



Audit and Review Unit
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

2023 NOPD Specific Annual Performance Evaluation Audit

May 2024

Sample Period 2023 Annual

Report # PE052024

Submitted by PSAB: May 29, 2024

Final Report: July 11, 2024

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Unit.

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) completed the 2023 NOPD Specific Annual Performance Evaluation Audit in May 2024. Performance Evaluations are conducted to ensure that officers who police effectively and ethically are recognized through the performance evaluation process, that officers who lead effectively and ethically are identified, and receive appropriate consideration for promotion. The performance evaluation ensures that poor performance or policing that otherwise undermines public safety and community trust is reflected in officer evaluations so that NOPD can identify it and effectively respond. Performance Evaluation Audits are conducted to ensure officer performance is effectively documented and memorialized daily and annually. This process is regulated by Chapter 13.34 – Evaluations of Employees, of the New Orleans Police Department’s Operational Manual. In addition, Chapter 35.1.9 – Insight is used as a reference.

This audit, conducted from April 29, 2024, to May 17, 2024, was completed using the latest Performance Evaluation’s Protocol regarding the NOPD Specific Annual Evaluation process. The audit addresses all sections of the NOPD specific performance evaluations, including, Narrative Section (reporting, decision making, safety, community engagement and problem solving); Insight Section; Performance Section; and Supervisor Section (if the person being evaluated is a supervisor).

Scores of **95%** or higher are considered compliant or considered in substantial compliance. Noted deficiencies should be addressed with regard to supervisors writing more meaningful and effective evaluations with specific training through In-service Training classes, targeted in-person training, or Department Training Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced annually by close and effective oversight, in addition to Supervisor Feedback Log (SFL) entries.

The overall composite score for the Performance Evaluation Audit is **79%**.

The 5 sections audited by ARU include the following:

- Narrative Composite Score: Includes Q1 – Q4b: **62%**.
 - Q1 - Q4b scored non-compliant (due to incomplete examples).
- Insight Composite Score: Includes Q5a – Q5h: **72%**
 - Q5a - Q5h scored non-compliant (due to missing Insight Reports).
- Performance Composite Score: Includes Q6 – Q9: **87%**
 - Q8a, and Q8b scored non-compliant.
- Supervisor Composite Score: Includes Q10.1 – Q10.4: **97%**
 - No sections scored non-compliant.
- Other Composite Score: **90%**
 - BWC, Self-Assessments, and Employee Summary Report attachment (ESR) scored non-compliant.

The overall performance evaluation score improved compared to the 2023 score of **73%**. More detailed results in Scorecard and Conclusion sections.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Introduction 4

Purpose..... 4

Objectives..... 4

Methodology..... 4

Initiating and Conducting the Performance Evaluation Audit..... 6

Reviews - Scorecards 8

Conclusion 11

Recommendations..... 15

Supervisor Re-evaluations 16

Appendix A – NOPD NeoGov Evaluation Form 24

Appendix B – Performance Evaluation Audit Form 30

Appendix C – Report Distribution..... 35

Introduction

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a performance evaluation audit in April and May of 2024 of the “2023 NOPD Specific Annual Evaluations Review”.

Purpose

The Performance Evaluation audit is conducted to determine whether officers are being recognized for effective and ethical policing through the performance evaluation process. Conversely, this audit further determines and documents whether an officer’s performance is poor and otherwise undermines public safety and community trust. This audit also documents which supervisors do not complete accurate and timely evaluations on their subordinates and how those supervisors are held accountable for incomplete evaluations. Performance evaluations are not only regulated by Chapter 13.34 Performance Evaluations, but also by the following NOPD Operations Manual chapters:

- Chapter 13.03 Personnel Files
- Chapter 13.27 Professional Performance Enhancement Program (PREP)
- Chapter 13.27.1 Job Performance Improvement Plan (JPIP)

This list is not all inclusive.

Objectives

By applying the attached audit form as a rubric, the auditor qualitatively assessed the auditing data to determine whether Performance Evaluations substantively met the requirements of policy. Auditors compared the questions on the Performance Evaluation Audit Form to NEOGOV evaluation responses, EPRs, Body-worn Camera Footage, Supervisor Feedback Log, INSIGHT, Search Warrant Logs, NOPD Authorized Interpreter List, Secondary Employment Violations and Audit and Review Unit Data. Auditors did not randomly select BWC recordings for verification, rather auditors accessed BWC recordings for incidents referenced in performance evaluations to verify the performance reviewer’s substantive findings.

Methodology

Auditors qualitatively assessed performance evaluations using the audit forms for each of the sections (Narrative Section; Insight Section; Performance Section; and Supervisor Section) of the Performance Evaluation Audit (see Appendix A). Auditors analyzed the following data sources:

1. NEOGOV Perform NOPD Specific Annual Evaluations
2. Electronic Police Reports (EPR)
3. Body-worn Camera (BWC) recordings
4. Supervisor Feedback Log (SFL)
5. INSIGHT (Early Warning System (EWS) – Officer activity trends)
6. Search Warrant Logs

7. Secondary Employment Violations
8. NOPD Authorized Interpreter List
9. Audit and Review Unit Data

All documents and related incidents in the original sample that are not audited must be deselected. All deselections are recorded in the Deselection Log.

A review of the Deselection Log shows **two (2) entries** for this audit that were deselected and not replaced.

1. **Auditor elected to not audit the supervisor's two (2) evaluations due to supervisor leaving NOPD before audit began.**

Auditors must ensure they review the current audit protocol. The first tab in the audit tool contains general guidelines for auditing specific examples of the performance evaluation.

1. To be specific, examples MUST have item numbers, or date and time, or must describe a single event.
2. All item numbers MUST be explained (listing an item number is not enough).
3. If the supervisor references a video, the time the relevant action occurred MUST be listed in at least two (2) examples within the evaluation.
4. Examples MUST include analysis (a description of the impact of the action, or a description of why the action was a good example).
5. Examples should NOT be of routine actions.
6. The reader should NOT have to use the item number to find the related reports or videos to understand why the item number was listed.
7. Supervisors MUST provide two (2) examples for each question.

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

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

Initiating and Conducting the Performance Evaluation Audit

By applying the audit forms as a guideline, the auditors qualitatively assessed the Supervision data to determine whether performance evaluations substantively met the requirements of policy.

