



## CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON



### Bureau of Police

Ted Wheeler, Mayor

Danielle M. Outlaw, Chief of Police

1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue • Portland, OR 97204 • Phone: 503-823-0000

Integrity • Compassion • Accountability • Respect • Excellence • Service

## Directive 640.18, Case Management Executive Summary

### Introduction

The Portland Police Bureau (PPB) created Directive 640.18, Case Management System, in 2008 and last revised it in 2009. The Policy Development Team initiated the review process in response to member feedback indicating that the directive was outdated. The Bureau posted the directive on its website for public comment in April and September of 2019, respectively.

### Public Comments

The Bureau received limited feedback between both comment periods. Two main concerns identified include the timeline between when supervisors and members should meet to review open cases and how often members should check their work queues in the Record Management System (RMS).

#### *Timeline for reviewing open cases between supervisors and members*

A couple of public commenters expressed concern over the original (60 days) and proposed (90 days) amount of time for reviewing open cases between supervisors and members and believed the timeline should be shortened; however, high case volume and limited resources prevent supervisors from always conducting in-person meetings with each member about all open cases. Supervisors do monitor and review the progress of open cases in the RMS despite their practical inability to conduct face-to-face discussions with members about every aspect of case progress. Additionally, nothing in the directive restricts members from updating their supervisor of the progress of a case at any given time.

#### *Members checking their work queue on a more frequent basis*

A public commenter questioned whether members checking their work queues in the RMS on a weekly basis was sufficient and suggested that members review their work queue daily. Again, high case volume imposes challenges that make maintaining a daily review schedule unrealistic and impracticable for members. Subject matter experts agreed that incorporating a timeframe into the directive was necessary to ensure accountability, but they were also mindful that members could reasonably comply with established review requirements.

### The Bureau's Revised Policy

Beginning with definitions, the Policy Development Team substantially revised the directive to adequately reflect how members and supervisors should be using the system. In section 1, the directive provides more guidance on member responsibilities for using the RMS. The directive makes clear that members must utilize the RMS to track assigned cases, and upload and update case information as an investigation progresses. The directive also identifies criteria the supervisor relies on to determine whether to assign a case for a follow-up investigation (section 2.2). Additionally, the directive now grants Responsibility Unit Managers the authority to assign any case at their discretion. References throughout the directive were updated to replace outdated terminology with the correct information about technology systems that are currently in use.

The Bureau believes that the revised directive provides clearer guidance to its members; however, any suggestions to further improve this policy are welcome during its next review.

Directive 640.18, Case Management System, will go into effect on January 2, 2020

Published on 12/3/19

## 640.18, Case Management

### Definitions:

- **Case Assignment:** Police reports submitted by an initial officer that are determined by a supervisor or detective sergeant that an investigation is warranted are then assigned to a member by using the Record Management System (RMS). Assigned cases will typically be identified as “Open” (O), “Pending Additional Information” (U), or “Arrest Protective Custody” (D) in the RMS until the disposition code is changed to a closure status.
- **Disposition Codes:** Identifiers listed in the RMS to describe the status of a case. Commonly used codes by members include inactive/suspended, unfounded, or one of the referral options.
- **Investigation:** For the purpose of this directive, a case that warrants further follow-up to identify a suspect(s) or locate evidence is assigned to a specific sworn member. Misdemeanor investigations are generally conducted at the precinct level. Felony crimes and aggregate misdemeanor crimes are reviewed by the appropriate investigative unit under the Investigations Branch, with the exception of stolen or recovered vehicles without suspect leads.
- **Record Management System (RMS):** A central database of police reports, name records, and other report data. Investigating members, detectives, and supervisors will use the RMS to document the progress of a case, track the status on each assigned case, and monitor all cases assigned for follow up.

### Policy:

1. This directive establishes the procedures for Portland Police Bureau (PPB) members who use the Bureau’s Record Management System (RMS) to manage investigative cases. Case management is a continuous and ongoing process that requires regular maintenance of information by investigating members and supervisors.

