

OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT
Office of
Internal Accountability



2023 Internal Investigation Outcome and
Discipline Report

June 2024

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Limitations	5
Allegation Breakdown	5
Department Demographics	8
Sustained Rate Analyses	9
Sustained Rate by Investigation Type	10
Sustained Rate by Complaint Origin	11
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint Allegations	12
Discipline Analyses	13
Discipline by Class	13
Comparison of Class II Sustained Black and White Sworn Member Cases	16
Conclusion	20
Appendix 1: Chi-Square Tests by Allegations per Case	21
Appendix 2: Chi-Square Tests by Investigation Type	22
Appendix 3: Chi-Square Tests by Complaint Origin	24
Appendix 4: Chi-Square Tests by Level of Discipline for Class II Cases	26
Appendix 5: 2023 Sustained IA Cases with Discipline	27

Executive Summary

The Oakland Police Department (henceforth “the Department”) is committed to ensuring internal investigation outcomes and discipline are fair and transparent. To identify and remedy potential disparities, Department General Order R-01, *Risk Management*, requires the Department to conduct an annual inspection of internal investigation outcomes by race and prepare a report reflecting its findings. The current report covers internal investigation cases that came to a finding in 2023 and includes an analysis of findings and discipline by race, gender, and rank for sworn personnel. The analysis follows the *Department’s Working Methodology for Internal Affairs Disparity Analyses*.

The data is analyzed at both the allegation level and the officer per case level. A “case” is defined as any number of allegations that fall under a single internal affairs case number for an employee. Officer per case is determined by removing additional allegations against the same officer in a case so the officer is only counted one time per case. Findings based on the outcomes of collision, pursuit, and force boards are excluded.¹

The methodology used for the analysis calls for 2 x 2 chi-square statistical tests² where a large enough sample size allows. Chi-square tests help identify if there is evidence of disparity. The p-value, or probability value, computed in a chi-square test is a number describing how likely it is that test results would have occurred by random chance. The level of statistical significance is often expressed as a p-value between 0 and 1. The smaller the p-value, the less likely the results occurred by random chance. It is important to remember, however, that a p-value is a piece of evidence, not definitive proof. For purposes of this analysis, a p value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant, indicating an association between variables. By race, white sworn members are used as the reference category, meaning it was the category of comparison for other races.

Excluding cases that were reviewed by a Board, there were 691 cases approved in 2023 involving sworn members that had at least one allegation of misconduct. The 691 cases included 2,680 allegations of misconduct and 1,648 subject officers.

¹ The findings for such cases are based on recommendations from a review board, not solely on the recommendations of an IA investigator or field sergeant. The investigative process for these cases is different than a typical internal investigation, involving more layers of review. Additionally, not all Board Findings are tracked by the Internal Affairs Division. On-duty vehicle collisions, pursuits and Level 2 uses of force that are found in compliance and have no parallel internal affairs investigation are not tracked by the Internal Affairs Division.

² A chi-square test is a statistical test comparing observed frequencies (i.e., cell counts in a table) with expected frequencies under the Null Hypothesis that two variables of interest (e.g., race and whether a case is sustained or not) are not associated, to determine if any observed difference can reasonably be attributed to chance alone (if the probability of obtaining such a difference under the Null Hypothesis is 5% or higher), or whether it’s reasonable to instead reject the Null Hypothesis (because the probability of observing this difference under the Null Hypothesis is less than 5%) and conclude that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. The Yates correction was used, which subtracts 0.5 from the numerical difference between the observed and expected frequencies and is made to account for the upward bias for a 2 x 2 contingency table when using Pearson’s chi-square test.

Department Demographics

Between 2022 and 2023, there were small changes in Department demographics. As of December 2023, Hispanic officers made up the largest percentage of sworn members in the Department at 29%. White officers made up the largest percentage of the Department in 2022 but dropped 3% in 2023 to 26%. Table 7 shows the demographic breakdown of the department in 2023.

Sustained Rates

The analysis of 2023 investigative outcomes found that white sworn members were sustained at a statistically significant higher rate than Black members (p-value of 0.033). White sworn members had the highest overall sustained rate of all races (11%), which was the same as their sustained rate in 2022. Black members had the lowest overall sustained rate (6%), which was a decrease from their 11% sustained rate in 2022. The allegation of Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (FTARC) appeared to have the greatest impact on the difference between the white and Black member sustained rate in 2023. White members received far more allegations of FTARC than Black members and were sustained at a higher rate (48% versus 25%). When FTARC allegations were removed from the population, the disparity in sustained rates between Black and white members disappeared. Tables 8-13 show sustained rates for race, gender and rank.

Allegations Per Case

In 2023, no race group differed significantly from white members in more than one allegation per case (p-value was greater than 0.05 in all chi-square tests performed). Black members had the highest percentage of cases with more than one allegation (42%) but not significantly different than white members (36%, p-value of 0.090). By gender, female members had the highest percentage of cases with more than one allegation (44%) but not significantly different than male members (38%, p-value of 0.088). While there was no evidence of disparity between Black and white members or male and female members when comparing one allegation per case to more than one allegation per case, additional review may inform the Department as to why differences occur. The additional review will be conducted in a separate supplemental analysis. Tables 1-3 show the allegations per case for race, gender and rank.

Discipline

In 2023, Black members received a suspension in 46% of Class II sustained cases³, which did not differ significantly from white members who received a suspension in 33% of Class II sustained cases (p-value of 0.663). White members had twice the number of Class II sustained cases compared to Black members (27 versus 13). A more detailed review of Black and white member sustained Class II cases revealed that a second offense or multiple sustained allegations in the same case were the primary justifications for the suspensions for both races. There was only one Black member and one white member who received a suspension for a first offense of a single allegation. Table 17 shows the suspension rates for Class II cases and the detailed review of Black and white sustained cases can be found on page 12.

³ Class I offenses are the most serious allegations of misconduct (i.e., excessive force, truthfulness, discrimination, etc.) and, if sustained, shall result in disciplinary action up to and including dismissal and may serve as the basis for criminal prosecution. Class II offenses include all minor misconduct offenses. For the analysis conducted, a case is considered a Class I case if one or more sustained allegations are Class I offenses.

While there was no evidence of disparity, the Department will conduct additional review in a separate supplemental analysis to better understand factors that lead to differences in suspension rates.

Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint

The analysis of 2022 IA outcomes found that FTARC violations were a factor in the difference between Black and white member discipline. Black members were sustained and suspended for FTARC violations at a higher rate than white members, and the higher suspension rate for Black members was due to the violation being a second offense. The opposite was found in this current analysis of 2023 data. In 2023, Black members had far fewer allegations of FTARC than white members and were sustained at a significantly lower rate. Both Black and white members had a 25% suspension rate for Class II FTARC violations and all suspensions were because the violation was a second offense. For both Black and white members, all FTARC violations resulting in less severe discipline (counseling or written reprimand) were a first offense.

Following the observed disparity in the Department's 2022 data, the Department imposed several changes to policy and procedure to eliminate potential bias and resulting disparity in misconduct related to FTARC. While those changes were not in place until late 2023 and therefore could not have resulted in the elimination of disparity observed in the 2023 data, it is possible that Department's awareness of the potential for disparity with regard to FTARC misconduct may have had a positive impact on the fair and consistent application of FTARC discipline.

Future Areas of Study

As a result of the 2022 analysis of FTARC violations, the Department adjusted policy allowing FTARC violations to be handled via non-disciplinary corrective action when the subject employee has no pattern of prior FTARC violations. Non-disciplinary corrective action is documented and tracked in Supervisory Notes Files (SNF)⁴, and SNFs are used to assess patterns of Class II misconduct that could lead to an internal investigation. A review of SNFs will help the Department ensure entries are correctly coded and non-disciplinary corrective action is issued in a consistent manner.

