

# OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

## Community Policing Plan/Task 47 Audit Report

Project No.: E2013OPDT47CP-B

Project Manager: Dawn Reynolds, JD, CLEA, CPO

Staff Auditor: Christopher Figueroa, DPA, CGAP, CFE, CFS, CLEA, CRMA



**FINAL**

## Table of Contents

Audit Report	
• Purpose	1
• Background	1
• Prior Audits	2
• Reference Material	2
• Audit Period and Population	2
• Audit Steps/Methodology	3
• Audit Steps	3
• Methodology	4
• Summary of Findings	6
• Objective 3 – Task 47.3 Develop Mechanisms to Measure its Community Policing and Problems Solving Activities	7
▪ Objective 3.1 – Each Reviewing Supervisor Shall Ensure PAR Forms Were Completed	10
▪ Objective 3.2 – Each Reviewing Commander Shall Ensure PAR Forms Were Completed	10
▪ Objective 3.3 - Data from the PAR forms was promptly entered in the database	10
• Objective 4 – Task 47.4 Task 47.4 Incorporate Positive Statistics on Community Policing and Problem Solving Activities in “Crime-Stop” Meetings and Information on Citizen Complaints and Use of Force Incidents	12
• Objective 5 – Task 47.5 Arranges meetings with established organizations, community or church groups within 60 days of request	13
• Recommendations/Action Taken	14
• Recommendations	14

**Community Policing Plan/Task 47 Audit Report  
Project No.: E2013OPDT47CP-B**

**Conducted by  
ELITE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT CONSULTANTS, LLC  
FOR  
OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**Date:** February 20, 14

**PURPOSE**

This audit was conducted in order to assess compliance of the Oakland Police Department (OPD) adherence to established policies and procedures, and Task 47 (Community Policing Plan) of the Negotiated Settlement Agreement (NSA) between Delphine Allen, et al. (Plaintiff) and the City of Oakland, et al. (Defendant).

**BACKGROUND**

On January 22, 2003, the OPD was placed under a NSA; the NSA was updated on February 4, 2004. The NSA's Task 47 requires that OPD:

Within 138 days from the effective date of this Agreement, OPD shall develop and implement a plan to strengthen its commitment to relationships with local communities including, but not limited to, the following:

- A. Host at least one (1) community meeting per quarter in each Patrol Service Area **(Objective 1)**.
- B. Each patrol supervisor, and officer assigned to a regular beat or geographic area of the City, shall attend a minimum of one (1) community meeting per quarter in the Area he/she is regularly assigned **(Objective 2)**.
- C. OPD shall develop mechanisms to measure its community policing and problem solving activities **(Objective 3)**.
- D. OPD shall incorporate positive statistics on community policing and problem solving activities in "*Crime-Stop*" meetings, along with information on citizen complaints and use of force incidents **(Objective 4)**.
- E. The appropriate Departmental personnel shall arrange a meeting within 60 days unless not feasible with representatives of an established organization active within Oakland (PUEBLO, ACLU, NAACP, etc.) community groups or church groups, if an organization communicates a concern regarding specific police personnel or practices **(Objective 5)**.

The OPD established policies and procedures to implement the requirements of Task 47. This included Department General Order (DGO) B-7 Public Appearances, dated December 30, 2005 and Policy 11-01, Bureau of Field Operations (BFO), Problem Solving Officer Deployment, dated May 27, 2011.

In consultation with OPD staff, this audit was bifurcated and only Objective 3 through 5 are addressed in this report. Objectives 1 and 2 were addressed in an earlier audit report, Project No. E2013OPDT47CP-A. Objectives 3 through 5 were more complex and need additional review, but the Department wanted immediate feedback on Objectives 1 and 2.

### **PRIOR AUDITS**

This was the first audit conducted by Elite Performance Assessment Consultants, LLC (EPAC), a contracted external consulting firm. The OPD has conducted several reviews and assessments to determine compliance with Task 47 (see References).

