform long-term, strategic planning (facilitated by the historical nature of this data), but that the Training Plan for In-service training be more responsive to immediate needs.

During interviews, the Audit Team found there is no formal process for either the PPB Chief's review of the NA, or the delivery of the NA to the Inspector. However, an informal process for the Chief's review of the NA exists as part of the development of the Training Plan.

Conclusions

The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- The source materials utilized for the NA are comprehensive. Currently, the NA, while thorough, is too cumbersome to be utilized in the formal Training Plan development process.
- PPB and Training Division command structures lack formalized processes for acknowledging review of the NA.

Recommendations

85a-1 Evaluate the utility of the sources in the NA. For example, sources that have not produced actionable training needs in the past three years should be removed. Consolidation of sources should result in a document that is more timely and responsive to PPB needs.

85a-2 Training Division command staff should work with PPB command to reallocate analyst personnel (not currently assigned to the Training Division) to provide more resources for the production and timely delivery of the NA.

85a-3 The Audit Team recommends that the Training Manager develop and implement a formal process for the review of the NA by the Chief, or designee, during the Training Plan development process.



CRITERIA 85B: Training Plan

Background Directive 1500.00 provides guidance regarding the development of the Training Plan. According to policy, the Training Plan details all training due to be delivered in the next year. It *“expressly identifies who will receive training, what course material the Training Division will present, when and where the training will occur, and the reason for the training”*. The Training Manager is responsible for the development of the Training Plan.

Observations and Findings The Audit Team conducted interviews with the current Training Manager and the CDU Lieutenant on October 10, 2017. An additional interview was conducted with the former Training Manager on October 11, 2017.

According to PPB policy, it is the responsibility of the Training Manager to determine the best medium for the delivery of trainings, as well as training topics. Interviews with the Training Managers revealed that a number of sources inform the Training Plan. These include, but are not limited to: meetings with the Operations Branch, informal conversations with members, instructor leads, sergeants, lieutenants, and other sources.

The Training Division often has to accommodate requests and direction for training from third party sources on curriculum that PPB analyses have not identified as bureau-wide training needs. For example, the Training Division has accommodated requests from third party sources for changes in the Training Plan up to 24 hours prior to In-service. The unintended consequence of implementing these last minute requests is the derailment of the Training Plan.

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85B: Training Plan

Conclusions The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- The development of the Training Plan is an ad-hoc process (allowing for responsiveness and flexibility to training needs identified by various sources) rather than the formalized process outlined by PPB Directive 1500.00.
- The Training Plan development process is hobbled by last minute changes made at the direction of third parties on topics not shown by PPB analysis to be immediately necessary.

Recommendations 85b-1 All recommendations for training, from any party, must be delivered to the Training Division no later than 45-days prior to the start of In-service. Requests delivered after this date should be accommodated only under extenuating circumstances. The Training Division should determine these circumstances and develop an SOP to guide the process.

85b-2 The Training Plan should be informed by the needs of the Bureau rather than being driven by third party requests. The Training Manager should develop a formal process for vetting, evaluating and, when applicable, denying requests from third parties.

85b-3 The Training Division is currently in the process of developing a strategic plan to deliver training on perishable skills with the intent to deliver training on these skills every 3 years. We recommend continued work on this process culminating in a formalized product.

85b-4 The Training Division needs to develop a standardized process to address training needs annually. This process would encompass needs identified in the strategic plan (Recommendation 85b-3) and would guide all trainings provided at the Training Division on a yearly basis.

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85C: Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Training

Background USDOJ SA paragraph 80 requires:

“within 180 days of the Effective Date, PPB shall develop and implement a process that provides for the collection, analysis, and review of data regarding the effectiveness of training for the purpose of improving future instruction, course quality, and curriculum. These evaluations shall measure and document student satisfaction with the training received; student learning as a result of training; and the extent to which program graduates are applying the knowledge and skills acquired in training to their jobs”.

The effectiveness of training is evaluated by the CDU within the PPB Training Division. Please see Criteria 85a for the structure and personnel within the CDU.

The SMA developed a tool for student evaluation of trainings delivered. This is a survey that is delivered at the end of training sessions. The tool was informed by the work of Dr. Jolene Smith and Dr. James Kirkpatrick, experts in the field of survey design and training evaluation.