Furthermore, cases reviewed by Force and Pursuit Boards were excluded from the analysis included in this report because they go through a different review process than a typical internal investigation. However, analyzing Board findings and resulting discipline may help the Department identify points in the Board review process that could lead to disparities in investigative outcomes. Board findings and SNFs are two areas deserving more detailed review, which will be conducted in future analyses.

⁴ Per *Department General Order B-22 (Supervisory Notes Files)*, effective date May 29, 2009, the purpose of a Supervisory Notes File (SNF) is to centralize information to help supervisors, commanders, and managers identify patterns of exemplary and substandard performance and behavior. Additionally, the SNF is utilized to document incidents deserving of a commendation or award, to document non-disciplinary corrective action taken, and to prepare performance appraisals.

Limitations

As with any data collection, internal investigation data is vulnerable to data entry errors. The data for this analysis was reviewed and cleaned to the extent possible. However, undetected data entry errors or changes to cases subsequent to the date of the data pull could impact some of the analysis. Any impact is expected to be minimal.

Comparisons are made in this report between outcomes found in the analysis of 2022 data (*2022 Internal Investigation Outcome and Discipline Report, March 2023*) and the analysis of 2023 data (this current report). However, there may be inconsistencies between how the data was retrieved and which cases were excluded. Additionally, due to the ransomware attack on the City of Oakland in February 2023, all risk analysis reports had to be rebuilt, which may also have impacted the way the data was retrieved.

Allegation Breakdown

The first step in these analyses was to review whether there were any differences in the number of allegations received by race, gender and rank. In both 2022 and 2023, 61% of all sworn members received one allegation per case.

In 2023, no race group differed significantly from white members in more than one allegation per case (p-value was greater than 0.05 in all chi-square tests performed). Male and female members did not differ significantly in more than one allegation per case (p value of 0.088). Officers and sergeants and above did not differ significantly in more than one allegation per case (p value of 0.689). Black members (42%) and female members (44%) had the highest percentage of cases with more than one allegation. In 2022, Black members had a lower percentage of cases with more than one allegation than white members and female and male members had nearly the same percentage.

Tables 1-3 display the number of allegations by race, by gender and by rank (“officer” and “sergeant and above”). The “Total” column is the number of officers in each category (# of allegations per case). The total number of complaint allegations included in this analysis can be determined by multiplying the number in the “Total” column with the corresponding number in the “# of Alleg Per Case” column and then adding all the results.

Throughout this report, variables tested (chi-square test) are shaded in blue and any differences found to be statistically significant (by column) are in red. By race, white sworn members are used as the reference category, meaning it was the category of comparison for other races. The chi-square test tables can be found in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Allegations per Case by Race or Ethnicity

# of Alleg Per Case	White Sworn		Black Sworn		Hispanic Sworn		Asian Sworn		Other/Unk Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
1	64%	224	58%	197	62%	319	61%	230	62%	42	61%	1012
2	24%	83	26%	89	23%	116	26%	97	22%	15	24%	400
3	7%	24	9%	32	9%	47	9%	33	9%	6	9%	142

4	2%	8	6%	21	4%	18	3%	13	4%	3	4%	63
5	1%	4	0.3%	1	1%	7	1%	3	0%	0	1%	15
6	0.3%	1	0%	0	0.2%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	5
7	0.3%	1	0.3%	1	1%	4	0%	0	1%	1	0%	7
8	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
9	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
10	0.3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0.3%	1	0%	0	0%	2
Total	100%	348	100%	341	100%	512	100%	379	100%	68	100%	1648
1 Alleg per case	64%	224	58%	197	62%	319	61%	230	62%	42	61%	1012
More than 1 Alleg per case	36%	124	42%	144	38%	193	39%	149	38%	26	39%	636

Table 2: Allegations per Case by Gender

# of Alleg Per Case	Male Sworn		Female Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
1	62%	893	56%	119	61%	1012
2	24%	340	28%	60	24%	400
3	8%	115	13%	27	9%	142
4	4%	57	3%	6	4%	63
5	1%	15	0%	0	1%	15
6	0.3%	5	0%	0	0.3%	5
7	0.4%	6	0.5%	1	0.4%	7
8	0.1%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
9	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
10	0.1%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
Total	100%	1435	100%	213	100%	1648
1 Alleg per case	62%	893	56%	119	61%	1012
More than 1 Alleg per case	38%	542	44%	94	39%	636

Table 3: Allegations per Case by Rank

# of Alleg Per Case	Officer Sworn		Sgt and Above Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
1	61%	914	63%	98	61%	1012
2	25%	370	19%	30	24%	400
3	8%	124	12%	18	9%	142

4	4%	57	4%	6	4%	63
5	1%	14	0.6%	1	1%	15
6	0.3%	5	0%	0	0.3%	5
7	0.4%	6	0.6%	1	0.4%	7
8	0.1%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
9	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
10	0.1%	1	0.6%	1	0.1%	2
Total	100%	1493	100%	155	100%	1648
1 Alleg per case	61%	914	63%	98	61%	1012
More than 1 Alleg per case	39%	579	37%	57	39%	636

While there was no evidence of disparity when comparing one allegation per case to more than one allegation per case for race, gender or rank, Black members and female members had the highest percentage of cases with more than one allegation, which the Department will explore in a separate supplemental analyses.

Next, allegations were reviewed by type to see if a particular race, gender, or rank received a disparate amount of a particular violation. The top allegations in 2023 were the same as the top allegations in 2022.

Tables 4-6 display the information.

Table 4: Top Allegations by Race

Allegation	White Sworn		Black Sworn		Hispanic Sworn		Asian Sworn		Other/Unk Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	34%	186	32%	183	37%	309	38%	230	37%	43	36%	951
Performance of Duty – General	21%	118	24%	137	19%	159	22%	136	17%	19	21%	569
Use of Force	12%	68	16%	90	16%	132	18%	108	22%	25	16%	423
Conduct Towards Others	8%	43	8%	47	8%	66	5%	32	4%	5	7%	193
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	8%	42	3%	16	4%	37	4%	25	4%	5	5%	125
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	3%	15	3%	19	4%	32	3%	18	4%	5	3%	89

Black officers had the highest percentage of Performance of Duty General allegations and white officers had the highest percentage of Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint. White officers had the lowest percentage of use of force allegations.

Table 5: Top Allegations by Gender

Allegation	Male Sworn		Female Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	36%	827	36%	124	36%	951
Performance of Duty – General	21%	491	22%	78	21%	569
Use of Force	16%	374	14%	49	16%	423
Conduct Towards Others	7%	172	6%	21	7%	193
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	5%	109	5%	16	5%	125
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	3%	76	4%	13	3%	89

Table 6: Top Allegations by Rank

Allegation	Officer Sworn		Sgt and Above Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	38%	911	16%	40	36%	951
Performance of Duty - General	22%	528	16%	41	21%	569
Use of Force	16%	398	10%	25	16%	423
Conduct Towards Others	7%	164	11%	29	7%	193
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint - Unintentional	4%	105	8%	20	5%	125
Performance of Duty - Care of Property	3%	84	2%	5	3%	89

The percentage of allegation type was relatively consistent for gender. There were larger differences for rank, but this may be explained by the difference in job function. Officers make arrests more often than their superiors and are therefore more often the target of allegations related to improper search, seizure and arrest and use of force.

Department Demographics

Table 7 contains a demographic breakdown of the Department and IAD cases for 2023. A case is identified as sustained if one or more allegation against a sworn member was sustained. Each member is counted once per case, regardless of how many allegations they received in that case. There were 1,648 sworn member cases included in the 2023 analysis. As of December 2023, there were 745 sworn personnel employed by the Department.