1. Auditors compared the questions on the Performance Evaluation Audit Form to NEOGOV evaluation responses, EPRs, Body-worn Camera Footage, Supervisor Feedback Log, INSIGHT, Search Warrant Logs, Audit and Review Unit Data, and NOPD Authorized Interpreter List. Auditors did not randomly select BWC recordings for verification, rather auditors accessed BWC recordings for incidents referenced in performance evaluations to verify the performance reviewer's substantive findings.
2. Auditors then documented their answers to audit questions on the Performance Evaluations Audit Form.
3. The performance evaluation encompasses four (4) sections (Performance Evaluation Audit Question Numbers):
 - a. Evaluation Exists
 - i. Auditors determined whether an evaluation existed.
 - b. Narratives (1-4b)
 - i. Auditors reviewed evaluation responses related to written documents, decision-making skills, safety, community policing and community engagement.
 - ii. Auditors checked to ensure at least two (2) specific examples are included in each response. Each specific example must include (1) item number(s), if applicable, (2) date and time of single event or time stamps for body-worn camera recordings and (3) a detailed account of incident.
 - c. INSIGHT Documentation (5a-5h):
 - i. Insight is an early warning data system used to document, analyze, and provide feedback on employee performance and conduct.
 - ii. Auditors verified evaluation responses related to attendance, training, complaints, secondary employment, and awards/commendations based on data from Insight's Employee Activity and Summary Reports.
 - d. Performance Details (6-9)
 - i. Auditors reviewed evaluation responses related to search warrants, non-compliance, quarterly check-ins/areas of growth and improvement and bilingual pay and secondary employment.
 - ii. Data was verified by using Search Warrant Logs, Audit and Review Unit raw data, Insight, and the Authorized Interpreter's list.
 - iii. All non-compliance and exceptional performance require documentation in evaluations.
 - iv. Auditors compared evaluation responses related to search warrants to the Search Warrant Log and the Supervisor Feedback Log.
 - v. Auditors compared evaluation responses of non-compliance related to stops, pat-downs and arrest to PSAB's raw data and the Supervisor Feedback Log.

- vi. Auditors verified evaluation responses related to quarterly check-ins included (1) dates of quarterly meetings with subordinate and (2) descriptions of areas of growth and improvement discussed during the meetings.
- vii. Auditors verified bilingual employee pay with Authorized Interpreter's records.
- e. Supervisor's Evaluation Statement (10.1-10.4); if applicable:
 - i. Auditors verified evaluation responses completed by rating supervisor on his/her direct report who is also a supervisor.
 - ii. Data verification is located in a subordinates' evaluation, Supervisor Feedback Log, Insight and Reporting Supervisor Report.
 - iii. The supervisor's evaluation statement section includes a review of how the subordinate supervisor (1) addressed and deterred misconduct, (2) identified patterns in Insight, (3) addressed non-compliance and (4) described direct reports ability and effectiveness in conducting supervisory reviews.
- 4. The evaluation encompasses four sections (Performance Evaluation Audit Question Numbers):
 - a. Narratives (1-4b)
 - b. Insight Documentation (5a-5h)
 - c. Performance Details (6-9)
 - d. Supervisor's Evaluation Statement (10.1-10.4); if applicable

Note: The audit includes an "Other" section consisting of the following:

- a. BWC references
- b. SVS interactions
- c. Signatures (3 levels)
- d. Self-Assessment attachments
- e. Employee Summary Reports

The total number of performance evaluations reviewed is **382**. Once the auditors entered their audit results into the auditing database, the compliance rate for each of the requirements was determined. This final report documents whether the compliance rate for each requirement met the threshold for substantial compliance (95%).

2023 Audit Exceptions

During the 2023 NOPD Specific Annual Performance Evaluation completion period (Jan. 2 – April 1, 2024) there were no new exceptions or modifications to consider in the auditing process. NOPD's INSIGHT system was last updated in 2021 to INSIGHT 2.0. During this update, the Employee Summary Report generates the employees' information with two options. Supervisors can review and upload the data for either 18 months or four (4) quarters. Auditors were instructed to accept the 18-month range of information as compliant due to the system process, as long as the supervisors referenced information that occurred in 2023 and not from 2022.

Reviews - Scorecards

Audit results data in Excel spreadsheet, raw data based on individual questions on the 2023 NOPD Specific Annual Performance Evaluation Audit Forms. Below are two versions of the scorecards.

Summary Scorecard

Supervisor Performance Evaluation 2024 Table

Compliance percentages for supervisor performance evaluation requirements

Review Period: 2023 Annual

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA	Consent Decree ¶	NOPD Policy Chapters
NARRATIVE (Q1 - Q4B)	62%	1,092	664	-	144		
1 Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q1 (written quality reports)?	71%	261	108	0	11	¶296.i, 298	Ch 13.34 ¶3, ¶36, ¶50
2 Did the supervisor include 2 specific examples for Q2 (Decision Making)?	67%	250	125	0	5	¶296.j, 303.c, 298	Ch 13.34 ¶3, ¶36, ¶50
3 Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q3 (Safety)?	60%	222	147	0	11	¶296.g, 298	Ch 13.34 ¶3, ¶36, ¶50
4A Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q4 with at least one example that is not related to community meetings or toy drives?	58%	195	139	0	46	¶296.a, 298	Ch 13.34 ¶3, ¶36, ¶50
4B Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q4B (Problem Solving)	53%	164	145	0	71	¶296.b, 303.a, 298	Ch 13.34 ¶3, ¶36, ¶50
INSIGHT (Q5A - Q5H)	72%	2184	842	0	14		
5A Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report?	77%	290	89	0	1	¶296.c, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5B Did the supervisor verify the employee completed all required training as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	73%	275	104	0	1	¶296.h, 300, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5C Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of bias-free policing as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	73%	275	104	0	1	¶296.e, 303.c, 151, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5D Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any citizen complaints as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	69%	262	117	0	1	¶296.c, 303.b, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5E Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any supervisor initiated complaints as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	71%	269	110	0	1	¶296.c, 303.b, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5F Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any discipline levied against him/her as reported in Insight's Employee Summary report?	71%	267	111	0	2	¶296.d, 303.d, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5G Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of the Secondary Employment Policy as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	74%	278	100	0	2	¶296.f, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
5H Did the supervisor document any awards and/or commendations received by the employee as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?	71%	268	107	0	5	¶296.c, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
Performance (Q6 - Q9)	87%	1551	234	0	115		
6 Did the supervisor describe the quality and accuracy of any search warrants written by the employee, as documented in the Search Warrant Log?	96%	334	14	0	32	¶296.c, 137, 146	Ch 13.34 ¶46; Ch 35.1.9 ¶1-2
7 Did the supervisor list all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Unit?	99%	344	3	0	33	¶297, 151	
8A Did the employee list dates of ALL quarterly check ins that occurred during the reporting year?	61%	222	144	0	14	¶298-299, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶25-¶34
8B Did the employee briefly describe discussions during each check-in related to areas of growth and challenges?	81%	294	71	0	15	¶298, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶25-¶34
9 Did the supervisor accurately record whether the officer receives bilingual pay?	99%	357	2	0	21	¶297, 189.1	
Supervisor Specific (Q10.1 Q10.4)	97%	657	20	0	1983		
10.1 Did the reporting supervisor describe how the employee deterred and/or addressed misconduct?	98%	94	2	0	284	¶296.c, 299, 313	
10.2A Did the employee conduct regular reviews of Insight?	96%	92	4	0	284	¶296.c, 316, 319	Ch 35.1.9 ¶22
10.2B Did the employee list the number of late quarterly reviews, as reported in Insight?	97%	94	3	0	283	¶299, 301, 316, 319	Ch 13.34 ¶25-¶34
10.2C Did the employee list the number of patterns identified and documented, as reported in Insight?	97%	97	3	0	280	¶299, 316, 319	Ch 35.1.9 ¶31
10.2D Did the employee list the number of non-disciplinary corrective actions, as reported in Insight?	96%	92	4	0	284	¶299, 313, 316, 319	Ch 35.1.9 ¶26
10.3 Did the employee address all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Unit?	99%	93	1	0	286	¶299, 313	
10.4 Did the reporting supervisor describe the employee's ability and effectiveness in conducting supervisory reviews?	97%	95	3	0	282	¶299, 313, 316, 319	
Other	90%	1914	214	0	532		
BWC Did the supervisor reference video in the evaluation?	76%	163	52	0	165	¶297, 328.f	Ch. 41.3.10: A ¶¶endix B
SVS If the employee is assigned to SVS, did the supervisor include specific examples of victim interactions and services in the evaluation?	95%	20	1	0	359	¶297, 201.f	
Oth Did the reporting supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she met with the employee?	100%	379	0	0	1	¶297, 301	Ch 13.34 ¶48 ¶52 ¶55
Oth Did the employee sign the evaluation indicating he/she met with the reporting supervisor?	98%	370	9	0	1	¶297	Ch 13.34 ¶48 ¶52 ¶55
Oth Did the reviewing supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she reviewed and approved the reporting supervisor's ratings?	97%	369	10	0	1	¶297, 301	Ch 13.34 ¶48 ¶52 ¶55
Oth Is the Self-Assessment attached to the Evaluation?	79%	297	81	0	2	¶297	Ch 13.34 ¶46
Oth Employee Summary Report Attached?	84%	316	61	0	3	¶298	Ch 13.34 ¶46
Total	79%	7,398	1,974	-	2,788		