### Procedure:

1. Member Responsibilities.
  - 1.1. On a weekly basis, members shall log into RMS to monitor assigned cases and identify any new cases assigned to them by their supervisor.
  - 1.2. Members shall update case information in the RMS as an investigation progresses.
    - 1.2.1. Members may use additional resources such as Microsoft Office applications to supplement the management of documentation (e.g., images, spreadsheets) through the course of their investigation.
    - 1.2.2. Investigative work using other resources must be added to the RMS in a timely manner.
  - 1.3. Members shall review their assigned cases every 90 days and document changes and follow-up as needed.

- 1.4. Members shall input a closure status code at the conclusion or suspension of an investigation. For suspended cases, members shall provide a brief text entry, clarifying the closure status.
2. Supervisors Responsibilities.
  - 2.1. Supervisors shall use the RMS to track case progress in order to maintain uniformity and supervisory control regarding the assignment and closure of cases assigned for follow-up investigation.
  - 2.2. Supervisors shall review incoming police reports that are routed to their case management queue and determine the appropriate course. Supervisors shall determine whether to suspend further investigation of a case, assign an investigator to a case, or send the case to another responsibility unit (RU) for review.
    - 2.2.1. Supervisors shall evaluate whether to assign a case to an investigator based on the following criteria which include, but are not limited to:
      - 2.2.1.1. Physical custody of the suspect,
      - 2.2.1.2. Name of suspect is known,
      - 2.2.1.3. Serial pattern crimes,
      - 2.2.1.4. Level of violence or severity of the crime (Measure 11),
      - 2.2.1.5. Presence of physical or electronic evidence, or
      - 2.2.1.6. Cooperation of the victim(s) and/or witness(es).
    - 2.2.2. If a supervisor determines that there is not enough information to assign a case to an investigator, they shall suspend the case in RMS using an appropriate closure status code. When needed, supervisors who suspend a case shall document the reason for the closure.
  - 2.3. Supervisors shall ensure cases that are being actively investigated or reopened from a suspended status are identified in the RMS as “open” and have an investigator assigned.
  - 2.4. Supervisors shall review each member’s assigned cases every 90 days for updates. Supervisors shall follow up on cases flagged as “overdue” in the RMS and assign more time on the case or cease further investigation.
3. Responsibility Unit Manager or Designee Responsibilities.
  - 3.1. The RU Manager may directly assign a case at their discretion.
  - 3.2. The RU Manager or their designee shall log into RMS every 180 days, at a minimum, to check case statuses.
    - 3.2.1. The RU Manager and any designee must have adequate permissions within the RMS.
  - 3.3. The RU Manager of Detectives shall review case management queues and determine the threshold for overload and acceptable work load by unit.

**History:**

- Originating Directive Date: 10/06/08
- Last Revision Signed: 12/03/19

- Effective Date: 01/02/20
- Next Review Date: 01/02/22

## **640.18—CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM POLICY, Case Management**

The System (CMS) is used to manage and track cases and information reported, reviewed and assigned to members conducting follow up on cases. The CMS system is also used to assign disposition codes to cases that no longer need follow up investigation. Detectives, officers with investigative duties, and PASS personnel, as designated by a supervisor, are required to use the CMS on all cases reviewed and assigned to be investigated.

When members are involved in investigations that require follow up or a change in a disposition code, the member will ensure that the CMS is initiated and updated as needed. Members will contact the responsible person in their RU tasked with managing the CMS to make the necessary changes.

### **PROCEDURE (640.18)**

#### **Directive Specific**

#### **Definitions (640.18):**

Case Management System: Sub-system of the Portland Police Data System (PPDS).

PPDS: A Portland police data tracking system.