Hispanic members made up the largest percentage of Department personnel at 29%, which was an increase from 2022. White members represented 26% of the Department in 2023 and received 21% of the complaints. Asian and Hispanic members received a slightly higher percentage of complaints than their department representation. The Department representation and percentage of cases was the same for Black sworn members and members of Other/Unknown race. By gender, the breakdown of cases was nearly the same as the breakdown of the Department. By rank, officers represented 78% of the Department but received 91% of the complaints. Supervisors typically have fewer interactions with the public than officers. Since most cases are generated by members of the public, it follows that officers, who have the most exposure, would receive the majority of cases.

Table 7: Demographic Breakdown of the Department and Cases

	% of Sworn Personnel in the Department (Total 745)*	% of Cases (Total 1,648)
By Race		
White	26% (194)	21% (348)
Black	21% (156)	21% (341)
Hispanic	29% (217)	31% (512)
Asian/Filipino	20% (149)	23% (379)
Other/Unknown	4% (29)	4% (68)
By Gender		
Male	86% (637)	87% (1435)
Female	14% (108)	13% (213)
By Rank		
Officer	78% (584)	91% (1493)
Sgt or Above	22% (161)	9% (155)

*Source: December 2023 Police Staff Report. Police Officer Trainees are included.

Sustained Rate Analyses

Following the review by allegation, the next step was to calculate the sustained rate based on cases (sworn members counted once per case). Sustained rates were calculated for each independent variable (race, gender, rank) and for the moderating variables (investigation type and case origin). A chi-square test was used to determine whether any differences between sustained rates were statistically significant.

Sustained Rate by Investigation Type

The first moderator variable was by investigation type. The data was split into three categories: All Investigations; Division Level Investigations (DLI) & DLI Summary Findings;⁵ and Internal Affairs (IA) investigations & IA Summary Findings. DLIs are generally conducted by field sergeants and typically contain less serious allegations. IA investigations involve the most serious allegations and are conducted by supervisors assigned to the Internal Affairs Division.

The sustained rate for all cases involving a sworn member was 8%, excluding those reviewed by a Board. By race, white sworn members had the highest sustained rate at 11% and Black sworn members had the lowest sustained rate at 6%. There was a statistically significant difference between white and Black sworn members for the overall sustained rate (p value of 0.033), but there was no significant difference between white members and members of other races (p values greater than 0.05). By rank, sergeants and above were sustained at a statistically significant higher rate than police officers (p value less than 0.01).

The overall sustained rate for DLIs was 6% and 15% for IA investigations. For all independent variables, the sustained rate for IA investigations was higher than the sustained rate for DLIs. White sworn members and sworn members of Other/Unknown race had the highest sustained rates for DLIs (8%), though the numbers for Other/Unknown members were much smaller. White and Hispanic sworn members had the highest sustained rate for IA investigations (19%).

When performing chi-square tests for DLIs and IA Investigations, none of the tests showed evidence of disparity when comparing white sworn members to members of other races, males to females, or officers to sergeants and above. The chi-square test comparing white members to members of Other/Unknown race could not be performed due to the low numbers.

The sustained rates can be found in Tables 8-10 below. The chi-square test tables can be found in Appendix 2. Variables tested are shaded in blue and any differences found to be statistically significant (by column) are in red. By race, white sworn members are used as the reference category.

Table 8: Sustained Rate by Race

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	11%	37	348	8%	20	245	19%	17	91
Black	6%	20	341	5%	13	274	11%	7	61
Hispanic	8%	40	512	6%	26	425	19%	14	75
Asian/Filipino	7%	26	379	6%	19	311	11%	7	61
Other/Unknown	9%	6	68	8%	5	59	11%	1	9
Total	8%	129	1648	6%	83	1314	15%	46	297

⁵ A Summary Finding is an abbreviated internal investigation in which a finding can be reached without conducting a full formal internal investigation because the correct finding can be determined with no or minimal follow-up and be based on the existing documentation, evidence, statements, and crime information data.

Table 9: Sustained Rate by Gender

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	8%	116	1435	7%	77	1142	15%	39	261
Female	6%	13	213	3%	6	172	19%	7	36
Total	8%	129	1648	6%	83	1314	15%	46	297

Table 10: Sustained Rate by Rank

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	7%	106	1493	6%	75	1244	14%	31	214
Sgt and Above	15%	23	155	11%	8	70	18%	15	83
Total	8%	129	1648	6%	83	1314	15%	46	297

Sustained Rate by Complaint Origin

The second moderator variable identified in the methodology was case origin. A case was categorized as internal if it was initiated by a member of the Department. A case was categorized as external if a member of the public or a member of another organization/department initiated the investigation. However, it is important to note that while a complaint may be initiated by a member of the public, investigators may add allegations to a case if additional misconduct is suspected or discovered during the investigation.

Overall, internally generated cases had a 24% sustained rate compared to externally generated cases with a 6% sustained rate. Tables 11-13 display the sustained rates. Appendix 3 contains the chi-square tests for the tables.

Table 11: Sustained Rate by Race

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	11%	37	348	26%	14	54	8%	23	294
Black	6%	20	341	23%	8	35	4%	12	306
Hispanic	8%	40	512	25%	12	48	6%	28	464
Asian/Filipino	7%	26	379	16%	5	32	6%	21	347
Other/Unknown	9%	6	68	50%	2	4	6%	4	64
Total	8%	129	1648	24%	41	173	6%	88	1475

Table 12: Sustained Rate by Gender

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	8%	116	1435	24%	37	156	6%	79	1279
Female	6%	13	213	24%	4	17	5%	9	196
Total	8%	129	1648	24%	41	173	6%	88	1475

Table 13: Sustained Rate by Rank

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	7%	106	1493	24%	27	113	6%	79	1380
Sgt and Above	15%	23	155	23%	14	60	9%	9	95
Total	8%	129	1648	24%	41	173	6%	88	1475

When performing chi-square tests for internally generated and externally generated cases, none of the tests showed evidence of disparity when comparing white sworn members to members of other races, males to females, or officers to sergeants and above (p values greater than 0.05). The chi-square test comparing white members to members of Other/Unknown race could not be performed due to the low numbers. Members of Other/Unknown race had very few sustained findings and only four internally generated cases, so chi-square tests could not be performed on this race category. When comparing genders in internally generated cases, while the chi-square test could not be performed due to low numbers, the sustained rate was the same for both males and females.

Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint Allegations

Of the top allegations received in 2023, FTARC allegations were sustained at the highest rate by far, having a disproportionate impact on the overall sustained rates. Table 14 includes the sustained rates for the top allegations received in 2023.

Table 14: Sustained Rate for Top Allegations

Allegation	Total Allegations	Sustained Rate
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	951	1%
Performance of Duty – General	569	6%
Use of Force	423	1%
Conduct Towards Others	193	10%
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	125	42%
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	89	3%

Due to the high sustained rate of FTARC allegations, the overall sustained rates were recalculated after removing all FTARC allegations from the population. Removal of this allegation type caused the differences in sustained rates to nearly disappear for race (Table 15).

Table 15: Sustained Rate by Race for All Investigations – FTARC Allegations Removed

	% Sustained	# Sustained	Total
White	6%	20	332
Black	5%	16	335
Hispanic	5%	25	495
Asian/Filipino	5%	17	366

Other/Unknown	6%	4	65
Total	5%	82	1593

Per Department General Order M-03 (Complaints Against Departmental Personnel), Class II misconduct may be addressed through non-disciplinary corrective action if the misconduct is discovered by the Department and does not indicate a pattern of misconduct. Prior to December 2023, Class II FTARC allegations were the only exception. All FTARC allegations had to be investigated via the IA process. In December 2023, policy was updated to remove the exception and allow for FTARC allegations to be addressed like other Class II misconduct. While this policy change occurred too late to impact the 2023 data, disparities caused by FTARC allegations may disappear in future analyses of IA outcomes.