General Comments

ARU audited the sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

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

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

District Scorecard

Supervisor Performance Evaluation 2024 Scorecard

Compliance percentages for supervisor performance evaluation requirements

Review Period: 2023 Annual

District	# PE's Reviewed	Q1	Q2	Q4 A-B		Q5 A-H	Q6 Search	Q7 Stops, Pat-	Q8 A-B	Q9 Bilingual
		Reporting Skills	Decision Making	Q3 Safety Employed	Community Engagement and Problem Solving	Insight Verification	Warrant Log Verification	Downs, Or Arrests Verification	Quarterly Check-ins Date(s) Verification	Pay Verification
1	29	86%	69%	52%	40%	87%	100%	100%	69%	97%
2	29	76%	52%	50%	41%	74%	100%	96%	48%	100%
3	32	66%	53%	48%	48%	72%	100%	97%	74%	100%
4	34	91%	100%	88%	93%	95%	96%	95%	56%	100%
5	30	77%	80%	66%	55%	89%	100%	100%	62%	100%
6	25	64%	68%	68%	62%	69%	96%	100%	63%	100%
7	26	88%	100%	76%	72%	72%	83%	100%	50%	100%
8	35	33%	20%	31%	22%	39%	88%	100%	40%	100%
SOD	32	67%	65%	48%	59%	70%	97%	100%	74%	100%
FOB*	4	100%	100%	75%	75%	75%	100%	100%	50%	100%
Academy	10	88%	90%	100%	87%	41%	100%	100%	67%	100%
Homicide	16	56%	88%	75%	63%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
ISB*	14	77%	86%	79%	80%	55%	100%	100%	71%	100%
SID	14	57%	43%	36%	62%	74%	86%	100%	64%	100%
PIB	14	86%	71%	69%	63%	65%	93%	100%	64%	93%
MSB*	23	40%	40%	37%	43%	78%	100%	100%	21%	100%
SVS	13	92%	62%	85%	61%	43%	100%	100%	75%	100%
Overall	380	71%	67%	60%	56%	72%	96%	99%	61%	99%

Supervisor's Performance Review

Q10.1 Described How Employee Deterred and/or Addressed Misconduct	Q10.2 A-D Conducted Regular Reviews of Insight	Q10.3 Addressed All Non- Compliance as Distributed by ARU	Q10.4 Ability and Effectiveness in Conducting Supervisory Reviews	BWC Video is Referenced in Eval	SVS Examples of Victim Interactions Used	Reporting Supervisor Signed the Eval	Employee Signed the Eval	Reviewing Supervisor Signed the Eval	Self- Assessment Attached	Employee Summary Report Attached	Overall
100%	94%	100%	100%	62%	100%	100%	93%	93%	79%	90%	85%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	97%	97%	83%	86%	84%
100%	100%	100%	100%	87%	100%	100%	97%	97%	88%	88%	86%
100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	67%	100%	97%	100%	97%	97%	93%
100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	-	100%	100%	100%	70%	93%	89%
100%	100%	100%	100%	38%	-	100%	100%	100%	92%	88%	84%
75%	75%	75%	75%	100%	-	100%	88%	81%	62%	76%	82%
80%	95%	100%	67%	23%	-	100%	100%	100%	71%	74%	67%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	87%
100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	93%
100%	75%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	80%	40%	90%
100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	50%	71%	81%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	64%	64%	88%
100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	96%	57%	74%	79%
100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	62%	77%	83%
98%	97%	99%	97%	76%	95%	100%	98%	97%	79%	84%	79%

General Comments

ARU audited the sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

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

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Conclusion

The results of this audit were first verified through an Auditor Peer Communication process. In this process, the reviewing auditor discusses any variances with the originally assigned auditor to reach a consensus. If a consensus is not reached, the Audit Innovation Manager is consulted for resolution. This process is documented in the audit tool.

The Auditor Peer Communication process is completed, and the Audit Innovation Manager Review has concluded. Any issues identified by the Audit Innovation Manager were sent back to the assigned auditor for review and resolution, but none were identified. Following the completion of this process, the districts/units have an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. If any discrepancies or concerns are identified, an Audit Re-Evaluation Request Form should be submitted to PSAB documenting their concerns.

The “Q#” correlates to the number of the question on the actual performance evaluation. The text following the “Q#” is the question asked of the assigned auditor in the audit tool. There were **382** performance evaluations reviewed for this audit.