#### **Code Definitions (640.18)**

a. Exceptionally Cleared (EX): Clear status is cases where:

1. Offender is deceased.
2. Denial of extradition because the offender committed a crime in another jurisdiction and is being prosecuted for that offense.
3. Victim refuses to cooperate; victim does not wish to prosecute. Members must meet the following four conditions in order to clear an offense under this sub-section. Members must have:
  - a) Identified the offender.
  - b) Gathered enough evidence to support an arrest, make a charge, and turn over the offender to the court for prosecution.
  - c) Identified the offender's exact location so that the suspect could be taken into custody immediately.
  - d) Victim's refusal to cooperate with the prosecution after the offender has been identified.
4. Suspect has active warrant and dies.
5. Juvenile offense for minor offenses is handled verbally or by written notice to parents.
  6. Statute of limitations is up on the case.
  7. The recovery of property does not clear an offense.
- b. Fugitive (FG) — Pending Status: Suspect is identified and has an active warrant out for their arrest, and is not in custody.
- e. Investigative Arrest (IA) — Clear Status: As a result of an investigation, suspect is arrested, charged with an offense and the investigation is forwarded to court for prosecution.
- d. Pending (PE) — Pending Status: Case is open and the investigation is pending.
- e. Received (RC) — Pending Status: Case has been reviewed but not assigned for investigation.
- f. Refer to District Attorney (DA) — Pending Status: Investigation has been forwarded to District Attorney's office for review. Case status will remain in pending status until changed by investigating agency.
- g. Refer to Inter-department Division. (RD) — Pending: Investigation responsibility of case is transferred from one division to another.
- h. Refer to Outside Agency (RF) Cleared Status: Investigation is transferred to jurisdictional agency.
- i. Suspended (SP) — Suspended Status: Case is suspended due to unavailability of victim or investigation is unable to develop any tangible leads.
- j. Unfounded (UN) — Cleared Status: Allegations are determined to be false or baseless (i.e., crime did not occur).

- Case Assignment: Police reports submitted by an initial officer that are determined by a supervisor or detective sergeant that an investigation is warranted are then assigned to a member by using the Record Management System (RMS). Assigned cases will typically be identified as "Open" (O), "Pending Additional Information" (U), or "Arrest Protective Custody" (D) in the RMS until the disposition code is changed to a closure status.

- Disposition Codes: Identifiers listed in the RMS to describe the status of a case. Commonly used codes by members include inactive/suspended, unfounded, or one of the referral options.
- Investigation: For the purpose of this directive, a case that warrants further follow-up to identify a suspect(s) or locate evidence is assigned to a specific sworn member. Misdemeanor investigations are generally conducted at the precinct level. Felony crimes and aggregate misdemeanor crimes are reviewed by the appropriate investigative unit under the Investigations Branch, with the exception of stolen or recovered vehicles without suspect leads.
- Record Management System (RMS): A central database of police reports, name records, and other report data. Investigating members, detectives, and supervisors will use the RMS to document the progress of a case, track the status on each assigned case, and monitor all cases assigned for follow up.

**Policy:**

1. This directive establishes the procedures for Portland Police Bureau (PPB) members who use the Bureau's Record Management System (RMS) to manage investigative cases. Case management is a continuous and ongoing process that requires regular maintenance of information by investigating members and supervisors.

**Procedure:**

**1. Member Responsibilities ~~(640.18)~~**

- 1.1. On a weekly basis, members shall log into RMS to monitor assigned cases and identify any new cases assigned to them by their supervisor.
- 1.2. Members shall update case information in the RMS as an investigation progresses.
  - 1.2.1. Members may use additional resources such as Microsoft Office applications to supplement the management of documentation (e.g., images, spreadsheets) through the course of their investigation.
  - 1.2.2. Investigative work using other resources must be added to the RMS in a timely manner.
- 1.3. Members shall review their assigned cases every 90 days and document changes and follow-up as needed.
- 1.4. Members shall input a closure status code at the conclusion or suspension of an investigation. For suspended cases, members shall provide a brief text entry, clarifying the closure status.