### **REFERENCE MATERIAL**

The reference materials used in this audit include:

- Negotiated Settlement Agreement (NSA) between Delphine Allen, et al. (plaintiff) and the City of Oakland, et al. (defendant), updated: February 4, 2004, at pages 42-43
- Departmental General Order (DGO) B-7: Public Appearances, December 16, 2003
- Bureau of Field Operations (BFO) Policy & Procedure Manual (P & P) 11-01
- Community Meetings Training Bulletin (TB) III-A.5 Community Oriented Policing
- 15<sup>th</sup> Report Monitor, October 31, 2013
- Oakland NSA Compliance Report,
- Oakland City Council Resolution 72727, Establishing Implementation of the City of Oakland's Community Policing Policy, June 11, 1996
- Oakland City Council Resolution 79235, Amending the City of Oakland's Community Policing Policy, to Provide a Structured Approach to Community Involvement.
- Measure "Y" Community Policing, April 15, 2011 Quarterly Report.<sup>1</sup>
- Best Practices Review, Oakland Police Department, Strategic Policy Partnership, October 31, 2013.
- Community Policing Defined, US Department of Justice, COPS.

### **AUDIT PERIOD AND POPULATION**

The audit scope for Objectives 3 through 5 was the established time frame from July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013. Objective 3 required OPD to develop mechanisms to measure its community policing and problem solving activities. The population for this objective included 106 PAR forms, the OPD Scanning, Analysis, Strategize, Response, Assessment (SARA) Activity Status spreadsheet, 40 SARA reports, and interviews with citizens. The interviews included two (2) Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council members, two (2) staff and one (1) volunteer responsible for Measure "Y" oversight, and one (1) individual responsible for Citizen's Complaint Review Board management.

---

<sup>1</sup> This was the most recent Measure Y Community Policing Report available on the city's website.

The EPAC staff conducted a stratified randomized sample from the established time frame indicated above. The time frame was stratified for the months of July, August and September. The EPAC then randomly selected an audit sample of 40 dates (14 for July, 14 for August and 12 for September) applying a one-tail test sample size calculation with a 95 percent confidence level, an expected error rate of six percent, and a precision of plus four percent. The dates specific for each month were selected using the results from the “Research Randomizer” ([www.randomizer.org](http://www.randomizer.org)) website. The SARA reports were selected from the randomized sample dates.

Objective 4 required OPD to incorporate community policing and problem solving activities in its "Crime Stop" meetings along with information on citizen complaints and use of force incidents. The population for this objective used the same stratified sample documented in Objective 3. The sample consisted of 40 Daily Policing Report (DPR) selected from the randomized sample dates. Interviews were conducted of three (3) Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council members. Two (2) Citizens Complaint Review Board Reports were reviewed.

It is important to note that since the adoption of the NSA the Department has changed many practices relating to Objective 4. “Crime Stop” meetings no longer exist and have been replaced with other means of gathering and reporting relevant information on a more regular and systematic basis. Most significantly, “Daily Crime Call” meetings, while relatively brief, are held each morning. Participants in the Daily Crime Call meetings discuss significant crime issues and have before them written Daily Policing Reports (DPR) that delineate complaints and use of force incidents that have come in within the previous 24 hours. The DPR reports also capture, to a lesser degree, directed policing activities in each of the divisions. While the Department also holds bi-weekly Compstat meetings on issues relating to crime, community-policing activities, problem solving activities and the OPD’s Ceasefire program, no written minutes or records are made of these meetings so the Compstat processes could not be audited.

Risk Management meetings are also held on a monthly basis and address many of the issues raised in the use-of-force and complaint reports. The Risk Management reports are an integral part of the ongoing oversight of the federal monitor’s work in tracking OPD’s progress in its investigation and handling of use-of-force allegations and complaints. The audit team found the DPR reports more timely and better suited to random sampling and auditing under the specified goals of Task 47.

Objective 5 required OPD to schedule meetings within 60 days of receiving it the request from established community and church groups. The population for Objective 5 consisted of 20 schedule memorandums from the office of the Chief of Police and interviewing (2) community leaders (see Table 1).

THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK  
(Continue on next page)

**TABLE 1 – AUDIT PERIOD AND POPULATION**

Objective	Period	Population
3. OPD develops mechanisms to measure its community policing and problem solving activities.	July 1 through September 30, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 106 PAR forms</li> <li>• 40 SARA forms</li> <li>• SARA activity status spreadsheet</li> <li>• Interviews with (2) Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council members.</li> <li>• Interviews with (2) staff and (1) volunteer responsible for Measure “Y” oversight.</li> <li>• Interview with (1) individual responsible for Citizen Complaint Review Board management</li> </ul>
4. OPD incorporates community policing and problem solving activities in its Crime Stop meetings along with information on citizen complaints and use of force incidents.	July 1 through September 30, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observation of a Crime Stop meeting.</li> <li>• 40 DPR forms</li> <li>• Review of DPRs</li> <li>• Review of Use of Force reports.</li> <li>• Review of Complaint Reports.</li> <li>• Interviews with (2) Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council members.</li> <li>• Review of (2) Citizen Complaint Review Board Reports.</li> </ul>
5. Appropriate personnel schedule meetings with established community groups, (including ACLU, NAACP, Pueblo) and church groups within 60 days of receiving a request.	July 1 through September 30, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with (2) community leaders</li> <li>• Review of (20) scheduling memorandum from the office of the Chief of Police</li> </ul>

**AUDIT STEPS/METHODOLOGY**

**Audit Steps:**

The following audit steps were followed to complete this audit. An opening conference was conducted with OPD staff to address the audit's procedures and to answer questions. The engagement was then assigned to an EPAC staff member who was selected as the Project Manager (PM) and contact person. A staff auditor (SA) was also assigned to conduct second level review.

The PM requested and received all or portions of the following documents from OPD staff:

- All Public Appearance Report (PAR) forms from July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013.
- All documentation of tracking Public Appearances.
- All reference documents (see Reference Material)
- SARA Activity Status spreadsheet
- SARA and DPR reports
- Minutes from a Crime Stop Meeting

- Use of Force/Complaint/Supervisory Intervention spreadsheet
- Scheduling memorandum from the Office of the Chief of Police

The PM reviewed the above listed documents and then prepared the Audit Work Plan Report documenting the engagement's process. The PM prepared the following Excel spreadsheets to test compliance

- The PAR Evaluation Form
- The PAR 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Totals
- SARA Reports Evaluation Form
- DPR Reports Evaluation Form
- Arranged Meetings with Established Organizations, Community or Church Groups Evaluation Form
- Interview Questionnaire

Task 47 Review Protocols specify the minimum compliance requirements for Objective 5 to be at 85%, while compliance with Objectives 3 and 4 was governed by the discretion of the auditor. The EPAC staff used 85% as the compliance standard for Objectives 3 and 4.

The EPAC audit staff conducted fieldwork by reviewing pertinent documents to determine the audit findings. The findings were analyzed and documented in the Audit Report. The EPAC staff contacted OPD staff for clarification of exceptions that were discovered during the audit engagement. This allowed OPD staff to respond and clarify the findings. The EPAC staff received OPD's responses and they were reviewed and considered.

The EPAC staff interviewed OPD staff, including command staff, along with volunteers working with Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils, civil rights leaders, and City staff responsible for Measure "Y" Compliance and civilian complaints. Communication with OPD staff and community members was either telephonic or through e-mail. The OPD staff provided the names and contact information for individuals who were interviewed.

After consultation with OPD staff, a decision was made to bifurcate the Task 47/Community Policing Plan audit engagement. The PM prepared this audit report and it was submitted to the OPD Audit Manager for OPD staff review and comment. An exit conference was conducted with OPD staff to discuss the audit findings.

### **Methodology:**

The EPAC staff followed the described methodology. All the documents were stratified by month within the established time frames. The EPAC auditors tabulated all PAR reports from July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013 and the information fields were measured for thoroughness, accuracy, supervisory controls and timely reporting of data.

Interviews were conducted with command staff (1), city officials (2), volunteers working with Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (2), the Executive Director of a local civil rights organization working on community policing issues (1). Individuals interviewed were asked a series of open and closed questions related to each of the Task 47 objectives.

Relevant to the requirement that the OPD develop measurement tools to assess its community policing and problem solving activities, interviews were used to supplement a review of the data provided by OPD staff on the SARA process.

Compliance with Objectives 3 through 5 was determined by reviewing the PAR reports, SARA reports, DPR reports, memos and conducting interviews. For Objective 3, EPAC auditors reviewed the PAR reports and tabulated their findings on the PAR 3rd Quarter Totals spreadsheet. Also SARA reports review results were tabulated.

The EPAC staff reviewed DPRs, Crime Stop meeting minutes and a Use of Force/Complaint/Supervisory Intervention spreadsheet to evaluate Objective 4. The PM also interviewed several individuals. Objective 5 consisted of reviewing Office of the Chief of Police memorandums and interviewing citizens.