NARRATIVE SECTION:

Q1 Reporting Skills – Did the supervisor include at least two (2) specific examples for Q1 (Quality Written Reports)? The overall score for this question was **71%** vs. the previous score of 69%. Supervisors did not use specific examples, details, or analysis of the examples used. **FOB scored compliant.**

Q2 Decision Making - Did the supervisor include at least two (2) specific examples for Q2 (Decision Making)? The overall score for this question was **67%** vs. the previous score of 61%. Supervisors did not use specific examples, details, or analysis of the examples used. The **4th, 7th, and FOB scored compliant**

Q3 Safety Employed - Did the supervisor include at least two (2) specific examples for Q3 (Safety)? The overall score for this question was **60%** vs. the previous score of 51%. Supervisors did not use specific examples, details, or analysis of the examples used. **Academy scored compliant.**

Q4A – B Community Engagement and Problem Solving - Did the supervisor include at least two (2) specific examples for Q4A with at least one (1) example that is not related to community meetings or toy drives? Did the supervisor include at least two (2) specific examples for Q4B (Problem-solving Strategies)? These questions are asked independently of each other in the audit tool, but their scores were combined for the scorecard. The overall composite score for these questions was **56%** vs. the previous score of **44%%**. Q4A scored **58%** vs. the previous score of **45%**, and Q4B which scored **53%** vs. the previous score of **42%**. Supervisors did not use specific examples, details, or analysis of the examples used. **No unit scored compliant.**

INSIGHT SECTION

Q5A–H Insight Verification – Questions 5 A–H were asked independent of each other on the audit tool, but their scores were combined for the scorecard. **The 4th District and Homicide scored compliant.**

Q5A Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insight’s Employee Activity Report? **77%** vs. the previous score of 61%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5B Did the supervisor verify the employee completed all required training as reported in Insight’s Employee Summary Report (ESR)? **73%** vs. the previous score of 69%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5C Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of bias-free policing as reported in Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **73%** vs. the previous score of 69%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5D Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any citizen complaints as reported in Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **69%** vs. the previous score of 66%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5E Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any supervisor-initiated complaints as reported and Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **71%** vs. the previous score of 67%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5F Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any discipline levied against him/her as reported in Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **71%** vs. the previous score of 69%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5G Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of the Secondary Employment Policy as reported in Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **74%** vs. the previous score of 68%. **(Non-Compliant)**

Q5H Did the supervisor document any awards and/or commendations received by the employee as reported and Insight’s Employee Summary Report? **71%** vs. the previous score of 69%. **(Non-Compliant)**

The combined score for **Q5 A–H** was **72%** vs. the previous score of **67% (Non-Compliant)**. This was due to the fact that supervisors **DID NOT** attach the required Employee Summary Report or Activity Report. Auditors could not verify that supervisors reviewed the items and their accuracies without having attached the reports to the evaluation.

PERFORMANCE SECTION

Q6 Search Warrant Log Verification - Did the supervisor describe the quality and accuracy of any search warrants written by the employee, as documented in the Search Warrant Log? The overall score for this question was **96%** vs. the previous score of 88% **(Compliant)**. **1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th,**

SOD, FOB, Academy, Homicide, ISB, MSB, SVS all scored compliant.

Q7 Stops, Pat-Downs, or Arrests Verification - Did the supervisor list all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs and/or arrest scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Section? The overall score for this question was **99%** vs. the previous score of 98%. **All units scored compliant.**

Q8 A–B Quarterly Check-ins Date(s) Verification - Questions 8 A–B were asked independent of each other on the audit tool, but their scores were combined for the scorecard.

Q8A - Did the employee list dates of ALL quarterly check-ins that occurred during the reporting year? **61%** vs. the previous score of 50%. **(Non-Compliant).**

Q8B - Did the employee briefly describe discussions during each check-in related to areas of growth and challenges? **81%** vs. the previous score of 71%. **(Non-Compliant).**

The combined score Q8 A–B was **61%** vs. the previous score of 49%. **(Non-Compliant).** Supervisors did not list the requisite quarterly check-ins, or the listing did not contain any specifics of what was discussed. **Homicide scored compliant.**

Q9 Bilingual Pay Verification - Did the supervisor accurately record whether the officer receives bilingual pay? (Refer to latest NOPDAI list). The overall score for this question was **99%** vs. the previous score of 100%. **All units scored compliant except PIB, which was non-compliant.**

SUPERVISOR SECTION (Supervisor was the person being evaluated)

Q10.1 Described How Employee Deterred and/or Addressed Misconduct - Did the reporting supervisor describe how the employee deterred and/or address misconduct? The overall score for this question was **98%** vs. the previous score of 97%. **(Compliant).**

Q10.2 A–D Conducted Regular Reviews in Insight – These questions were asked independent of each other on the audit tool, but their scores were combined for the scorecard.

Q10.2A - Did the employee conduct regular reviews of Insight? **96%** vs. the previous score of 97%. **(Compliant)**

Q10.2B - Did the employee list the number of late quarterly reviews, as reported in Insight? **97%** vs. the previous score of 97%. **(Compliant)**

Q10.2C - Did the employee list the number of patterns identified and documented, as reported in Insight? **97%** vs. the previous score of 99%. **(Compliant).**

Q10.2D - Did the employee list the number of non-disciplinary corrective actions, as reported in Insight? **96%** vs. the previous score of 97%. **(Compliant).**

The combined score for Q10.2 A–D was **97%** vs. the previous score of 98%. **(Compliant).**

Q10.3 Addressed All Non-Compliance as Distributed by ARU - Did the employee address all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed

by the Audit and Review Unit? The overall score for this question was **99%** vs. the previous score of 100%. **(Compliant)**.

Q10.4 Ability and Effectiveness in Conducting Supervisory Reviews - Did the reporting supervisor describe the employee's ability and effectiveness in conducting supervisory reviews? The overall score for this question was **97%** vs. the previous score of 98%. **(Compliant)**.

OTHER SECTION

BWC Video is referenced in the Eval - Did the supervisor reference video in the evaluation? The overall score for this question was **76%** vs. the previous score of 69%. **(Non-Compliant)**.

SVS Examples of Victim Interactions Used - If the employee is assigned to SVS, did the supervisor include specific examples of victim interactions and services in the evaluation? The overall score for this question was **95%** vs. the previous score of 94%. **(Compliant)**.

Reporting Supervisor Signed the Eval - Did the reporting supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she met with the employee? The overall score for this question was **100%** vs. the previous score of 100%. **(Compliant)**.

Employee Signed the Eval - Did the employee sign evaluation indicating he/she met with the reporting supervisor? The overall score for this question was **98%** vs. the previous score of 94%. **(Compliant)**.

Reviewing Supervisor Signed the Eval - Did the reviewing supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she reviewed and approved the reporting supervisor's ratings? The overall score for this question was **97%** vs. the previous score of 89%. **(Compliant)**.

Self-Assessment Attached - Is the self-assessment attached to the evaluation? The overall score for this question was **79%** vs. the previous score of 72%. **(Non-Compliant)**.

Employee Summary Report Attached - Is the Employee Summary Report attached to the evaluation? The overall score for this question was **84%** vs. the previous score of 72%. **(Non-Compliant)**.