Observations and Findings The Audit Team interviewed the CDU on September 25, 2017. The interview established that the Training Division currently collects data regarding the effectiveness of training for Advanced Academy, In-service, portions of Enhanced Crisis Intervention Team (ECIT) training, and portions of Supervisor In-service.

Effectiveness of training is predominately informed by learning assessments and the aforementioned survey tool. In the future, the Training Division has plans to expand on their training evaluation, per the Kirkpatrick Method, when analyst resources allow. (cont.)

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85C:

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Training

Observations and Findings (cont.)

Third parties provided feedback on the survey tool, which generalized the information gathered. The feedback was geared towards creating a tool that would be informative for research purposes; however, many of these suggestions conflict with best practices in training evaluation.

Conclusions

The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- Interviews found that the Training Division has implemented a program to evaluate the effectiveness of training (informed by industry standards and best practices). The CDU demonstrated that they have built the foundation for this process and have plans to expand where gaps exist.
- Due to incorporation of third party feedback, the evaluation tool provided less actionable information at the expense of context rich, officer-need driven survey data.

Recommendations

85c-1 The Audit Team recommends that Training Division command work with PPB command to reallocate analyst resources (not currently assigned to the Training Division) to address gaps in the evaluation of the effectiveness of all trainings.

85c-2 The CDU should continue to focus on developing evaluation tools that are in line with the best practices in training evaluation.

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85D & 85E: Maintenance and Accessibility of Training Records

Background USDOJ SA paragraph 81 requires that:

"PPB shall ensure that the Training Division is electronically tracking, maintaining, and reporting complete and accurate records of current curricula, lesson plans, training delivered, attendance records, and other training materials in a central, commonly-accessible, and organized file system".

Directive 1500.00 provides direction to the Training Division regarding the maintenance and reporting of training records. It specifies that the Training Manager is responsible for management of all training records. Two SOPs guide the recordkeeping process, SOP 1-15 and SOP 1-20.

PPB uses Skills Manager, a software program developed by Crown Pointe Technologies, to maintain training records. Records are accessed using Snapshot, Skills Manager's reporting platform, by anyone with PPB credentials.

In order to assess the maintenance and accuracy of training records, including substance and attendance, the Audit Team reviewed records for a random sample of 501 sworn officers (to include 100% of supervisors and 2016 probationary officers). Ultimately, the random sample included 324 officers, 20 probationary officers, and 157 supervisors.

In order to achieve a 95% confidence interval with +/- 3.5%, analysts randomly selected 332 officers. During the audit, auditors discovered that eight officers in the sample were members of outside agencies. These members were removed from the sample, leaving the final sample of 324 officers. The training records of members on FMLA during 2016 were not reviewed for In-service attendance or recertification. The training records of members on FMLA were assessed only for retraining upon return to service.



CRITERIA 85D & 85E: Maintenance and Accessibility of Training Records

Observations and Findings

The Audit Team interviewed the Training Division Police Administrative Support Specialists (PASSes) on October 10, 2017. The interview established that training materials (course content, such as PowerPoints and lesson plans) are maintained on a secured network drive and linked to the corresponding course in Skills Manager. Most materials for In-service and Advanced Academy are kept using this method, but other courses do not have any linked training materials.

Attendance records are maintained on a secured network drive and are linked to the corresponding course in Skills Manager. Attendance records are reported to DPSST to verify required training was completed.

As to the accuracy and maintenance the Audit Team found the following³:

- The review of officer records found 18/324 (5.6%) were missing at least one of the required 2016 In-service courses for members who were not supervisors, or probationary officers.
- The review of supervisor records found 12/324 (7.6%) were missing 24 hours of supervisor or leadership training over the three-year period (2014-2016).
- The review of probationary officer records found five courses that were lacking consistent documentation in the officer's record.
- The review of officers who were absent from full duty for more than 30 days in 2016 found that 9/57 records (15.8%) were missing qualification/re-certification with one or more pieces of required equipment.
- As it pertains to officers who held secondary certifications:
 - 17 records were missing the required number of AR-15 qualifications.
 - 14 records were missing the required number of less lethal qualifications.

³ See Appendix 85d-1 for training record review data.



CRITERIA 85D & 85E: Maintenance and Accessibility of Training Records

Conclusions The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- Generally for In-service and Advanced Academy training materials, lesson plans, training delivered, attendance records, and individual scores are well tracked, maintained and accessible.
- Generally, training records of sworn officers, supervisors and probationary officers are well maintained and accurate. It is important to note that the findings above do not necessarily indicate a member missed the required training only that the training was not documented in the members record. Further questions about member attendance would need to be directed to the Training Division.