After the reviews were completed, the PM analyzed the findings. The PM confirmed and tabulated the exceptions associated with the evaluated documents. All documents containing confirmed exceptions were considered out of compliance for the corresponding objective. A lack of documentation was also considered out of compliance. Documents that were unable to meet the standard for any one objective or any combination of objectives were considered out of compliance. The documents that were considered out of compliance were totaled and reported on by objective. The total number of documents compliant in any one objective was identified by a percentage relative to the respective NSA and OPD DGO mandates.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The OPD has undertaken a number of programs to enhance community policing objectives and focus resources on effective problem solving policing and has done so with marked results. Their approach has been described as “holistic” and the term seems apropos to the effort in policy development, training, deployment and outreach. From on-site visits, reviews of reports and interviews, the commitment to community policing appears at every level of OPD and its mission. Findings in this audit primarily relate to deficits in information management, training and supervision (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2 – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Objective No.	Objective Title	Task No.	DGO B7 ¶	Objective %	Objective Compliance
3.	OPD measures its community policing and problem solving activities.	47.3		82%	Non-Compliant
	A. SARA - Dates on Which Activities Were Logged	47.3		87%	Compliant
	B. SARA- Dates on Which Assessments Were Conducted	47.3		69%	Non-Compliant
	C. SARA- Steps Recorded-Process Completed in Sufficient Detail	47.3		89%	Compliant
3.1.	Each reviewing supervisor ensured PAR forms were completed per directive.	47.3	¶III. D	73%	Non-Compliant
3.2.	Each reviewing commander ensured PAR forms were completed per directive.	47.3	¶III. D	84%	Non-Compliant
3.3.	Data from the PAR forms was promptly entered in the database.	47.3	¶III. D	70%	Non-Compliant
4.	Incorporate positive statistics on community policing and problem solving activities in “Crime-Stop” meetings and information on citizen complaints and use of force incident	47.4		68%	Non-Compliant
4.1.	Crime-Stop meetings incorporate positive statistics on citizen complaints	47.4		90%	Compliant
4.2.	Crime-Stop meetings incorporate positive statistics on use of force.	47.4		98%	Compliant
5.	Arranges meetings with established organizations, community or church groups within 60 days of request	47.5		21%	Non-Compliant

**Objective 3 – Task 47.3 OPD measures its community policing and problem solving activities**

**Criteria**

The OPD shall develop mechanisms to measure its community policing and problem solving activities (Objective 3). Task 47.3 Review Protocol compliance for Objective 3 is Y/N and the measurement is at the discretion of the auditor. The EPAC staff chose 85%.

**Audit Procedure**

Two basic measurement instruments developed by the Department to measure problem-solving activities were reviewed. One was a review of documentation of the Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment (SARA) reports and the other was the Public Appearance Request (PAR). Broadly put, the SARA files document focused policing efforts to resolve specific crimes and problems in a specific area, while the PAR form captures request and presentation of community meetings. The PAR form’s audit procedures are documented under Objectives 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

The SARA approach to problem solving has been adopted by OPD and is a key component on how its Problem Solving officers work in their assigned areas. Per OPD staff, the primary tool for measuring Problem-Solving Policing is the SARA database.

The EPAC auditors reviewed the SARA Activity Status spreadsheet. It did not provide sufficient detail to determine whether SARA activities were being measured. Instead, the spreadsheet indicated only whether activity, primarily opening and closing a file, had occurred on a specific date. The SARA spreadsheet did not provide sufficient detail to allow for analysis of the SARA program and its efficacy as “a mechanism to measure community policing and problem solving.” EPAC auditors then requested individual, complete SARA files. There were 40 individual SARA files received and 39 were reviewed. One file was deselected due to being a duplicate. The individual SARA reports provided some insight.

The SARA files typically represent long-term projects that may go on for more than a year. Some of the reviewed files had been opened in 2011 and were still active in 2013. With the understanding that activities will not occur everyday, EPAC auditors counted any recorded activity that took place during the study period. This included the opening of the file (none were opened during the period), an entry in the response log, an assessment entry, or a closure date (no files were closed) on any of the selected dates within the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter of 2013. Each file was reviewed to determine whether responses to the identified SARA problem or assessments of the project had been recorded in the specified time period.