Recommendations

The completion and audit of Performance Evaluations continue to show an overall improvement compared to the previous audit. However, there are opportunities to improve in the following areas:

Narrative Section (Q1 – Q4B):

While examples and detailed descriptions are improving, supervisors need continuous reinforcement of the expectations around clear and concise explanations for any given answers or responses.

1. This report will serve as notification of district/unit performance during this audit.
2. Work with Policy Standards Section to develop DTB's to address the training issues identified in this report.
3. Additional Academy training is recommended to inform supervisors of the proper writing format and following instructions as given.
4. "Train the Trainer" sessions may be helpful to have a specific person in each district/division to assist supervisors completing evaluation and to answer on-going questions in each district/division.
5. Revert to requiring subordinates to give two (2) examples in the Self-Assessments for guidelines or bases for reporting supervisors to use as a guideline when completing subordinate evaluations.
6. Continue to give district/division status reports to show the completion process of all assigned evaluations.

Supervisor Reevaluation Requests and PSAB Responses

5th District Review and Request:

SPO

- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report, and the evaluating sergeant's responses are below. To the BWC question, the auditor responded no to the question. However, the auditor's comments, stated that the officer is not assigned a BWC. On the Officer's evaluation of the question "Is this employee assigned a BWC for their regular work duties/responsibilities?", the Sergeant responded, "Detective is not assigned a BWC for his daily duties as a Detective." The auditor's response to this question should be "yes."

SPO

- Q2: Did the supervisor include 2 specific examples for Q2 (Decision Making)? Auditor's Answer: No
DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To Q2: The Sergeant listed two examples providing two examples for the Officer's decision-making skills where the officer blocked the deceased from a young child to avoid any potential shock/trauma and where the officer made a decision by contacting the Auto Theft detective and towed the vehicle that was stolen from the scene.
- Q5A: Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report? Auditor's Answer: No. Auditor's Comments: Q5(a). Per the Activity Report, the officer was not compliant with the attendance policy. He has 161 sick days compared to 62 for NOPD all and 120 for Patrol – 3rd Platoon. DSA Response: The District Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To QA, 5(a), Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in the Insights Employee Activity Report? First, the evaluation dates could not be changed for the officer's Employee Activity Report. The report is dated 9/23/2022 which is out of the supervisor's control. This is listing sick time from 9/23/2022 to 3/25/2024 when the supervisor printed the form. Secondly, the sick leave is listed as hours and not days in the Employee Activity Report as the auditor documented. The question asked if the officer complied with the attendance policies. The officer complied with the policy as the Sergeant documented because he did not violate the policy. The officer who works on the platoon is a 12:15 (converted as 12.25 decimals) hour employee and it is 12:13 (converted as 12.22 decimals). On the officer's employee activity, the hours are 161.82 (hours). The officer only had 13 days of sick days. 10 of those days where he had a medical condition and provided documentation. 2 of those days were undocumented sick which were not consecutive. According to the attendance policy paragraph #7, an employee may accrue eight (8) undocumented sick leave days, utilized singly or consecutively, per calendar year (January 1- December 31 of the same year). The officer did not violate policy if he only had 2 days undocumented. Also, the sick hours aren't accurate. If both the activity and summary reports are compared, you can see the information is not reported accurately.
- Q5F: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any discipline levied against him/her as reported in Insight's Employee Summary report? Auditor's Answer: No
- Auditor's Comments: Q5(f). The officer received several feedback logs for various violations during this evaluation period. DSA Response: The district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To Q5F: The Sergeant documented that he "verified that the officer did not have any departmental disciplinary action." After reviewing the

officer's summary report, the officer did not have any supervisor disciplinary actions. The auditor stated she located two supervisor feedback. However, they were not disciplinary actions, they were employee recognitions.

Sergeant

- Q5A: Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report? Auditor's Answer: No. Auditor's Comments: Q5(a). Q5(a). The Sgt., per the activity report, is not compliant with sick leave. He has 94 compared to 61 for NOPD all and 70 for Sergeants.
- DSA Response: The Sergeant reviewed the audit report, and the evaluating Lt.'s responses are below. To QA, 5(a), Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in the Insights Employee Activity Report? First, the evaluation dates could not be changed for the officer's Employee Activity Report. The report is dated 9/21/2022 which is out of the supervisor's control. This is listing sick time from 9/23/2022 to 3/23/2024 when the supervisor printed the form. Secondly, the sick leave is listed as hours and not days in the Employee Activity Report as the auditor documented. The question asked if the sergeant complied with the attendance policies. The officer complied with the policy as the Lt. documented because he did not violate the policy. The sergeant who works on the platoon is a 12:15 (converted as 12.25 decimals) hour employee and it is 12:13 (converted as 12.22 decimals). On the sergeant's employee activity, the hours are 94.17 (hours). The officer only had 7 days of sick days. 6 of those days where he had a medical condition and provided documentation. 1 of those days was undocumented sick. According to the attendance policy paragraph #7, an employee may accrue eight (8) undocumented sick leave days, utilized singly or consecutively, per calendar year (January 1-December 31 of the same year). The officer did not violate policy if he only had 2 days undocumented. Also, the sick hours aren't accurate. If both the activity and summary reports are compared, you can see the information is not reported accurately.

Sergeant

- Q5A: Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report? Auditor's Answer: No. Auditor's Comments: Q5(a). Per the Activity Report, the officer was not compliant with the attendance policy. He has 161 sick days compared to 62 for NOPD all and 120 for Patrol – 3rd Platoon.
-
- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To QA, 5(a), Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in the Insights Employee Activity Report? First, the evaluation dates could not be changed for the officer's Employee Activity Report. The report is dated 9/23/2022 which is out of the supervisor's control. This is listing sick time from 9/23/2022 to 3/25/2024 when the supervisor printed the form.
- Secondly, the sick leave is listed as hours and not days in the Employee Activity Report as the auditor documented. The question asked if the officer complied with the attendance policies. The officer complied with the policy as the evaluating Sergeant documented because he did not violate the policy. The officer who works on the platoon is a 12:15 (converted as 12.25 decimals) hour employee and it is 12:13 (converted as 12.22 decimals). On the officer's employee activity, the hours are 161.82 (hours). The officer only had 13 days of sick days. 10 of those days where he had a medical condition and provided documentation. 2 of those days were undocumented sick which were not consecutive. According to the attendance policy paragraph #7, an employee may

accrue eight (8) undocumented sick leave days, utilized singly or consecutively, per calendar year (January 1- December 31 of the same year). The officer did not violate policy if he only had 2 days undocumented. Also, the sick hours aren't accurate. If both the activity and summary reports are compared, you can see the information is not reported accurately.