Discipline Analyses

This next section includes analyses of discipline imposed for sustained cases. Discipline is determined based on the severity and number of sustained allegations, whether the member has been sustained for that allegation in the past, and the aggravating and mitigating factors. Commanders of each employee produce a Pre-Discipline Report⁶ which includes the above information and a recommendation for discipline. The Department’s Discipline Matrix⁷ is the reference for determining a range for discipline. Discipline determinations are made during a pre-discipline conference which is attended by members of the Executive Team. Final discipline is determined by the Chief of Police or their designee, or in some cases the City Administrator. Appendix 5 contains discipline for each sustained case and includes race, aggravating/mitigating factors, offense number, discipline matrix recommendation, and rank (officer/supervisor).

Discipline by Class

Following the methodology, cases were separated by Class. Class I allegations are typically more severe and generally result in more severe discipline. If at least one of the sustained allegations against a member was a Class I allegation, the case was coded as “Class I.” If the case had only Class II sustained allegations, it was coded as “Class II.”

The first step in this review was to determine whether certain races were disproportionately sustained in relation to their makeup of the Department. Table 16 displays this information in three ways: any sustained case, Class I sustained cases, and Class II sustained cases.

For Table 16, members were counted only once per category even if they were sustained in multiple cases. For example, an officer with one sustained Class I case and three sustained Class II cases would be counted once in the any sustained case category, once in the Class I category, and once in the Class II category. Table 16 includes this information and provides the percentage of members with a sustained case compared to employee demographics from the December 2023 Quarterly Police Staffing Report.

⁶ TF 3340 Pre-Discipline Report. Revised: May 2015.

⁷ Training Bulletin V-T Discipline Policy Appendix (Discipline Matrix). Effective Date: March 14, 2014.

Table 16: Sworn Members with a Sustained Case in 2023 by Race

	# of Members in the Dept		Any Sustained Case		Class I Sustained Case		Class II Sustained Case	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
White	26%	194	30%	33	27%	7	30%	28
Black	21%	156	14%	16	19%	5	13%	12
Hispanic	29%	217	32%	36	31%	8	34%	31
Asian	20%	149	19%	21	19%	5	18%	17
Other/Unknown	4%	29	5%	5	4%	1	4%	4
Total	100%	745	100%	111	100%	26	100%	92

The table above reveals the proportion of members who had a sustained case in 2023 was generally consistent with the demographics of the Department for Hispanic, Asian and Other/Unknown sworn members. Black sworn members experienced a lower percentage of sustained cases than their representation in the Department by seven percentage points. White officers experienced a higher percentage of sustained cases than their representation in the Department by four percentage points.

To compare discipline categories, Class I and Class II cases were separated. The number of cases per category for Class I cases were too small to conduct a chi-square test. Additionally, due to the low numbers of Class I cases, displaying percentages was not meaningful.

For Class II cases, where possible, chi-square tests were conducted on combined discipline categories: lower-level discipline (Counseling and Written) and more severe discipline (Suspension, Demotion and Termination). Tables 17-19 display discipline broken down by Class and type.

Table 17: Discipline by Race

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
White	1	0	3	5	9
Black	2	0	1	4	7
Hispanic	1	0	4	3	8
Asian	1	0	2	3	6
Other/Unknown	0	0	0	1	1
Total	5	0	10	16	31

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
White*	52%	14	15%	4	33%	9	0%	0	100%	27
Black	54%	7	0%	0	46%	6	0%	0	100%	13
Hispanic	56%	18	22%	7	22%	7	0%	0	100%	32
Asian	50%	10	20%	4	30%	6	0%	0	100%	20
Other/Unknown	60%	3	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	100%	5
Total	54%	52	15%	15	31%	30	0%	0	100%	97

*There was one white officer who was sustained for failing to accept or refer a complaint but was not disciplined because the investigation exceeded the timeline allowed by California Government Code 3304.

Table 18: Discipline by Gender

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Male	4	0	9	15	28
Female	1	0	1	1	3
Total	5	0	10	16	31

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Male	53%	46	14%	12	33%	29	0%	0	100%	87
Female	60%	6	30%	3	10%	1	0%	0	100%	10
Total	54%	52	15%	15	31%	30	0%	0	100%	97

Table 19: Discipline by Rank

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Officer	5	0	8	11	24
Sgt and Above	0	0	2	5	7
Total	5	0	10	16	31

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Officer	54%	44	17%	14	28%	23	0%	0	100%	81
Sgt and Above	50%	8	6%	1	44%	7	0%	0	100%	16
Total	54%	52	15%	15	31%	30	0%	0	100%	97

For Class I cases, no trends could be identified because the number of cases were too low. Demotion/Termination was the most common discipline for all races, genders and ranks, followed by suspensions.

For Class II cases, chi-square tests could not be performed on white versus Other/Unknown members and male versus female members. There was no evidence of disparity between lower level versus more severe discipline for race or rank (p values greater than 0.05). Black members had the highest percentage of suspensions (46%), but their suspension rate did not differ significantly from white officers (33%, p value of 0.663). This difference in Black and white sworn member discipline for Class II cases is explored in the next section.

Comparison of Class II Sustained Black and White Sworn Member Cases

This section details each Class II sustained case for both Black and white sworn members and provides a comparison of discipline for both races.

Black Sworn Member Cases

In 2023, there were 13 Class II sustained Black sworn member cases. One Black sworn member had two sustained Class II cases in 2023 and eleven had one each. Eleven of the Black sworn members with Class II cases were police officers and one was a sergeant. Eleven were male and one was a female. Of the 13 cases, seven were externally generated and six were internally generated. In 12 cases, the Black member was assigned to patrol at the time of complaint and in one case the member was assigned to the Criminal Investigations Division.

While Black sworn members had the lowest sustained rate of all races, they had the highest percentage of suspensions for Class II sustained cases (46%). Aside from Other/Unknown members, Black members had the lowest number of sustained Class II cases, only 13. Table 20 shows the Class II discipline by rank for Black members.

Table 20: Black Sworn Member Class II Discipline by Rank

Rank	Counseling	Suspension	Grand Total
Police Officer	7	5	12
Sgt and Above		1	1
Grand Total	7	6	13

There were five Black officers and one supervisor who received a suspension for a Class II case. One Black sergeant received a 3-day suspension for Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint Unintentional (FTARC). The sustained violation was the sergeant's second offense, and a 3-day suspension was the mid-range for a second offense (Discipline Matrix range: 1-day suspension to 5-day suspension).

Four Black officers received a suspension, ranging from one to five days. One officer had two Class II sustained cases, both for Performance of Duty (POD) General. In the two cases, the officer received a suspension (3-days and 5-days) based on the allegations being a second offense, as well as the officer's history of deficient performance. One officer received a 4-day suspension for a second offense of demeanor, and that officer also had multiple prior sustained findings for POD General. One officer received a 2-day suspension for two sustained POD General allegations in the same case. Finally, one officer received a 5-day suspension for an inappropriate relationship.⁸ While it was the officer's first offense, there were 10 aggravating and no mitigating factors and the range in the Discipline Matrix for a first offense is a 2-day to 5-day suspension.

Four of the six Black members who received suspensions, received a higher level of discipline because the sustained violation was their second offense. One Black officer received a suspension for two sustained

⁸ Per the Department's *Manual of Rules*, effective date September 30, 2010: Conduct Toward Others – Relationship – Members and employees shall not inappropriately convert or attempt to convert an on-duty contact to an intimate relationship.

allegations in the same case. For one Black officer, the violation was their first offense, but the type of offense was deemed serious warranting a higher level of discipline.

No Black sworn members received Written Reprimands. Of the seven Black officers who received Counseling, the sustained allegation was their first offense, and they were only sustained for one allegation in the case. Three were sustained for FTARC, two were sustained for POD General and two were sustained for POD Care of Property.