Each SARA file was also reviewed to determine whether key steps of the SARA process had been identified and specific information had been provided for the project. Under the “Scanning” part of the process, this information includes: identifying the specific problem, where the problem was occurring, why the problem continues, who the stakeholders are, causes of the problem, and a tentative goal. Under the Analysis portion of the project, EPAC staff looked to determine whether the officer had identified the analysis goals for the project. The bulk of each file reviewed was the Response part of the process or, in other words, what actions the officer has taken and on what dates. The Assessment part of the process requires a plan for the determining progress while the Assessment Log portion of the file is intended to documents, and tracks and help in determining what adjustments need to be made. One point was given for each part of the process the officer completed with no points given for areas left blank or which inadequately described the activity.

The areas that received the least amount of attention were developing an assessment plan and logging assessments. In some instances there were only one or two entries for projects that had been continuing for over a year (see Tables 3, 4, and 5).

**SARA TABLES****TABLE 3 – A. SARA - DATES ON WHICH ACTIVITIES WERE LOGGED**

Total Number of Days Activities Recorded	Total Number of Work Papers	Percentage of Days Activity was Recorded
33	39	87%
<i>Note: Compliance Rate: 85%</i>		

**TABLE 4 – B. SARA- DATES ON WHICH ASSESSMENTS WERE CONDUCTED**

Total Number of Days Assessments Taken	Total Number of Work Papers	Percentage of Days Assessments Taken
27	39	69%
<i>Note: Compliance Rate: 85%</i>		

**TABLE 5 – C. SARA- STEPS RECORDED-PROCESS COMPLETED IN SUFFICIENT DETAIL**

Process	Total Process Completed	Percentage
% of reports identifying problem	38	97%
% of reports stating location	37	95%
% of reports identifying when	37	95%
% of reports identify why it continues	37	95%
% of reports identifying stakeholders	37	95%
% of reports stating cause of problem	37	95%
% of reports setting tentative goals	37	95%
% of reports setting analysis goals	28	72%
% of reports with response logs	39	100%
% of reports with assessment plans	30	77%
% of reports with assessment logs	23	59%
<b>Overall Compliance</b>		<b>89%</b>
<i>Note: Compliance Rate: 85%; Maximum possible per process = 39</i>		

The PM conducted separate interviews with three civilians active in NCPC and Measure “Y” program oversight. These individuals acknowledged that the community policing programs had been successful, crime had been reduced and trust was being reestablished between civilians in many districts and the police officers serving their areas. However, these individuals were adamant in expressing their frustration that information gathered through the SARA process was not made available to the local groups. One long-time (15 years) Neighborhood Community Police Council volunteer expressed his view that specific information from Problem-Solving police programs was not always forthcoming. He stated he would like to see, after proper precautions were taken to account for security and privacy concerns, information sharing with the community become “more of a two-way street.”

A review of the SARA data collection and management systems indicates several areas of concern with regard to training and supervision of the program.

- Many of the SARA forms were textbook examples of how the SARA system works and is applied, however, there were numerous forms in which it was clear the person filling it in did not understand basic terminology and concepts.
- 33% of the reviewed plans had no assessments plan logged in as part of the process. This seems to indicate a lack of supervision and training.
- 41% of the reviewed plans had no evidence that an assessment had been conducted even though the projects had been initiated many months earlier. Some had aged past their one-year anniversary without having been subjected to an assessment. This seems to indicate a lack of supervision and training.
- Some officers appeared to be using the SARA logs as in which all of their activities were recorded-regardless of the relevance of those activities to the project.
- Events such as major crime incidents, training, professional football games and public demonstrations during the third quarter of 2013 frequently prevented officers from working on their community policing projects. Some officers recorded these events and thus gave an accounting of why they were prevented from following through on planned directed policing activities. But the majority of officers did not account for what were frequently significant gaps in activity even though these gaps coincided with community events and emergencies.

## **Finding**

The OPD was out of compliance with 82% for Objective 3.

Objectives 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and DGO B7 ¶III. D.)

## **Criteria**

Each reviewing supervisor shall ensure PAR forms were completed per directive (Objective 3.1). Each reviewing commander shall ensure PAR forms were completed per directive (Objective 3.2). Data from the PAR forms was promptly entered in the database (Objective 3.3). Task 47.3 Review Protocol compliance for Objectives 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 is Y/N and the measurement is at the discretion of the auditor. The EPAC staff chose 85%.