- Q5F: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any discipline levied against him/her as reported in Insight's Employee Summary report? Auditor's Answer: No
- Auditor's Comments: Q5(f). The officer received several feedback logs for various violations during this evaluation period.
- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To Q5F: The Sergeant documented that he "verified that the officer did not have any departmental disciplinary action." After reviewing the officer's summary report, the officer did not have any supervisor disciplinary actions. The auditor stated she located two supervisor feedback. However, they were not disciplinary actions, they were employee recognitions.

PO

- Q5A: Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report? Auditor's Answer: No. Auditor's Comments: Q5(a). The officer was not in compliance with sick leave. According to his activity report, he had a total of 120 sick leave compared to 61 by all NOPD and 116 Patrol 3rd Platoon. The evaluating Lt marked the officer as compliant.
- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To Q5E, 5(a), Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in the Insights Employee Activity Report? First, the evaluation should be listed as the correct officer. Secondly, the sick leave is listed as hours and not days in the Employee Activity Report as the auditor documented. The question asked if the officer complied with the attendance policies. The officer complied with the policy as the Sergeant documented because he did not violate the policy. The officer who works on the platoon is a 12:15 (converted as 12.25 decimals) hour employee and it is 12:13 (converted as 12.22 decimals). On the officer's employee activity, the hours are 120.80 (hours). The officer only had 10 days of sick days. 8 of those days were because of an injury caused on the job under item# A-23259-23 which were consecutive. 2 of those days were undocumented sick which were not consecutive. According to the attendance policy paragraph #7, an employee may accrue eight (8) undocumented sick leave days, utilized singly or consecutively, per calendar year (January 1- December 31 of the same year). The officer did not violate policy if he only had 2 days undocumented.

SPO

- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. First the auditor's notes say the incorrect Sergeant. The Sergeant listed was not on the platoon in the 5th District for 6 years. The officer being evaluated only has two years on the job. His immediate supervisor is another Sergeant. Q1, the evaluating Sergeant answered with two dates and two item numbers. Q2, the Sergeant provided two good decision-making skills with two different dates and item numbers. Q3, the Sergeant provided two examples of safety measures with two different dates and item numbers. Although he copied and pasted one of the examples for both Q2 & Q3, he should not get both questions wrong. He should receive credit for

at least one of the two questions. According to the Performance Evaluation Scorecard Review and instructions we received on June 20, 2024. Q4A, the Sergeant answered with two dates and two item numbers.

- Q4B, although he copied and pasted one of the examples for both Q2 & Q4, he should not get both questions wrong. He should receive credit for at least one of the two questions.
- Q5E, the Sergeant reviewed the officer's Insight Employee Summary, and the officer did not have any supervisors'-initiated complaints. In his answer to the question the Sergeant stated, "I verified that the Officer did not have any supervisor feedback logs." He used the wrong word. He used feedback log instead of initiating complaints. The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the Summary Report to confirm that the officer did not have any supervisor-initiated complaints.

PO

- Q5E: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any supervisor-initiated complaints as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report? Auditor's Answer: No
- Auditor's Comments: Q5(e). 12/13/2023 Rank Initiated DI-1 Unknown Rule 2: Moral Conduct - Paragraph 06 - Unauthorized Force.
- DSA Response: The fifth district Sergeant reviewed the audit report and the evaluating Sergeant's responses are below. To Q5E, 5(e). Supervisor-Initiated Complaints: I verify the employee did not have any supervisor-initiated complaints. The Sergeant responded, "yes, 12/13/2023 Rank Initiated DI-1 Unknown Rule 2: Moral Conduct - Paragraph 06 - Unauthorized Force." He lists the rank-initiated complaint, and the auditor has this listed in their notes as well.

PSAB Response

- Changes have been made to the evaluations of the mentioned officers, as your assessments were correct.
- There will be **No Change** to the other evaluations for the following reasons:
- The officer's evaluation was a total copy and paste from the employee's self-assessment. **No Change.**
- Both officers' evaluation of sick time was audited correctly. Auditors review sick time usage compared to peers to audit this question. Supervisors should give an explanation of overage in their evaluations if the employee falls above the range. (The auditor used days instead of hours in her explanation and that will be corrected in training.) **No Change.**
- Q2 **No Change** - the supervisor used the exact example given in the self-assessment therefore did not provide two required examples. Q5a no change - same reason as above for sick leave and usage. Q5f changed - your assessment was correct.
- The updated answers will reflect on the final scorecard.

Academy Review and Request:

- Q8a - 22% Captain disagrees on the following ones regarding the four quarterly reviews in insight that are done in 2024. Please review and respond.

PSAB Response

- PSAB addressed the concerns for the Performance Evaluations and agree with Academy.
- The changes have been made and will reflect on the final scorecard. All changed to Yes.

Central Evidence and Property Review and Request:

- On Question 1 of the 2023 Performance evals, the Sergeant received 0%. Upon reviewing the responses, it was noted the answers were copy and pasted. He reviewed his responses and compared them to the officer's self-evaluations and the verbiage, while similar, they were different. In the officer's Q1, the who, what, when, why, were all answered (date, officer, the reports, and the fact they were written well enough to secure warrants). In another officer's example, all were answered as well but he did not receive credit for the answers.

PSAB Response

- Question 1 (officer 1) - **NO CHANGE** The first example was the exact wording from the self-assessment leaving you with one example and did not meet the requirement of providing two specific examples.
- Question 1 (officer 2) - **NO CHANGE** - the examples did not include an analysis of why the reports were good examples of report writing.
- On question 5D, the Sergeant received a response of "no" relating to verifying citizen complaints as reported in Insight employee report. While the Sergeant did reply "yes" to the question, the complaint that was filed was given the disposition of "NFIM" and no action was taken. There was no investigation on the actual complaint so it did not seem relevant to mention as it would not even be included on the officer's short form from PIB.

PSAB Response

- Question 5D - **NO CHANGE**: The evaluation question asked if the employee received any complaints. As I understand your thought process in taking the investigation status into consideration, the employee did receive a complaint.
- On question 8A, the Sergeant received a "no" for both officers, however, he explained I did not supervise Officer Wise during the check-ins and listed the 2 dates he did meet with Officer McCarvy during the reviews.

PSAB Response

- Question 8A (officer 1) - **NO CHANGE**: There was an explanation given for three quarters and not four nor did give a date for the fourth quarter.
- Question 8A (officer 2) - **CHANGED to YES**.
- Question 8B, the Sergeant received a "no" for the Officer, however, areas of growth and challenges as "he encouraged him to continue to get better daily with his time management" and the Sergeant also commended his exemplary job performance. he believes that qualifies for growth and challenges.

PSAB Response

- Question 8B - **CHANGED TO YES**.

Homicide Review and Request:

- Question# 1. The Sgt. provided different dates and Items for each Detective.
- Question# 1. The Sgt. explained that the report had minimal errors and contained the information needed for prosecution. The auditor mentioned that the impact of the action, or a description of why the action was a good example was not included. I believe that this information was included.
- Question# 2. The Sgt. provided different dates and items for each Detective.
- Question# 3. The Sgt. provided different dates and Items for each Detective.