White Sworn Member Cases

In 2023, there were 27 Class II sustained white sworn member cases that resulted in discipline. No white members had more than one Class II sustained case. Twenty white members were officers and seven were sergeants and above. Twenty-four were males and three were females. Eighteen cases were externally generated and nine were internally generated. Twenty-two white members were assigned to patrol at the time of complaint and five were assigned to other Department Sections.

White sworn members had the second highest rate of suspensions for Class II cases (33%). In 27 cases, there were six police officers and three supervisors who received a suspension. Table 21 shows the Class II discipline by rank for white members.

Table 21: White Sworn Member Class II Discipline by Rank

Rank	Counseling	Written Reprimand	Suspension	Grand Total
Police Officer	10	4	6	20
Sgt and Above	4		3	7
Grand Total	14	4	9	27

One white sergeant had a sustained Class I case in addition to their sustained Class II case in 2023. Their Class II case was for Supervisors Authority and Responsibilities (2nd offense), for which they received a 20-day suspension. Their Class I case was for Refusal to Accept or Refer a Complaint, for which they was demoted. One white police officer had two sustained Class I cases in addition to their sustained Class II case. Their Class II case was for demeanor (3rd offense), for which they received a 15-day suspension. They was sustained for consumption of intoxicants and other offenses in one Class I case and refusal to provide name and serial number and other offenses in another Class I case, two of which were FTARC allegations. The officer was terminated in both Class I cases.

There were two officers who received two sustained findings in the same case. One officer was sustained for FTARC and demeanor, for which they received a 2-day suspension. The other officer was sustained for obedience to laws (misdemeanor/infracton) and general conduct, for which they received a 1-day suspension. Three officers and one sergeant were sustained for their second offense of FTARC, and their suspensions ranged from 2 days to 5 days. One sergeant was sustained for a first offense of POD General and received a 1-day suspension.

Eighteen white sworn members received Counseling or Written Reprimands (14 officers and 4 supervisors). Twelve of the 18 white members were sustained for FTARC and all but one received Counseling. One member received a Written Reprimand. Two officers were sustained for POD General, and one received a Written Reprimand and the other received Counseling. One officer received a Written Reprimand for POD Improper Search. One officer received a Written Reprimand for demeanor. Two

supervisors received Counseling for supervision (authority and responsibilities). In all 18 cases, the sustained allegation was the member’s first offense.

Comparison of Black and White Sworn Member Discipline

Although Black sworn members had a higher rate of Class II suspensions than white members, both generally received discipline commensurate with a first or second offense or multiple sustained allegations in the same case. Four of the six Black sworn members who received a suspension for a Class II allegation received more severe discipline because the sustained allegation was a second offense (67%). One Black member was suspended because they received multiple sustained findings in the same case (17%). Only one Black officer received a suspension for a first offense in a case where there was a sustained finding resulting from a single allegation; they were sustained for a more serious (discipline matrix is higher) Class II offense (inappropriate relationship). All Black members who received lower-level discipline (Counseling) were sustained for a single allegation which was their first offense of that allegation.

Similarly, white members who received suspensions for Class II allegations were either sustained for their second offense (67%) or had multiple sustained allegations in the same case (22%). Only one officer received a suspension for the first offense of a single allegation. The officer was investigated by an external investigator and the discipline was determined by the City Administrator. All white members who received Counseling or a Written Reprimand were sustained for their first offense.

In 2022, Black members were suspended for Class II violations of FTARC at a higher rather than white members. The more severe discipline for Black members appeared to be caused by more Black members being sustained for a second offense, increasing the level of progressive discipline. A supplemental report of the 2022 data focusing on FTARC allegations found that Black members were sustained at a significantly higher rate than other races (60%).

This current analysis of 2023 data shows that Black members had far fewer allegations of FTARC than white members and were sustained at a significantly lower rate than white members. Only one of four Black members sustained for FTARC violations received a suspension in 2023, a 25% suspension rate. Four of 16 white members received suspensions for FTARC violations, also a 25% suspension rate for Class II FTARC violations.

Tables 22 and 23 summarize the sustained and suspension rates for Black and white officers who received a suspension for Class II allegations in 2023. The total and sustained allegations are based on all allegations received and sustained in 2023, even if there were multiple allegations for the same officer within the same case. The Class II suspension rate is based on the number of suspensions in Class II sustained cases.

Table 22: Sustained and Suspension Rates for Class II Allegations against Black Sworn Members

Violation	Sustained Allegations	Total Allegations	Sustained Rate	Suspensions in a Class II Case	Class II Suspension Rate
Performance of Duty General	7	137	5%	3 (2 nd offense for 2 cases and multiple	60%

				sustained findings in 1 case)	
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	4	16	25%	1 (2 nd offense)	25%
Conduct Toward Others Demeanor	2	41	5%	1 (2 nd offense)	100%
Conduct Toward Others Relationships	1	1	100%	1 (1 st offense)	100%

Table 23: Sustained and Suspension Rates for Class II Allegations against White Sworn Members

Violation	Sustained Allegations	Total Allegations	Sustained Rate	Suspensions in a Class II Case	Class II Suspension Rate
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	20	42	48%	4 (2 nd offense for all cases)	25%
Conduct Toward Others Demeanor	6	35	17%	2 (2 nd offense in 1 case and multiple sustained findings in 1 case)	67%
Performance of Duty General	4	118	3%	1 (1 st offense)	33%
Supervisors Authority and Responsibilities	3	7	43%	1 (2 nd offense)	50%
Obedience to Laws (Misdemeanor/Infraction)	2	5	40%	1 (multiple sustained findings in case)	100%

In contrast with the 2022 data, the 2023 data described herein where the Department observed racial disparity involved sustained misconduct against Black officers for second offenses for Class II cases involving allegations of POD General (2), Demeanor (1), and FTARC (1). There were no officers of any other race with a second offense for POD General, so no direct comparison of discipline is available. There was one white officer who was sustained for a second offense of demeanor and received a suspension. There were white (4) and Asian (3) officers who had second offenses for FTARC. All officers of all races received a suspension except one Asian officer who received a written reprimand (23-1311). The Asian officer had two complaints of FTARC within about a month of each other, both of which were sustained. Although the second complaint was a second offense, the sustained finding and subsequent training for the first complaint occurred after the second complaint was received. Therefore, the officer received a lower level of discipline for the second offense.

There were only two other cases in the 2023 data set in which members received discipline below the discipline matrix range. In one case (22-1346), three officers (one Black, one Asian and one white) were sustained for Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number. The Chief approved counseling for all three because the officers had called a supervisor to the scene and the allegation was viewed as a technical violation. In another case (22-1512), a Black officer also received counseling for Refusal to Provide Name and Serial Number due to their tenure (sworn date only two weeks prior to complaint date) and the fact that they called a supervisor to the scene to take a complaint.

Conclusion

There were some changes in 2023 compared to 2022 in the outcomes of internal investigations. Hispanic members surpassed white officers to become the highest represented race in the department. The overall sustained rate dropped from 10% to 8% between 2022 and 2023. The sustained rate for Black members dropped from 11% to 6%, while it remained nearly the same for white, Asian and Hispanic members. White members had the highest sustained rate for internally generated cases in 2022 by a wide margin, but in 2023 their sustained rate for the same case type was similar to Black, Asian and Hispanic members. In 2023, Black members had a higher percentage of cases with more than one allegation than white members. In 2022, the reverse was true. Like 2022, however, Black members had the highest percentage of suspensions for Class II cases in 2023.

Overall, the 2023 data does not reflect significant differences in the data that would directly suggest remediation is required through changes to policy or practice. However, the Department is interested in looking more closely at the differences in suspension rates and allegations per case between Black and white members, as well as the difference in allegations per case between male and female members. Looking more closely at these differences may help the Department understand what factors contributed to the differences and possibly identify additional data to track that would allow more efficient monitoring. A further analysis may also help the Department in its future annual analyses if more significant differences are observed in subsequent years. Learning more about these slight differences now may allow the Department in the future to more quickly zero in on likely correlative factors and identify the most effective ways to fix any similar observed more significant disparity.