## **Audit Procedure**

The primary means the Department employs for measuring community policing is the PAR form. All of the individual PAR forms submitted for the third quarter of 2013 were reviewed and each form analyzed to measure whether the information had been completely filled out, required time frames could be established and verified, whether personnel were identified and their time commitments recorded, whether there were adequate supervisory controls, whether there was

sufficient information to identify the issues covered in the meetings whether outcomes were recorded, and whether the database was maintained and up-to-date (see table 6).

**TABLE 6 – SUMMARY OF INFORMATION FROM JULY, AUGUST & SEPTEMBER 2013 PAR REPORTS**

Information	Percentage	Information	Percentage
Location of Meeting Identified	100%	Reviewing Supervisor Identified <sup>1</sup>	73%
Date the Meeting Was Requested	0%	Serial Number	79%
Date the Meeting to Take Place	100%	Date of Review	77%
PSA/Beat Identified	75%	Reviewing Commander Identified <sup>2</sup>	84%
Person Accepting the Meeting Request	94%	Serial Number	74%
Serial Number	78%	Date of Review	88%
Unit	75%	Person Receiving PAR form Identified	75%
Primary Attendee's Name Provided	84%	Serial Number	74%
Time at meeting (start & end)	93%	Date Received	73%
Watch/PSA	50%	Date Entered in PAR Database <sup>3</sup>	70%
(2) Additional Attendee's Name Provided	76%	(3) Additional Attendee's Name Provided	58%
Serial Number	77%	Serial Number	60%
Time at meeting (start & end)	77%	Time at meeting (start & end)	50%
Watch/PSA	52%	Watch/PSA	38%
(4) Additional Attendee's Name Provided	14%	(5) Additional Attendee's Name Provided	10%
Serial Number	14%	Serial Number	10%
Time at meeting (start & end)	2%	Time at meeting (start & end)	2%
Watch/PSA	7%	Watch/PSA	12%
(6) Additional Attendee's Name Provided	12%		
Serial Number	11%	<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>56%</b>
Time at meeting (start & end)	9%		
Watch/PSA	5%		
<i><sup>1</sup>Objective 3.1, <sup>2</sup>Objective 3.2 &amp; <sup>3</sup>Objective 3.3</i>			
<i>Note: Compliance Rate: 85%</i>			

A review of the PAR forms indicates a number of problems with the design of the form, supervisory oversight over public appearances, the usefulness of the information recorded, and how the data is managed and used.

- Only two of the 108 reports reviewed recorded community policing approaches to local issues that could be readily comprehended and put to practical use by an audience beyond the person filling out the form.
- Personnel routinely fill in the date of the request as the actual date of the public meeting appearance/event. Thus there was no way to gauge the amount of time between the request for a meeting and the response to that request.
- The same person completing the form sometimes approved the request and reviewed it as supervisor or commander.

- Information was frequently missing -- particularly the complete time period the supervisor or officer attended the meeting. When more than two officers attended a meeting, times and watch/beat assignments completion on the form fell to below 20%.
- The purpose of the meetings has been expanded to include meetings with individual merchants and it is not clear from the reports whether these were actual meetings or calls for service at individual locations. One meeting was attended by six officers and took place at a Starbuck's at which only one community member was present. While these may be legitimate meetings, the PAR form as currently constructed does not capture the information.
- All of the reports, from July 1 through September 30, 2013 were recorded in the database "October 13." Only 70% of the forms were recorded in the database. Those that were recorded were from the two same PSA.
- The information in the database measured only the individual officers' attendance at meeting.
- The forms do not provide an information field to capture a number or estimate of the number of civilians attending the community meetings.
- Because the information is not entered in a timely manner and because of the lack of specific detail, it is improbable the form is a useful tool in measuring policing and problem-solving policing efforts.
- Meetings scheduled with organizations identified in Task 47.5 (ACLU, NAACP, PUEBLO) and church groups were not reflected on any of the PAR forms for the audit period. Yet such meetings occur routinely and requests are promptly met through the Office of the Chief of Police. The interests of these stakeholders are significant. Similarly, it is acknowledged their commitment and experience make them an important part of the ongoing dialog necessary to insure responsive and constitutionally based policing in the community. When representatives of these groups requests a meeting the NSA requires verification the meeting occurred and that they occurred within 60 days of the request. A means of capturing the timeliness of the meetings as well as the substance of identified issues, proposed solutions and timetables should be developed and the useful outcomes shared. The revised PAR form might be a suitable tool as it would collect data on a wide range of topics as well as document the efforts of the department.