Recommendations 85d-e-1 The Audit Team recommends that the Training Division maintain training records and course materials for specialty trainings (eg. SERT, EDU, RRT, etc.).

85d-e-2 We recommend that a standardized naming convention for the courses manually entered into Skills Manager be developed and implemented.

85d-e-3 The Audit Team recommends that the Training Division develop and implement a quality assurance process for the periodic review of member training records.

85d-e-4 Currently, only LEDS and CPR certification expirations are programmed into Skills Manager (notifying PASSes when an officer's skill is about to expire). We would recommend programming additional certification expiration dates into Skills Manager.

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85F: Training on Specific Areas of Officer Responsibilities

Background

The Training Division delivers training to officers throughout the course of their careers. This begins with Advanced Academy and the Field Training and Evaluation Program (FTEP) and continues through In-service, specialty training, and supervisor In-service for sergeants and above. Due to the scope of trainings delivered, the Audit Team selected FTEP for review. In order to determine compliance with USDOJ SA paragraph 85f – that the Training Division trains officers, supervisors, and commanders on areas specific to their responsibilities, the Audit Team assessed FTEP on whether they provided training to recruits and Field Training Officers (FTOs).

PPB uses FTEP to train recruits to be law enforcement professionals. FTEP is governed by Directive 1501.00. In addition to Directive 1501.00, SOP 3-4 outlines FTO selection, standards, certification, recertification, and decertification.

FTEP is part of the Training Division and is under the command of the Training Manager and a Lieutenant, who is responsible for the overall program. The FTEP sergeant is responsible for recruit training. There are three FTEP coordinators who report to the FTEP sergeant; each is assigned to a Precinct and each is responsible for reviewing weekly evaluations of recruits. The coordinators are also responsible for the maintenance and administration of the ADORE database. The FTEP program selects FTOs. These members, who act as coaches, are rotationally assigned a recruit whose performance they must evaluate. Each precinct has a Recruit Training Sergeant (RTS) assigned to each relief. The RTS is designated as the FTEP coordinator for that relief. RTS responsibilities are outlined in Directive 1501.00.

FTEP uses an industry standard software program named ADORE (Automated Observation Reports and Evaluations – developed by MdE, Inc) to track recruit progress and evaluations through each phase of training. The system is internet based and can be accessed from anywhere. Directive 1501.00 requires that FTOs submit weekly evaluation reports for their recruits. Recruits are encouraged to utilize the journal feature of ADORE to make notes, or conduct self-assessment. Data from ADORE is easily exported to Excel and allows for any number of performance evaluations and analyses. An FTEP Coordinator demonstrated the software to the Audit Team.



CRITERIA 85F: Training on Specific Areas of Officer Responsibilities

Observations and Findings

The Audit Team conducted interviews with an FTEP Coordinator, on September 25, 2017 and the FTEP Sergeant on October 11, 2017 at the Training Division.

Because FTOs are required to complete evaluations and recruits are required to complete self-assessments, access to ADORE in the field is critical. This can be difficult with only one computer in the patrol vehicle.

Precinct RTSs are required to notify FTEP of changes in the RTS or Scheduling Sergeant assignments. As a part of supervisor training, sergeants are regularly rotated through the RTS position at the precinct level. The rotation of supervisory staff hampers direct communication with FTEP. Consequently, instead of communicating with the RTS or Scheduling Sergeant, FTEP communicates directly with precinct command and staff.

The RTS is required to notify the Training division (in writing) of any performance deficiencies with FTOs. In practice, the FTEP coordinators struggle to get an accurate assessment of FTO performance from the precincts.

A review of documentation of training phase, timelines and evaluations for probationary officers found⁴:

- All probationary recruits were rotated between at least two precincts.
- All phase 5 probationary recruits were assigned the same day off as their FTO.
- No probationary recruits were assigned to the same FTO for more than two consecutive training periods.
- No probationary recruits were assigned to any plain clothes, undercover assignments.
- All 2016 probationary recruits had records of an expected start date, an actual start date, and completed weekly evaluations for each phase.