- Question# 4A. The Sgt. provided different dates and items for each Detective.
- Question# 1. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and items for each Detective and different explanations.
- Question# 3. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and Items for each Detective both were relevant.
- Question# 4. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and Items for each Detective.
- Question# 4B. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and Items for each Detective.
- Question# 8B. The Sgt. was marked noncompliant "No" for questions 8B and no description was provided on why the question was noncompliant for Detective.
- Question# 1. The Sgt. provided different examples of each detective's report writing skills when completing Detective's evaluation. The auditor stated that the same description was given for both examples.
- Question# 4A. The Sgt. gave two separate examples with separate locations and items. The Auditor concluded that the Sgt. gave the same description for both examples documented; however, this is incorrect regarding Detective.
- Question# 1. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and Items. Question# 3. The Sgt. provided different dates, locations, and Items. These were separate examples and events.
- Question# 4A. Both examples are relevant for each detective.
- Question# 4B. Both examples are relevant for each detective.
- Question# 4B. The Sgt. explained that the detective met with the victim's family at a NOK Meeting to assure them that the case would be prosecuted. The detective also invited member of the DA's Office to join them to reassure the family. The Sgt. explained this collaboration and the effect it had. The auditor noted that this example didn't include the necessary "analysis." In the other example the detective encouraged citizens to attend NOMPAC meetings. I believe that the Sgt. included the necessary information to obtain compliance.

PSAB Response

- Question 4b: **No Change**. The supervisor did not explain how the citizens going to the NONPACC Meetings were problem solving strategies for the community.
- Question 8b: **No Change**. The supervisor did not document any areas of growth or challenges discussed for the officer as required in the question.
- **No change** for the remaining of the reevaluation forms submitted, the supervisors used the same description to describe the item numbers or events documented. When the same description is used in the same question for the same subordinate it only counts as one example provided and does not comply with the evaluation requirement of providing two examples. When the same description is used for multiple subordinates the supervisor receives credit for one subordinate and not the other as it is deemed a "copy and paste." Changing the item number does not constitute as being a different example when the descriptions are the exact same.

SOD Mounted/Canine/RTA Review and Request:

- On the scorecard, it identified the Lt. had zero percent for the first 5 questions for both Sergeants under her command. Please reevaluate NOPD specifics for both Sergeants.
 - Q1, March 20, 2023
 - Q2, 5/29/23, BWC Mark 3:50, 6/24/23, BWC mark 4:19,
 - Q3 1/15/23, BWC 26:03, 6/8/23, BWC mark, 10:29,

- Q4a, 3/25/23 and 4/11/23 examples
- Q4b - N/A with explanation

PSAB Response

After reviewing the reevaluation form submitted, below are the following conclusions:

- Questions 1-4a: **NO CHANGE**. The examples submitted are the exact examples documented in the employee's self-assessment.
- Question 5 series: **NO CHANGE**. The attached summary report does not include the full year of 2023. The document provided is from Oct 1 - Dec 31, 2023.
- Questions 1-3 and 4b: **NO CHANGE**. The examples submitted are the exact examples documented in the employee's self-assessment.
- Question 4a: **NO CHANGE**. the first example is acceptable as the supervisor provided additional information outside of what was given from the self-assessment, but the second example was the exact information from the self-assessment. In this case this question does not meet the standard of providing two examples for this question.
- Question 5 series: **NO CHANGE**. The attached summary report does not include the full year of 2023. The document provided is from Oct 1 - Dec 31, 2023.

4th District Review and Request:


- 2023 NOPD Specific Annual Performance Evaluation for the Lieutenant question #6 asks if the employee wrote a search warrant. It stated that he did not author any search warrants. but the reviewer stated the supervisor did not describe the quality and accuracy of any search warrants.

PSAB Response

- After reviewing your re-evaluation form and the supporting documents, the score **was changed**.

Appendix A – NOPD NeoGov Performance Evaluation Form

Example NOPD NeoGov Evaluation Form:

Employee Name YEAR 2022 NOPD-Specific Annual Performance Evaluation Due Date: Weekday, Month, Day, Year		Direct Manager:
--	---	------------------------

General Information		
Position	Division	Evaluation Type
		Periodic
Department	Class Spec	
Police Department		

Content	
Narrative Section I Text Only	
Title/Job Assignment	
<p>Please list the employee's title(s)/job assignment(s) during the evaluation period including specific duties and responsibilities.</p>	
Rater	Comment

Evaluation Statement Section I NOPD Consent Decree Evaluation (Rating Scale)	
Evaluation Section I - Narratives	
<p>Rate the employee on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the least contribution possible, 3 being meets average and 5 being the highest. If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required. For each section, at least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Refer to training materials. Note: If the employee is assigned to SVS, the performance evaluation must include descriptive language which incorporates victim interactions and services (201f).</p>	
1. Did the employee produce quality written documentation?	
At least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Provide them in a given comment box.	
Refer to training materials.	
If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required.	
Rater & Rating	Comment

2. Did the employee demonstrate good decision-making skills?

At least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Provide them in a given comment box.

Refer to training materials.

If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required.

Rater & Rating

Comment

3. Did the employee employ safety measures?

At least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Provide them in a given comment box.

Refer to training materials.

If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required.

Rater & Rating

Comment

4(a). Did the employee conduct community policing by engaging and communicating with the community?

At least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Provide them in a given comment box.

Refer to Training Guide, page 18, Common Non-Compliant Errors, Community Policing.

If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required.

Rater & Rating

Comment

4(b). Did the employee conduct community policing by using problem-solving strategies regarding community needs?

At least TWO specific examples are REQUIRED. Provide them in a given comment box.

Refer to Training Guide, page 18, Common Non-Compliant Errors, Community Policing.

If "N/A" is selected, an explanation is required.

Rater & Rating

Comment

Evaluation Section II -Insight Documentation

Attendance, Training, Bias-Free Policing, Citizen and Supervisor-initiated Complaints, Discipline, Secondary Employment and Commendations. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report to this evaluation.

5(a). Attendance: I verify the employee is compliant with attendance policies.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Activity Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Activity Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Activity Report.

Rater & Rating	Comment
----------------	---------

5(b). Training: I verify the employee has completed all required training.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating	Comment
----------------	---------

5(c). Bias-Free Policing: I verify the employee did not have any violations of bias-free policing.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating	Comment
----------------	---------

5(d). Citizen Complaints: I verify the employee did not have any citizen complaints.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating

Comment

5(e). Supervisor-Initiated Complaints: I verify the employee did not have any supervisor-initiated complaints.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating

Comment

5(f). Discipline: I verify the employee did not have any discipline.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating

Comment

5(g). Secondary Employment: I verify the employee did not have any violations of NOPD secondary employment policy.

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the above statement. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report at the end of this form.