**2. Supervisors' Responsibilities.**

- ~~1.1.2.1.~~ Supervisors shall use the RMS to track case progress in order to maintain uniformity and supervisory control regarding the assignment and closure of cases assigned for follow-up investigation. ~~When applicable, cases that do not require any case follow up will be assigned disposition codes.~~

- ~~a. Upon receiving or initiating a case which meets the criteria, notify supervisor to enter case information into the CMS.~~
- ~~b. Ensure the CMS is updated as the investigation progresses.~~
- ~~c. Ensure cases are assigned disposition code at conclusion or suspension of investigation.~~
- ~~d. Review monthly Information Technology Division (ITD) CMS status reports and ensure case status is appropriate.~~

2.2. Supervisors shall review incoming police reports that are routed to their case management queue and determine the appropriate course. Supervisors shall determine whether to suspend further investigation of a case, assign an investigator to a case, or send the case to another responsibility unit (RU) for review.

2.2.1. Supervisors shall evaluate whether to assign a case to an investigator based on the following criteria which include, but are not limited to:

- 2.2.1.1. Physical custody of the suspect,
- 2.2.1.2. Name of suspect is known,
- 2.2.1.3. Serial pattern crimes,
- 2.2.1.4. Level of violence or severity of the crime (Measure 11),
- 2.2.1.5. Presence of physical or electronic evidence, or
- 2.2.1.6. Cooperation of the victim(s) and/or witness(es).

2.2.2. If a supervisor determines that there is not enough information to assign a case to an investigator, they shall suspend the case in RMS using an appropriate closure status code. When needed, supervisors who suspend a case shall document the reason for the closure.

2.3. Supervisors shall ensure cases ~~are~~ that are being actively investigated or reopened from a suspended status are identified in the RMS as “open” and have an investigator assigned.

2.4. Supervisors shall review each member’s assigned cases every 90 days for updates. Supervisors shall follow up on cases flagged as “overdue” in the RMS and assign more time on the case or cease further investigation.

### 2.3. Responsibility Unit Manager or Designee Responsibilities.

3.1. The RU Manager may directly assign a case at their discretion.

3.2. The RU Manager or their designee shall log into RMS every 180 days, at a minimum, to check case statuses.

3.2.1. The RU Manager and any designee must have adequate permissions within the RMS.

The RU Manager of Detectives shall review case management queues and determine the threshold for overload and acceptable work load by unit.

- ~~a. Ensure that the CMS is being used properly. Supervisor will suspend, clear or pend case during the review process whenever possible. See Code Definition section.~~
- ~~b. Review incoming reports and enter into the CMS when applicable.~~
- ~~c. Review member’s monthly status reports.~~
- ~~d. Meet with each member at least every 60 days to discuss case progress.~~
- ~~e. With the exception of Homicide investigations, fatal traffic collision investigations, and missing persons, cases that are 60 days or older shall be reviewed~~



~~and suspended if appropriate. Supervisor will determine the best appropriate action with input from the investigator.~~

~~f. In order to provide an accurate monthly report, supervisors will provide ITD with a current roster of the detail members' names, DPSSTs and assigned detail or precinct.~~

**~~RU Manager Responsibilities (640.18)~~**

~~a. Review members' monthly CMS status reports to ensure compliance with directive.~~

~~b. Coordinate the CMS and recommend improvements as necessary.~~

**~~RESPONSIBILITY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTROL (640.18)~~**

~~2.1.3.3. The Detective Division is responsible for maintenance and changes regarding this directive. Changes or issues regarding this procedure should be directed to the Detective RU manager.~~

#1

1st Universal Review: 4/1/19-4/16/19

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 10:06:16 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 10:45:41 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:39:25  
**IP Address:**

---

Page 1

**Q1** Please provide feedback for this directive

1. The abbreviation "RU" is not defined in the text of this policy section.

2. Under Code Definitions: a. Exceptionally Cleared (EX):

"7. The recovery of property does not clear an offense."