CRITERIA 85F: Training on Specific Areas of Officer Responsibilities

Conclusions The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- During interviews both the FTEP Sergeant and the FTEP coordinator were able to outline the FTO selection process for the Audit Team in accordance with SOP 3-4.
- Due to the high turnover of RTS at the precincts, communication between FTEP and RTSs is inconsistent. It is unclear whether the RTSs at the precincts are aware of the responsibilities of FTOs and their own responsibility to evaluate FTO performance. This feedback was received from the Training Division; however, it was beyond the scope of this audit to interview the RTSs.

Recommendations 85f-1 Each recruit would benefit from an assigned iPad, tablet, or a laptop for use during the probationary period. This would guarantee that both the FTO and recruit would have access to ADORE while in the field and would encourage timely evaluation/self-assessment.

85f-2 Because the specific roles performed by the FTEP coordinators (ADORE administration, for example) lack crossover, the Audit Team recommends that within 18 months the FTEP coordinators and FTEP Sergeant develop handoff documents outlining specific processes and procedures for the roles they fulfill.

85f-3 The Training Manager should update Directive 1501.00 to reflect current practice regarding communication between FTEP Coordinators and Precincts.

85f-4 The Training Manager should update Directive 1501.00 to reflect current practice regarding FTEP Coordinator responsibilities (7.4.1.2, 7.4.1.3, 7.4.1.4) as it pertains to FTO performance review.



CRITERIA 85G: Directives

Background USDOJ SA paragraph 85g:

“ensures that sworn PPB members are provided a copy of all PPB directives and policies issued pursuant to this agreement, and sign a statement acknowledging that they have received, read and had an opportunity to ask questions about the directives and/or policies within 30 days of the release of the policy.”

A Lieutenant, who reports directly to the Commander of the Professional Standards Division (PSD), supervises the Policy Development Team (PDT). The PDT consists of a Senior Management Analyst (SMA), and a Management Analyst (MA).

Observations and Findings

The Audit Team interviewed the PDT on August 31, 2017. The Team conducted an additional interview with an Application Analyst (AA) assigned to the Information Technology Division on September 21, 2017 to further gain insight into directive acknowledgment.

With regard to member questions about directives, a process exists whereby questions are submitted by officers, reviewed by the supervising PDT Lieutenant, and archived in a database. When captured this way, comments or feedback can be organized by subject matter and forwarded to the appropriate training instructor or RU manager. Occasionally, bureau-wide emails are sent out to clarify an issue that has been identified by means of this process. PDT analysts are working on a more efficient method for collecting feedback through a non-email based platform. (cont.)

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85G: Directives

Observations and Findings (cont.)

Members have a 30 day window to read, test-on, and acknowledge the directive. The Directive Acknowledgement system identifies personnel by their network sign-on regardless of the DPSST entered. This prevents inaccurate reporting of outstanding acknowledgements due to member typos. When a member has not signed their directive in a timely fashion, a series of notifications are made. Upon release of a directive, members who do not sign receive the following notifications:

- 15 days – The member receives a notification that the directive has not been signed.
- 20 days – The member receives a notification that the directive still has not been signed.
- 22 days – A notification is sent to the member, their command, and administrative staff.
- After 30 days – No additional notification is sent; notification that had been previously posted on the member’s PPB portal page is no longer displayed.

Generally, those who do not sign within the 30-day acknowledgement period are out on FMLA or extended leave. Leave policy requires that upon a member’s return to duty, they are required to read, test-on and acknowledge all directives enacted during the member’s leave.

The Audit Team was granted access to the Directives Acknowledgement system and assessed the records for PPB members with outstanding Directives. Seven members had 7 or more unsigned directives in 2016. None of these members were on FMLA, and nearly half were reserve officers.

PORTLAND
POLICE



CRITERIA 85G: Directives

Conclusions The Audit Team reached the following conclusions during the engagement:

- The current Directive Acknowledgment process does not provide for a notification of directives outstanding beyond 30 days.
- Reserve Officers make up a disproportionate number of members with unsigned directives.
- Currently there is no consequence for failure to sign and acknowledge directives.

Recommendations 85g-1 The Audit Team recommends that a process be developed and implemented that would deliver an additional notification of outstanding directives to members when the directives become 60 days outstanding.

85g-2 The Audit Team recommends the continual display of outstanding directives on the member's PPB portal page, regardless of how long the directive has gone unsigned.

85g-3 The Audit Team recommends the development and implementation of a quality assurance mechanism for the directive review process by Reserve Officers.