## Findings

The OPD is out of compliance with Objective 3.1 by 73%, Objective 3.2 by 84%, and Objective 3.3 by 70%.

**Objective 4 – Task 47.4 Incorporate positive statistics on community policing and problem solving activities in “Crime-Stop” meetings and information on citizen complaints and use of force incidents.**

**Criteria**

The OPD shall incorporate positive statistics on community policing and problem solving activities in “Crime-Stop” meetings (Objective 4), along with information on citizen complaints (Objective 4.1) and use of force incident (Objective 4.2). Task 47.4 Review Protocol compliance for Objectives 4, 4.1 and 4.2 is Y/N and the measurement is at the discretion of the auditor. The EPAC staff chose 85%.

**Audit Procedures**

The EPAC staff reviewed reports relating to community policing, problem solving activities, citizen complaints and use of force incidents and listened in on one “Daily Crime Call” (identified in the NSA as “Crime Stop”) telephone conference call that took place on December 13, 2013. During this meeting, EPAC staff heard first hand how Area commanders reported activities of the previous day including crime, pursuits, complaints and uses of force.

The EPAC auditors then requested individual, complete DPR files. There were 40 individual DPR files received and reviewed. Each file reviewed was within the specified time frame period. The EPAC auditors reviewed each file for entries in DPR per watch in 24-hour period and each Police Service Area, the number of use of force reported within a 24-hour period, and complaints reported within a 24-hour period. Each entry received one point. The total number of possible watch entries determined analysis for DPR. The total number of use of forces and complaints documented in each file determined these analyses (see Table 7).

**TABLE 7 – CRIME STOP (“CRIME CALL”) THIRD QUARTER, 2013 STATISTICS**

Objective	Task 47.4 Incorporate Positive Statistics in “Crime-Stop” Meetings	Total Completed	Percentage	Objective Compliance
4.	Directed Policing Reported Per Watch in 24 hour period	135	68%	Non-Compliant <sup>1</sup>
4.1.	UOF Reported for 24 hour period	36	90%	Compliant <sup>2</sup>
4.2.	Complaints Reported for 24 Hour Period	39	98%	Compliant <sup>2</sup>
<i>Note: Compliance Rate: 85%; Maximum Possible = 1200, 240</i>				

**Findings**

Objective 4 was found out of compliance with the requirement that it incorporate positive statistics on community policing and problem solving activities in “Crime Stop” meetings with

68%. Objective 4.1 and 4.2 were found in compliance with information on citizen complaints (Objective 4.1) with 90% and use of force incidents (Objective 4.2) with 98%.

In reviewing the materials relevant to the objective several observations may be drawn.

- OPD is deeply engaged in community policing and the values of community policing are ingrained in its command staff and its culture, however, it does not do an adequate job of managing data relevant to the work they are doing.
- Information relating to community policing and Task 47 is spread out among several areas and is not well integrated.
- Policy development and training have not kept pace with improved current practices.

**Objective 5 – Task 47.5 Arranges meetings with established organizations, community or church groups within 60 days of request.**

**Criteria**

The appropriate Departmental personnel shall arrange a meeting within 60 days unless not feasible with representatives of an established organization active within Oakland (PUEBLO, ACLU, NAACP, etc.) community groups or church groups, if an organization communicates a concern regarding specific police personnel or practices (Objective 5). Task 47 Review Protocol compliance is 85%.

**Audit Procedure**

The EPAC auditors interviewed two (2) community leaders who reported that command and staff officers met with them regularly and promptly. The EPAC staff also reviewed twenty (20) scheduling memoranda from the Office of the Chief of Police.

There were at least 22 meetings held with community groups during the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2013 that were verified through scheduling memos issued by the Office of the Chief of Police or through interviews. Community members interviewed as part of this audit confirmed both the Chief of Police and Deputy Chief were responsive to requests for meetings and that these meetings routinely took place within a few days or weeks of the request.

Only one (1) memorandum documented the date of the meeting request and meeting appearance. The scheduling memoranda did not confirm two meetings one civil rights organization director described as having taken place in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter; she described OPD as being receptive to meetings and prompt to respond and that she believed the Chief and Deputy Chief of Police worked hard to make themselves available.