Beyond continued review of suspension rates and allegations per case, additional areas were identified for which further analysis may enable the Department to make operational changes that would reduce the potential for disparity. First, while there were only 15 Force and Pursuit Board cases that were excluded from the population of 2023 cases (a small percentage of total cases), those cases included 154 allegations of misconduct. Further review of these cases may help the Department identify points in the Board review process that could lead to disparities in investigative outcomes. Second, a Supervisory Notes File is the mechanism for tracking supervisory observations, including non-disciplinary corrective action. Supervisory Notes Files are used to identify patterns of Class II misconduct that could lead to an IA investigation. A review of SNFs will help the Department ensure entries are correctly coded and non-disciplinary corrective action is issued in a consistent manner. Board findings and SNFs will be incorporated into future analyses of investigative outcomes and discipline.

Appendix 1: Chi-Square Tests by Allegations per Case

Table 1: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Black Sworn Members

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	64% (224)	213	36% (124)	135	2.88	0.090
Black	58% (197)	208	42% (144)	133		

Table 2: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Hispanic Members

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	64% (224)	220	36% (124)	128	0.30	0.587
Hispanic	62% (319)	323	38% (193)	189		

Table 3: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Asian Members

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	64% (224)	217	36% (124)	131	0.90	0.343
Asian	61% (230)	237	39% (149)	142		

Table 4: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Other/Unknown Sworn Members

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	64% (224)	223	36% (124)	125	0.07	0.787
Other/ Unknown	62% (42)	43	38% (26)	25		

Table 5: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for Male v Female

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	62% (893)	881	38% (542)	554	2.90	0.088
Female	56% (119)	131	44% (94)	82		

Table 6: Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for Officer v Sgt and Above

	One Allegation per Case		More than One Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	61% (914)	917	39% (579)	576	0.16	0.689
Sgt and Above	63% (98)	95	37% (57)	60		

Appendix 2: Chi-Square Tests by Investigation Type

Table 1: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for White v Black Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	319	11% (37)	29	4.55	0.033
Black	94% (321)	313	6% (20)	28		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
White	92% (225)	229	8% (20)	16	2.00	0.158
Black	95% (261)	257	5% (13)	17		
IA and IA Summary Findings						
White	81% (74)	77	19% (17)	14	0.94	0.333
Black	89% (54)	51	11% (7)	10		

Table 2: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for White v Hispanic Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	316	11% (37)	31	1.69	0.194
Hispanic	92% (472)	466	8% (40)	46		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
White	92% (225)	228	8% (20)	17	0.72	0.395
Hispanic	94% (399)	396	6% (26)	29		
IA and IA Summary Findings						
White	81% (74)	74	19% (17)	17	0.04	0.843
Hispanic	81% (61)	61	19% (14)	14		

Table 3: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for White v Asian Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	318	11% (37)	30	2.80	0.094
Asian	93% (353)	346	7% (26)	33		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
White	92% (225)	228	8% (20)	17	0.60	0.438
Asian	94% (292)	289	6% (19)	22		
IA and IA Summary Findings						
White	81% (74)	77	19% (17)	14	0.94	0.333
Asian	89% (54)	51	11% (7)	10		

Table 4: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for White v Other/Unknown Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	312	11% (37)	36	0.05	0.818

Other/Unknown	91% (62)	61	9% (6)	7		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
White	92% (225)	225	8% (20)	20	0.03	0.853
Other/Unknown	92% (54)	54	8% (5)	5		
IA and IA Summary Findings						
White	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square					
Other/Unknown						

Table 5: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for Male v Female Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
Male	92% (1319)	1323	8% (116)	112	0.75	0.386
Female	94% (200)	196	6% (13)	17		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
Male	93% (1065)	1070	7% (77)	72	2.15	0.142
Female	97% (166)	161	3% (6)	11		
IA and IA Summary Findings						
Male	85% (222)	221	15% (39)	40	0.21	0.650
Female	81% (29)	30	19% (7)	6		

Table 6: Chi-Square Test by Investigation Type for Officer v Sgt or Above Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
Officer	93% (1387)	1376	7% (106)	117	10.61	0.001
Sgt or Above	85% (132)	143	15% (23)	12		
DLIs and DLI Summary Findings						
Officer	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square					
Sgt or Above						
IA and IA Summary Findings						
Officer	85% (183)	181	14% (31)	33	0.35	0.557
Sgt or Above	82% (68)	70	18% (15)	13		

Appendix 3: Chi-Square Tests by Complaint Origin

Table 1: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for White v Black Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	319	11% (37)	29	4.55	0.033
Black	94% (321)	313	6% (20)	28		
Internal Origin						
White	74% (40)	41	26% (14)	13	0.01	0.939
Black	77% (27)	26	23% (8)	9		
External Origin						
White	92% (271)	277	8% (23)	17	3.48	0.062
Black	96% (294)	288	4% (12)	18		

Table 2: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for White v Hispanic Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	316	11% (37)	31	1.69	0.194
Hispanic	92% (472)	466	8% (40)	46		
Internal Origin						
White	74% (40)	40	26% (14)	14	0.01	0.904
Hispanic	75% (36)	36	25% (12)	12		
External Origin						
White	92% (271)	274	8% (23)	20	0.65	0.418
Hispanic	94% (436)	433	6% (28)	31		

Table 3: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for White v Asian Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	318	11% (37)	30	2.80	0.094
Asian	93% (353)	346	7% (26)	33		
Internal Origin						
White	74% (40)	42	26% (14)	12	0.71	0.399
Asian	84% (27)	25	16% (5)	7		
External Origin						
White	92% (271)	274	8% (23)	20	0.53	0.467
Asian	94% (326)	323	6% (21)	24		

Table 4: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for White v Other/Unknown Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
White	89% (311)	312	11% (37)	36	0.05	0.818

Other/Unknown	91% (62)	61	9% (6)	7		
Internal Origin						
White	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square					
Other/Unknown						
External Origin						
White	92% (271)	272	8% (23)	22	0.03	0.864
Other/Unknown	94% (60)	59	6% (4)	5		

Table 5: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for Male v Female Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
Male	92% (1319)	1323	8% (116)	112	0.75	0.386
Female	94% (200)	196	6% (13)	17		
Internal Origin						
Male	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square					
Female						
External Origin						
Male	94% (1200)	1203	6% (79)	76	0.50	0.477
Female	95% (187)	184	5% (9)	12		

Table 6: Chi-Square Test by Complaint Origin for Officer v Sgt or Above Sworn Members

	Other than Sustained		Sustained		Chi-Square Value	p
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
All Investigations						
Officer	93% (1387)	1376	7% (106)	117	10.61	0.001
Sgt or Above	85% (132)	143	15% (23)	12		
Internal Origin						
Officer	76% (86)	86	24% (27)	27	0.01	0.916
Sgt or Above	77% (46)	46	23% (14)	14		
External Origin						
Officer	94% (1301)	1298	6% (79)	82	1.61	0.205
Sgt or Above	91% (86)	89	9% (9)	6		

Appendix 4: Chi-Square Tests by Level of Discipline for Class II Cases

Table 1: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for White v Black Sworn Members

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	67% (18)	17	33% (9)	10	0.19	0.663
Black	54% (7)	8	46% (6)	5		

Table 2: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for White v Hispanic Members

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	67% (18)	20	33% (9)	7	0.48	0.489
Hispanic	78% (25)	23	22% (7)	9		

Table 3: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for White v Asian Members

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	67% (18)	18	33% (9)	7	0.01	0.941
Asian	70% (14)	14	30% (6)	6		

Table 4: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for White v Other/Unknown Sworn Members

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>	
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected			
White	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square						
Other/Unknown							