85g-4 The Audit Team recommends the development and implementation of an accountability process for a member's failure to acknowledge directives.



Appendix 85a-1: Source Material Used in the Needs Assessment

Source Material Used in the 2016 Needs Assessment														
DOI Settlement Agreement Item	Survey	In-person Meetings	Conference / Trainings	FPDR Injury Data	PPB Injury Log	UoF Cases	IAD Cases	Email	Complaint Data	Community Reports	City Attorney's Office Report	LE Research Journals	PPB Policy	Oregon Change Law Report
79a - Trends in Hazards	X	X	X											
79b - Analysis Ofc. Safety	X	X		X	X	X		X						
79c - Misconduct Complaints		X							X					
79d - Problematic UoF						X	X							
79e - All Members/Levels Input	X	X						X						
79f - Community Input	X	X								X				
79g - Court Decisions Concerns		X									X			
79h - Best Practice Research			X											
79i - Law Enforcement Trends			X									X		
79j - Precinct Needs		X												
79k - Oregon/Federal Law Changes		X									X		X	X





Appendix 85d-1: Officer Record Review

Methodology

In order to assess the maintenance and accuracy of training records, including substance and attendance, the Audit Team reviewed records for a random sample of 501 sworn officers (to include 100% of supervisors and 2016 probationary officers). Ultimately, the random sample included 324 officers, 20 probationary officers, and 157 supervisors. In order to achieve a 95% confidence interval with +/- 3.5%, analysts randomly selected 332 officers. During the audit, auditors discovered that eight officers in the sample were members of outside agencies. These members were removed from the sample, leaving the final sample of 324 officers. The training records of members on FMLA during 2016 were not reviewed for In-service attendance or recertification. The training records of members on FMLA were assessed only for retraining upon return to service.

Summary of Findings

For members who were not supervisors or probationary officers in 2016:

- 18/324 records (5.6%) were missing at least one of the required 2016 In-service courses
- 16/324 records (4.9%) were missing a Field Training program
- 14/324 records (4.3%) were missing 8 hours of annual firearms or use of force training
- 10/324 records (3.1%) were missing current first aid / CPR certification training
- 7/324 records (2.2%) were missing 60 hours of other training
- 7/324 records (2.2%) were missing Advanced Academy training

For members who were supervisors in 2016:

- 12/157 records (7.6%) were missing 24 hours of supervisor/leadership training
- 8/157 records (5.1%) were missing initial supervisor training
- 7/157 records (4.5%) were missing at least one of the required 2016 In-service courses
- 3/157 records (1.9%) were missing 8 hours of annual firearms or use of force training
- 0/157 records (0%) were missing current first aid / CPR certification training
- 0/157 records (0%) were missing 36 hours of other training

For members who were probationary officers in 2016⁵:

- 14/20 records (70.0%) were missing Gas Mask Fit & Training
- 11/20 records (55.0%) were missing CPR / First Aid /AED
- 11/20 records (55.0%) were missing Firearms – New Hires training
- 7/20 records (35.0%) were missing Firearms/Use of Force training
- 5/20 records (25.0%) were missing LEDS certification
- 1/20 record (5.0%) was missing DPSST Basic Police Academy
- 1/20 record (5.0%) was missing FTEP Orientation
- 1/20 record (5.0%) was missing PPB Advanced Academy 2016
- 0/20 records (0%) were missing CEW training



Appendix 85d-1: Officer Record Review

Summary of Findings (cont.)

For members who held an AR-15 certification in 2016:

- 17/103 records (16.5%) were missing the required number of qualifications

For members who held a Less Lethal certification in 2016:

- 14/124 (11.3%) were missing the required number of qualifications

For members who held a Shotgun certification in 2016:

- 40/501 (8.0%) were missing the required number of qualifications

For members who held an ECIT certification in 2016:

- 2/64 (5.9%) were missing the required training

For members who held an FTO certification in 2016:

- 1/81 (1.2%) was missing the required training

For members who were absent from full-duty for 30 or more days in 2016:

- 9/57 records (15.8%) were missing qualification/re-certification with their PPB authorized sidearm, electronic control weapon (ECW), or other equipment as required by directive
- 3/57 (5.3%) were missing other required trainings for 2016