This statement does not make sense in the context of the definition.

3. Under Code Definitions: c. Investigative Arrest (IA):

"...forwarded to court for prosecution." Should be forwarded to DA for prosecution.

4. Under Supervisor Responsibilities: subsection d:

Meeting with members "every 60 days" seems like a very long time between case reviews. This should be a balance of prioritizing service to victims and the span of command for the supervisor. It seems reasonable that a supervisor could meet with members every 14 days (or less) to discuss open cases and their progress. This avoids losing focus and interest on cases and demonstrate the Bureau's dedication to protecting the public.

4. No option to close a case if the victim decides to discontinue an investigation.

Although I believe a request by a victim should be met with skepticism, there are times when a case can be resolved without any of the previously mentioned clearance causes. For example:

a. if the victim feels the effort to continue an investigation is not justified because the complaint and impact is minor;

b. if the victim determines that a crime did not, in fact, occur - property was misplaced not stolen, unlawful entry was really an authorized person; or

c. a resolution between the victim and a suspected party, like neighborhood complaints or family disputes.

However, to verify that the victim is not requesting a case closure due to intimidation from a suspect, I also believe that this type of clearance should require the department manager or lieutenant to approve.

5. Is the RU Manager a supervisor of the Supervisors? If so, there should also be a minimum review timeline with the supervisors, as supervisors have with members. Maybe not to discuss the progress of specific cases, but rather any issues or effectiveness topics.

---

**Q2** Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

---

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** RE: Directives for Universal Review and Comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 3, 2019 10:57:14 AM

---

Directive 640.18:

This directive needs a complete re-write due to CMS/PPDS no longer existing.

Exceptional Clearance should be updated to match RegJIN and the NIBRS definitions.

## 2nd Universal Review: 9/16/19-10/16/19

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** RE: Directives for Universal Review and Comment  
**Date:** Monday, September 16, 2019 10:56:15 AM

---

- Definitions
  - Case assignment: Should remove “(O)” after “Assigned cases will typically be identified with an Open...”, as the “O” code is specific to our RMS and the next RMS may use a different code for Open.
  - Investigation: I think Investigations Branch should be capitalized in the final sentence
- Procedure
  - 1.1: Is a weekly basis sufficiently frequent? Sworn members should be reviewing their work queues on a daily basis
  - 1.2.1: I’d like this to be rephrased so that external applications are not used for the **management** of documentation, but are instead allowable for the purposes of storing **draft** or **incomplete** work. The only management of documentation should occur in RMS, DIMS, or through PED, depending on the type of documentation/evidence
  - 1.2.2: “timely manner” really should be defined if we’re holding people to it, otherwise it’s highly subjective
  - 1.3: Every 90 days is too long of a timeframe. As an example, if a person is missing, by statute we must attempt to collect DNA and dental records within 30 days of the original report. As written, this would allow for a member to not follow ORS and yet not be held accountable through this directive. It should read along the lines of “every 30 days or more frequently as warranted or directed by a supervisor”
  - 1.4: I’d suggest using “case status code” instead of “closure status code,” as that’s more in line both with how the RMS presents that data field and how we actually talk about case statuses
  - 2.2.2: “When needed” is highly subjective. We should either specify that supervisors document the reason whenever they suspend a case, or provide guidance on when that action is expected of them
  - 2.4: As written, we’re not providing any expectation that the supervisors actually discuss with investigators the reasons why a case is overdue. Merely assigning more time is kicking the can down the road.
  - 3.1.1: Not sure if this is necessary here. If it is, it should actually be listed as a responsibility of the Technology Integration Group (fka RegJIN team), as they are the ones who manage permissions
  - 3.2: Why are we singling out just Detectives when other RUs have investigators who are held to the same standards of this Directive? What action are we expecting the RU Manager of Detectives to take if the threshold is exceeded? If we don’t specify what we want to do with that information, we’re just creating busy work.