Table 5: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for Male v Female

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>	
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected			
Male	Too few sustained cases to calculate a chi-square						
Female							

Table 6: Chi-Square Test by Level of Discipline for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Counseling – Written Reprimand		Suspension		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	72% (58)	56	28% (23)	25	0.84	0.358
Sgt and Above	56% (9)	11	44% (7)	5		

Appendix 5: 2023 Sustained IA Cases with Discipline

Case #	Race	Sustained MOR Violation	Offense #	Aggravating/Mitigating	Discipline Matrix*	Discipline
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314.42-1h – Obedience to Laws – Driving Under the Influence	1st	7/1	S10-T	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314-42.1e – Obedience to Laws – Felony	1st	7/1	S2-T	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314.28-1b – Notification - Criminal	1st	7/1	S2-T	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314.42-2 – Obedience to Laws – Misdemeanor/Infraction	1st	7/1	C-S2	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	7/1	C-S2	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 1	W	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	7/1	C-S2	Termination
22-0134 Ofc 2	W	314.48-1b – Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class 1)	1st	6/0	C-T	Suspension (20)
22-0153	B	314.08-2a – Conduct Toward Others – Relationships	1st	10/0	S2-S5	Suspension (5)
22-0267	B	370.27-1i – Use of Physical Force Comparable to Level 3	1st	9/0	C-T	Termination
22-0267	B	370.45-1e – Reports and Bookings	1st	9/0	T	Termination
22-0267	B	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	9/0	C-S3	Termination
22-0380	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	7/4	C-S3	Suspension (2)
22-0380	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	7/4	C-S5	Suspension (2)
22-0387 Ofc 2	A	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	7/3	C-S3	Suspension (4)
22-0387 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	7/3	C-S5	Suspension (4)
22-0387 Ofc 2	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	7/3	C-S2	Suspension (4)
22-0387 Ofc 2	A	314.39-2i – Performance of Duty - PDRD	1st	7/3	WR-S5	Suspension (4)

22-0387 Ofc 1	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/6	C-S2	Suspension (1)
22-0387 Ofc 1	H	314.39-2i – Performance of Duty - PDRD	1st	2/6	WR-S5	Suspension (1)
22-0443	A	314-42.1e – Obedience to Laws – Felony	1st	9/0	S2-T	Termination
22-0443	A	370.27-1f – Use of Physical Force Comparable to Level 1	1st	9/0	C-T	Termination
22-0443	A	314.38-1c – Obstructing the Internal Affairs Process	1st	9/0	C-T	Termination
22-0443	A	398.80-1a - Truthfulness	1st	9/0	T	Termination
22-0443	A	285.00-1b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Gross dereliction of duty)	1st	9/0	S5-T	Termination
22-0443	A	370.72-1d – Compromising Criminal Cases	1st	9/0	T	Termination
22-0443	A	328.53-1b – False Reporting of Illness or Injury	1st	9/0	S30-T	Termination
22-0443	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	9/0	C-S2	Termination
22-0443	A	342.57-2b – Care of Department Buildings	1st	9/0	C-S2	Termination
22-0443	A	328.56-2b – Physical Fitness for Duty	1st	9/0	C-S2	Termination
22-0500	W	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	7/3	S3-T	Termination
22-0500	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	4th	7/3	S5-30	Termination
22-0500	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	5th	7/3	S5-30	Termination
22-0500	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	7/3	S2-S5	Termination
22-0500	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	3rd	7/3	S5-S30	Termination
22-0957 Sup 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/1	C-S5	Suspension (1)
22-0957 Ofc 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/2	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1033 Ofc 2	W	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	5/2	C-S2	Written Reprimand
22-1033 Ofc 1	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	0/8	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1069 Ofc 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	7/2	S2-S5	Suspension (5)
22-1069 Ofc 1	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	5/2	S2-S5	Suspension (3)
22-1076	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training

22-1172 Ofc 1	UNK	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/2	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1172 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1226	A	314.39-2i – Performance of Duty - PDRD	2 nd	3/7	S2-S10	Suspension (2)
22-1250	H	314.42-1g – Obedience to Laws – Misdemeanor/Infraction	1st	4/5	C-S2	Suspension (3)
22-1250	H	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	4/5	C-S3	Suspension (3)
22-1250	H	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	4/5	C-S3	Suspension (3)
22-1251	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	4/3	C-S2	Written Reprimand
22-1333	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/2	C-S5	Written Reprimand
22-1386 Ofc 1	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1386 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/5	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1394 Ofc 1	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/3	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1394 Ofc 2	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training
23-0143	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/3	C-S5	Suspension (5)
22-0212	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	5/4	C-S2	Written Reprimand
22-0528 Ofc 1	W	342.00-1c – Department Property and Equipment – Collision w/ Gross Negligence	1st	2/4	S3-T	Suspension (5)
22-0528 Ofc 1	W	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/4	C-S3	Suspension (5)
22-0528 Sup 1	W	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0528 Sup 2	H	234.00-2b – Commanding Officers – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 234.00 subsections)	1st	1/3	C-S5	Written Reprimand
22-0528 Ofc 2	A	314.39-2i – Performance of Duty – PDRD	1st	4/3	WR-S5	Suspension (2)
22-0528 Ofc 2	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	4/3	C-S3	Suspension (2)
22-0569 Ofc 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/5	C-S5	Counseling & Training

22-0569 Sup 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	5/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0569 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	2/5	S2-S5	Suspension (2)
22-0617 Ofc 1	B	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0617 Ofc 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0617 Ofc 3	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	0/8	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0626	A	370.27-1h – Use of Physical Force Comparable to Level 2	1st	5/2	C-T	Suspension (16)
22-0638 Ofc 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-0638 Ofc 2	UNK	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0839	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/1	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0860 Ofc 1	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0860 Ofc 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/2	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0914	H	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others – Demeanor	1st	4/1	C-S3	Written Reprimand
22-1004	B	398.76-1a – Refusal to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Intentional)	1st	3/0	S5-T	Suspension (5)
22-1346 Ofc 1	B	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	4/7	S3-T	Counseling & Training
22-1346 Ofc 2	A	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	1/3	S3-T	Counseling & Training
22-1346 Ofc 3	W	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	0/5	S3-T	Counseling & Training
22-1419 Sup 1	W	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1419 Sup 2	H	234.00-2b – Commanding Officers – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 234.00 subsections)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1449	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	3/3	C-S2	Suspension (2)

22-1449	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	3/3	C-S2	Suspension (2)
22-1483	H	314.39-1e – Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation	1st	3/3	S2-T	Suspension (4)
22-1483	H	314.39-2i – Performance of Duty - PDRD	1st	3/3	C-S2	Suspension (4)
22-1495	W	342.00-2o – Department Property and Equipment – Preventable Collision	1st	2/5	C-S3	Counseling & Training
22-1511 Ofc 1	H	370.36-1b – Custody of Prisoners – Treatment	1st	1/3	C-T	Resigned
22-1511 Ofc 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/3	C-S2	Resigned
22-1511 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/2	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1512	B	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	1/7	S3-T	Counseling & Training
22-1540	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	1/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1667	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1672	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	4/4	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1713 Ofc 1	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	2nd	2/0	WR-S5	Suspension (3)
22-1713 Sup 1	H	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	1st	1/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1729	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	5/2	C-S2	Suspension (1)
23-0490	A	398.80-1a – Truthfulness	1st	6/0	T	Termination
23-0490	A	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	6/0	C-S3	Termination
23-0490	A	342.00-2q – Department Property and Equipment – Misappropriation/Misuse	1st	6/0	C-S3	Termination
23-0490	A	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	6/0	C-S3	Termination
22-0884 Ofc 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/0	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0884 Ofc 2	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	3/0	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-0974	W	398.76-1a – Refusal to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Intentional)	1st	6/1	S5-T	Demotion