Appendix 85f-1: Probationary Officer Assignment and Phase Requirements

Probationary Officers and FTEP Assignment Requirements						
Hire Date	Ofc was rotated between at least two precincts	Was the recruit assigned to the same FTO for more than 2 consecutive training periods?	Was the recruit assigned to any plainclothes, undercover assignments?	Are Phase V recruit officers assigned the same day off as their mentor?	Officer Hire Date - Sworn in and assigned to FTEP	
Officer 1	1/22/2015	Y	N	Y	4/2/2015	
Officer 2	1/22/2015	Y	N	Y	4/2/2015	
Officer 3	2/19/2015	Y	N	Y	5/28/2015	
Officer 4	2/26/2015	Y	N	Y	5/28/2015	
Officer 5	3/12/2015	Y	N	Y	5/28/2015	
Officer 6	3/26/2015	Y	N	Y	5/28/2015	
Officer 7	5/28/2015	Y	N	Y	5/28/2015	
Officer 8	6/4/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	
Officer 9	7/9/2015	Y	N	Y	7/9/2015	
Officer 10	7/16/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	
Officer 11	7/30/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	
Officer 12	8/27/2015	Y	N	Y	8/27/2015	
Officer 13	8/27/2015	Y	N	Y	8/27/2015	
Officer 14	10/8/2015	Y	N	Y	1/28/2016	
Officer 15	10/22/2015	Y	N	Y	10/22/2015	
Officer 16	11/19/2015	Y	N	Y	1/28/2016	
Officer 17	11/19/2015	Y	N	Y	1/7/2016	
Officer 18	6/4/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	
Officer 19	7/30/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	
Officer 20	6/4/2015	Y	N	Y	7/30/2015	