While there is no doubt these meetings occurred, these meetings were not recorded in any database established for tracking compliance with the NSA. Further, there does not appear to be

a systematic means of analyzing information gleaned from such meetings or how the information is applied to meet the evolving needs and concerns of the community (see Table 8).

**TABLE 8 – ARRANGED MEETINGS WITH ESTABLISHED ORGANIZATIONS, COMMUNITY OR CHURCH GROUPS**

Topic	Number	Percentage	Compliance
Established Community or Church Group Involved	22	100%	Compliant
Date of Request for Meeting Documented	0	0%	Non-compliant
Date Meeting was Held Documented	1	5%	Non-compliant
Documentation Maintained in any Database Related to Task 47	0	0%	Non-compliant
Documentation is available to show how substance of a meeting is incorporated into a mechanism for measuring community policing.	0	0%	Non-compliant
<b>Overall Compliance</b>			<b>21%</b>
<i>Note: Compliance: 85%; Maximum Possible = 22</i>			

## Findings

Objective 5 was found out of compliance with an overall total of 21%.

## RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS TAKEN

### Recommendations

#### Objective 3

1. The OPD should look at ways to close the gap between counting events and participants, and measuring information that can be gleaned through PAR forms.
2. It is recommended that the PAR forms and database be revised or replaced to capture information that can be put to practical use by a broader audience than the person filling out the form or entering data to the database.
3. It is recommended that the PAR form fields be amended to distinguish between the date of a request for a meeting and the actual date the meeting is to be held so that timeliness and responsiveness can be measured.
4. It is recommended that OPD supervisors and officers be trained in recording and capturing the substance of meetings.
5. It is recommended that captured substantive data be applied in problem-solving discussions, setting priorities, developing action plans or outcomes and the data analyzed and tracked over time.
6. It is recommended that approval and review of the form should go through a chain of command; the person completing the form should not be the same person approving and reviewing the request.

7. It is recommended that civilians might fill the role of scheduling, approving and recording the substance of meetings, managing the database and disseminate, when appropriate, relevant information, to OPD personnel and community groups.
8. It is recommended that a system be devised to allow for the supervision of how forms are completed and that officers be held accountable for submitting incomplete forms.
9. It is recommended that supervisors be held accountable for the careful review of proposed public meeting requests to ensure there is a bona fide community meeting purpose.
10. It is recommended that all of the reports be promptly recorded in the database and that database accessed and used by the department in developing strategies and community partnerships, deploying resources and personnel.
11. It is recommended the department update training on how to use the SARA process in order to insure more effective results. Some officers are leaving entire sections blank, others are lumping what appear to be assessment entries in with the response log, while others are putting unrelated matters in the logs.
12. It is recommended supervisors periodically review the SARA files to ensure activities and assessments are still occurring on a regular basis and that the individual parts of the SARA process are understood and applied to the project.
13. It is recommended the summary database be revised to be more inclusive and that information and insight gleaned through these projects be readily available and flagged for use by other members of the Department.
14. It is recommended officers be trained in logging activities which prevent them from taking part in assigned directed policing activities. The dates during which either zero, or only one or two activities, were recorded were those dates during which there were events, such as Raiders games or large scale protests, taking place. Calendaring major events in response logs or reporting negative activity and their causes may help OPD better plan and manage deployment of resources. It may also help the Oakland community better understand the limitations of a police department acknowledged to have too few officers for a city its size.

#### Objective 4

1. It is recommended the department keep minutes of meetings including Compstat and Daily Crime Call.
2. It is recommended that OPD integrate its databases so that statistics on community policing, problem solving, use of force and citizen complaints can be accessed, analyzed and used as management tools and building OPD and community partnerships and trust. The design of

any new or revised database should ensure the ability to extrapolate data for purposes of sharing it with community partners in a timely manner.

3. It is recommended that, in gathering and recording data, OPD enumerate some of the processes involved in community policing and problem solving. More specifically OPD should memorialize and acknowledge the roles played by citizens in identifying and resolving issues.

#### Objective 5

1. It is recommended that meetings scheduled with groups identified in Task-47.5 (ACLU, NAACP, PUEBLO) and church groups be memorialized in a PAR form or a closely related form and that information from these community meetings entered in the same database, analyzed and, where feasible, made use of in the same manner. Information and updates should be provided to the community groups whenever possible.