22-0974	W	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	2nd	6/1	S2-D	Demotion
22-1137	H	314.04-1e – Conduct Toward Others – Harassment, Discrimination, or Profiling by Gender	1st	6/0	S30-T	Termination - Resigned
22-1159	A	314.39-2g – Performance of Duty – Care of Property	1st	3/6	C-S2	Written Reprimand
22-1159	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	3/6	C-S2	Written Reprimand
22-1210	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1328	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	2nd	7/0	WR-S5	Suspension (5)
22-1390	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1710 Sup 1	H	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	1st	5/0	C-S5	Termination
22-1710 Sup 1	H	314.38-1d – Obstructing the Internal Affairs Process – Supervisors and Commanders	1st	5/0	C-T	Termination
22-1710 Sup 1	H	370.45-1e – Reports and Bookings	1st	5/0	T	Termination
22-1710 Ofc 1	W	398.80-1a – Truthfulness	1 st	7/0	T	Termination
23-0063	H	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	0/4	C-S3	Termination - Resigned
23-0063	H	370.63-1b – Security of Departmental Business	1st	0/4	C-T	Termination - Resigned
23-0133	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	4/4	C-S3	Written Reprimand
23-0186	W	285.00-2b – Supervisors – Authority and Responsibilities (Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90)	2nd	6/1	S2-D	Suspension (20)
23-0203	UNK	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	3/2	C-S3	Suspension (1)
23-0293	H	314.39-1e – Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation	1st	1/5	S2-T	Suspension (2)
23-0359	UNK	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	1st	1/2	C-S3	Suspension (1)
23-0392	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	3rd	5/2	S5-S30	Suspension (15)
23-0494	B	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others - Demeanor	2nd	7/2	WR-S5	Suspension (4)
23-0555	H	314.42-1h – Obedience to Laws – Driving Under the Influence	1st	8/3	S10-T	Suspension (10)
23-0649	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training

22-1364	B	328.07-1a – Prohibited Activity on Duty – Sexual Activity	1st	9/3	S2-T	Termination
22-1364	B	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	9/3	C-S3	Termination
22-1364	B	398.70-1b – Interfering with Investigations	1st	9/3	T	Termination
22-1364	B	342.00-2q – Department Property and Equipment – Misappropriation/Misuse	1st	9/3	C-S3	Termination
22-1402	W	314.39-2e – Performance of Duty – Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	1st	3/3	C-S3	Written Reprimand
22-1500 Ofc 1	W	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	2/5	S3-T	Suspension (3)
22-1500 Ofc 1	W	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others – Demeanor	1st	2/5	C-S2	Suspension (3)
22-1500 Ofc 2	H	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others – Demeanor	1st	1/3	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1524	H	314.04-2a – Conduct Toward Others – Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of AI 71	1st	5/3	C-S30	Suspension (15)
22-1546 Ofc 1	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	4/4	S2-S5	Suspension (2)
22-1546 Ofc 2	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/5	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1558	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/3	C-S5	Written Reprimand
22-1602 Ofc 1	B	314.39-2g – Performance of Duty – Care of Property	1st	1/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training
22-1602 Ofc 2	B	398.80-1a - Truthfulness	1st	8/0	T	Termination
22-1602 Ofc 2	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	2nd	8/0	WR-S5	Termination
22-1604 Sup 1	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/3	C-S5	Suspension (1)
22-1604 Sup 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	4/3	S2-S5	Suspension (3)
22-1604 Ofc 1	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	4/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
22-1660	H	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others – Demeanor	1st	5/3	C-S3	Suspension (2)
22-1723	W	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	7/3	C-S2	Suspension (1)

Sup 1						
22-1723 Sup 2	A	234.12-1a – Commanding Officers Authority and Responsibility	1st	6/2	S5-T	Suspension (5)
22-1723 Sup 2	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	6/2	C-S2	Suspension (5)
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	9/0	C-S2	Termination
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	314.48-1b – Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class 1)	1st	9/0	C-T	Termination
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	370.45-1e – Reports and Bookings	1st	9/0	T	Termination
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	370.72-1d – Compromising Criminal Cases	1st	9/0	T	Termination
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	398.75-1b – Compromising an Internal Investigation	1st	9/0	C-T	Termination
22-1723 Sup 3	Unk	398.80-1a - Truthfulness	1st	9/0	T	Termination
23-0023	A	314.39-2e – Performance of Duty – Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	1st	3/2	C-S3	Counseling & Training
23-0152	A	314.04-2a – Conduct Toward Others – Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of AI 71	1st	6/0	C-S30	Termination
23-0152	A	398.80-1a - Truthfulness	1st	6/0	T	Termination
23-0159	H	398.77-1a – Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1st	3/4	S3-T	Suspension (3)
23-0196	W	314.32-2b – Insubordination – Disrespect	1st	6/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0410	W	314.42-2g – Obedience to Laws – Misdemeanor/Infraction	1st	4/3	C-S2	Termination
23-0410	W	328.07-2c – Prohibited Activity on Duty	1st	4/3	C-S2	Termination
23-0410	W	328.63-1b – Consumption of Intoxicants	1st	4/3	S2-T	Termination
23-0441	B	398.80-1a - Truthfulness	1st	9/0	T	Termination
23-0441	B	314.42-1h – Obedience to Laws – Driving Under the Influence	1st	9/0	S10-T	Termination
23-0441	B	314.69-1b – Gifts, Gratuities – Soliciting or Accepting	1st	9/0	C_T	Termination
23-0441	B	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	9/0	C-S3	Termination
23-0441	B	328.70-2b – Intoxicants on Department Premises	1st	9/0	C-S2	Termination

23-0601	B	314.39-2g – Performance of Duty – Care of Property	1st	3/5	C-S2	Counseling & Training
23-0664 Ofc 1	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0664 Ofc 2	B	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0664 Ofc 3	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	1/5	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0664 Ofc 4	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0733 Ofc 1	A	314.07-2b – Conduct Toward Others – Demeanor	1st	1/4	C-S3	Counseling & Training
23-0733 Ofc 2	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/3	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-0754 Ofc 1	W	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/4	C-S2	Counseling & Training
23-0754 Ofc 2	B	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/4	C-S2	Counseling & Training
23-0844 Ofc 1	A	314.39-2e – Performance of Duty – Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	1st	2/5	C-S3	Written Reprimand
23-0844 Ofc 1	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/5	C-S2	Written Reprimand
23-0844 Ofc 2	Unk	314.39-2e – Performance of Duty – Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	1st	2/5	C-S3	Written Reprimand
23-0844 Ofc 2	Unk	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/5	C-S2	Written Reprimand
23-0844 Ofc 3	A	314.39-2e – Performance of Duty – Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	1st	2/5	C-S3	Written Reprimand
23-0844 Ofc 3	A	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	2/5	C-S2	Written Reprimand
23-0862 Ofc 1	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	3/4	S2-S5	Suspension (2)
23-0862 Ofc 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/5	C-S5	Counseling & Training

23-0955	B	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	2/3	S2-S5	Suspension (3)
23-1016 Ofc 1	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	0/6	C-S2	Counseling & Training
23-1016 Ofc 2	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	4/4	C-S2	Written Reprimand
23-1044	W	314.42-2g – Obedience to Laws – Misdemeanor/Infraction	1st	3/2	C-S2	Suspension (1)
23-1044	W	314.03-2c – General Conduct	1st	3/2	C-S3	Suspension (1)
23-1081	H	314.39-2f – Performance of Duty – General	1st	5/5	C-S2	Written Reprimand
23-1311 Ofc 1	A	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	2nd	2/4	S2-S5	Written Reprimand
23-1311 Ofc 2	W	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-1311 Ofc 3	B	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training
23-1311 Ofc 4	H	398.76-2a – Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1st	2/4	C-S5	Counseling & Training

* C – Counseling, S – Suspension (# of days), T - Termination