	Probationary Officers and FTEP Phase Assignment and Completion																						
	Entry Phase				Phase I				Phase II				Phase III				Phase IV				Phase V		
Officer#	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)	Expected Phase Start Date	Actual Phase Start Date	Completed weekly evaluations (projected)		
Officer1	9/8/2015	9/8/2015	Y	10/1/2015	9/25/2015	Y	11/5/2015	11/6/2015	Y	12/30/2015	12/31/2015	Y	6/2/2016	5/26/2016	Y	7/7/2016	7/7/2016	Y	8/16/2016	8/17/2016	Y		
Officer2	9/8/2015	9/8/2015	Y	10/1/2015	10/6/2015	Y	11/5/2015	11/25/2015	Y	12/30/2015	1/28/2016	Y	6/2/2016	7/14/2016	Y	7/24/2016	7/24/2016	Y	8/16/2016	10/2/2016	Y		
Officer3	11/5/2015	11/5/2015	Y	12/1/2015	12/1/2015	Y	1/7/2016	1/10/2016	Y	6/7/2016	5/30/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/7/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/16/2016	Y	8/16/2016	10/2/2016	Y		
Officer4	11/5/2015	11/5/2015	Y	12/1/2015	10/1/2015	Y	1/7/2016	1/27/2016	Y	6/7/2016	6/7/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/14/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/14/2016	Y	8/30/2016	9/18/2016	Y		
Officer5	11/5/2015	11/5/2015	Y	12/1/2015	12/1/2015	Y	1/7/2016	1/28/2016	Y	6/7/2016	6/22/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/7/2016	Y	7/12/2016	8/16/2016	Y	8/30/2016	9/19/2016	Y		
Officer6	11/5/2015	11/5/2015	Y	12/1/2015	12/1/2015	Y	1/7/2016	1/7/2016	Y	6/7/2016	6/7/2016	Y	7/12/2016	7/15/2016	Y	7/12/2016	9/20/2016	Y	8/16/2016	9/20/2016	Y		
Officer7	6/24/2015	6/24/2015	Y	7/22/2015	7/18/2015	Y	8/26/2015	8/1/2015	Y	8/30/2015	10/2/2015	Y	5/16/2016	5/16/2016	Y	6/21/2016	6/21/2016	Y	6/21/2016	9/21/2016	Y		
Officer8	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	6/7/2016	Y	7/5/2016	7/5/2016	Y	8/9/2016	8/10/2016	Y	9/13/2016	9/21/2016	Y	10/19/2016	9/22/2016	Y	10/19/2016	9/22/2016	Y		
Officer9	11/2/2015	11/2/2015	Y	12/10/2015	1/2/2016	Y	1/4/2016	2/9/2016	Y	2/25/2016	3/23/2016	Y	3/31/2016	4/30/2016	Y	5/5/2016	9/23/2016	Y	5/5/2016	9/23/2016	Y		
Officer10	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	5/18/2016	Y	7/5/2016	7/5/2016	Y	8/9/2016	9/9/2016	Y	9/13/2016	11/11/2016	Y	10/18/2016	9/24/2016	Y	10/18/2016	9/24/2016	Y		
Officer11	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	6/4/2016	Y	7/5/2016	7/11/2016	Y	8/9/2016	8/12/2016	Y	9/13/2016	9/14/2016	Y	10/18/2016	9/25/2016	Y	10/18/2016	9/25/2016	Y		
Officer12	5/25/2016	5/25/2016	Y	6/22/2016	7/2/2016	Y	7/27/2016	7/28/2016	Y	8/31/2016	9/1/2016	Y	10/5/2016	10/7/2016	Y	11/9/2016	9/26/2016	Y	11/9/2016	9/26/2016	Y		
Officer13	5/25/2016	5/25/2016	Y	6/22/2016	6/22/2016	Y	7/27/2016	7/27/2016	Y	8/31/2016	9/2/2016	Y	10/5/2016	10/7/2016	Y	11/9/2016	11/15/2016	Y	11/9/2016	11/15/2016	Y		
Officer14	6/30/2016	6/30/2016	Y	9/13/2016	9/11/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/12/2016	Y	11/22/2016	11/16/2016	Y	12/27/16	12/22/2016	Y	5/19/2017	6/3/2017	Y	5/19/2017	6/3/2017	Y		
Officer15	11/19/2015	11/19/2015	Y	12/17/2015	12/18/2015	Y	1/1/2016	6/4/2016	Y	6/14/2016	8/8/2016	Y	7/19/2016	9/10/2016	Y	8/13/2016	10/7/2016	Y	8/13/2016	10/7/2016	Y		
Officer16	6/30/2016	6/30/2016	Y	7/28/2016	7/30/2016	Y	9/1/2016	9/27/2016	Y	10/6/2016	12/21/2016	Y	11/6/2016	4/29/2017	Y	6/9/2017	6/5/2017	Y	6/9/2017	6/5/2017	Y		
Officer17	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	6/30/2016	Y	7/5/2016	7/25/2016	Y	8/9/2016	8/28/2016	Y	9/13/2016	10/5/2016	Y	10/18/2016	11/30/2016	Y	10/18/2016	11/30/2016	Y		
Officer18	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	5/36/2016	Y	7/6/2016	7/6/2016	Y	8/10/2016	8/10/2016	Y	9/13/2016	9/20/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/30/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/30/2016	Y		
Officer19	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	5/26/2016	Y	7/6/2016	6/29/2016	Y	8/10/2016	8/3/2016	Y	9/13/2016	9/19/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/22/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/22/2016	Y		
Officer20	1/4/2016	1/4/2016	Y	5/31/2016	5/25/2016	Y	7/6/2016	7/7/2016	Y	8/10/2016	8/10/2016	Y	4/26/16	9/13/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/19/2016	Y	10/18/2016	10/19/2016	Y		



Acronym Dictionary

AA	<i>Application Analyst</i>
ADORE	<i>Automated Observation Reports and Evaluations</i>
CDU	<i>Curriculum Development Unit</i>
COCL	<i>Compliance Officer and Community Liaison</i>
DPSST	<i>Department of Public Safety Standards and Training</i>
ECIT	<i>Enhanced Crisis Intervention Team</i>
EDU	<i>Explosive Disposal Unit</i>
FTEP	<i>Field Training and Evaluation Program</i>
FTO	<i>Field Training Officer</i>
IPR	<i>Independent Police Review</i>
LEDS	<i>Law Enforcement Data System</i>
MA	<i>Management Analyst</i>
NA	<i>Needs Assessment</i>
PASS	<i>Police Administrative Support Specialist</i>
PDT	<i>Policy Development Team</i>
PM	<i>Program Manager</i>
PPB	<i>Portland Police Bureau</i>
PSD	<i>Professional Standards Division</i>
RRT	<i>Rapid Response Team</i>
RTS	<i>Recruit Training Sergeant</i>
SA	<i>Settlement Agreement</i>
SERT	<i>Special Emergency Reaction Team</i>
SMA	<i>Senior Management Analyst</i>
SOP	<i>Standard Operating Procedure</i>
TDA	<i>Training Development Analyst</i>
USDOJ	<i>United States Department of Justice</i>