If "NO" is selected, a narrative that includes descriptions and incident identifiers is required.

All incident identifiers should correspond to documentation listed in the Insight Employee Summary Report.

Rater & Rating

Comment

Evaluation Statement Section | Text Only

5(h) AWARDS & COMMENDATIONS

Supervisors must refer to Insight's Employee Summary Report to verify the below sections. Please upload the Employee's Summary Report to this form.

5(h). Describe any awards and/or commendations.

Rater

Comment

Evaluation Statement Section | Text Only

Evaluation Section III - Performance Details

6. If the employee wrote a search warrant, describe the quality and accuracy.

Refer to search warrant logs.

Rater

Comment

7. List ALL non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Unit.

Refer to Audit and Review raw data.

Rater

Comment

8.(a) List dates of ALL quarterly check-ins that occurred during the evaluation year, reported in Insight.

Refer to Insight's quarterly tiles.

Rater

Comment

8.(b) Briefly describe discussions during each check-in related to areas of growth and challenges. Documentation of check-ins for the entire year is required.

Rater

Comment

Evaluation Statement Section I Consent Decree: Bilingual Pay

9. The employee is an Authorized Interpreter receiving bilingual pay in:

9. The employee is an Authorized Interpreter receiving bilingual pay in:

Refer to the authorized interpreters list.

Rater & Rating	Comment
----------------	---------

Notes & Attachments

Created By

Created On

Note

Refer to these resources to evaluate your employee:

Process

1	Rater	Completed On	You are about to save this form. You will be prompted to sign and approve it as you continue further.
2	Approval & Signature	Completed On	<p>CIVIL SERVICE EVALUATION: I acknowledge that I have carefully completed and/or reviewed this evaluation. My signature below does not indicate necessarily agreement with statements provided by the employee. It only means that I have either completed or reviewed this form and would like to submit it.</p> <p>NOPD CONSENT DECREE EVALUATION - FOR REPORTING SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE: By signing, I certify that (1) this form was completed by me personally, (2) I directly supervised the employee, and (3) met with the employee to discuss this evaluation.</p> <p>NOPD CONSENT DECREE EVALUATION - FOR REVIEWING SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE: By signing, I certify that (1) this form was reviewed by me personally, (2) I directly supervised the reporting supervisor, and (3) any changes to this form have been reported to the employee and reporting supervisor.</p> <p>X _____</p>
3	Evaluation Signature		X _____
4	Approval & Signature		X _____

Appendix B – Performance Evaluation Audit Forms

Performance Evaluation Audit Forms:

Performance Evaluation Audit			
ID Info			
Auditor Find items	Evaluation Period Find items	What is Evaluation Status of Employee? Find items	Supervisor Assignment Find items
Supervisor Conducting Evaluation <input type="text"/>	Employee Being Evaluated <input type="text"/>	Reviewing Supervisor <input type="text"/>	
Employee Rank Find items			
Narrative Section			
Q1: Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q1 (written quality reports)?		Q1: Please pick the reason(s) for the non-compliance for Q1:	
Find items		Find items	
Q1: Explain other <input type="text"/>			
Q2: Did the supervisor include 2 specific examples for Q2 (Decision Making)?		Q2: Please pick the reason(s) for the non-compliance for Q2:	
Find items		Find items	
Q2: Explain Other <input type="text"/>			

Q3: Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q3 (Safety)?

Find items

Q3: Please pick the reason(s) for the non-compliance for Q3:

Find items

Q3: Explain Other

Q4 A: Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q4 with at least one example that is not related to community meetings or toy drives?

Find items

Q4A: Please pick the reason(s) for the non-compliance for Q4A:

Find items

Q4 A: Explain Other

Q4 B: Did the supervisor include at least 2 specific examples for Q4B (Problem Solving)

Find items

Q4B: Please pick the reason(s) for the non-compliance for Q4B:

Find items

Q4 B Explain Other

Insight Section

Q5A: Did the supervisor verify compliance with attendance policies as reported in Insights Employee Activity Report?

Find items

Q5B: Did the supervisor verify the employee completed all required training as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?

Find items


Q5C: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of bias-free policing as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?

Find items


Q5D: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any citizen complaints as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?

Find items

Q5E: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any supervisor initiated complaints as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?


Q5F: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any discipline levied against him/her as reported in Insight's Employee Summary report?

Q5G: Did the supervisor verify the employee did not have any violations of the Secondary Employment Policy as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?

Q5H: Did the supervisor document any awards and/or commendations received by the employee as reported in Insight's Employee Summary Report?


 

Performance Section


Q6: Did the supervisor describe the quality and accuracy of any search warrants written by the employee, as documented in the Search Warrant Log?

Q7: Did the supervisor list all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Unit?


Q8A: Did the employee list dates of ALL quarterly check ins that occurred during the reporting year?

There should be 4 dates recorded in the evaluation based on the reporting cycle:

Jan - Mar, reported in April
Apr - Jun, reported in July
Jul - Sept, reported in October
Oct - Dec, reported in January

Q8B: Did the employee briefly describe discussions during each check-in related to areas of growth and challenges?


Q9: Did the supervisor accurately record whether the officer receives bilingual pay?


Refer to NOPD AI list

Supervisor Section


Q10.1 Did the reporting supervisor describe how the employee deterred and/or addressed misconduct?


Q10.2A: Did the employee conduct regular reviews of Insight?

Q10.2B: Did the employee list the number of late quarterly reviews, as reported in Insight?


Q10.C: Did the employee list the number of patterns identified and documented, as reported in Insight?

Q102.D: Did the employee list the number of non-disciplinary corrective actions, as reported in Insight?

Q10.3: Did the employee address all non-compliance documented in raw data for stops, pat-downs, and/or arrests scorecards, as distributed by the Audit and Review Unit?


 

Q10.4: Did the reporting supervisor describe the employee's ability and effectiveness in conducting supervisory reviews?


Other Section

BWC: Did the supervisor reference video in the evaluation?

Supervisors must include time stamp/minute mark at least twice to be compliant.

SVS: If the employee is assigned to SVS, did the supervisor include specific examples of victim interactions and services in the evaluation?


Reporting Supervisor Signature: Did the reporting supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she met with the employee?

Employee Signature: Did the employee sign the evaluation indicating he/she met with the reporting supervisor?


 

Reviewing Supervisor Signature: Did the reviewing supervisor sign the evaluation indicating he/she reviewed and approved the reporting supervisor's ratings?

Signature Comments: If any Signatures marked as N/A, please explain the reason(s) why those signature(s) were skipped.

Is the Self-Assessment attached to the Evaluation?


 

Self-Assessment Explanation: For N/A, please explain if the supervisor documents why the self-assessment is not included as an attachment.

ESR Attached: Is the Employee Summary Report attached to the Evaluation?

Other Attached: Are there additional attachments uploaded to the evaluation?

Auditor Comments

Reviewer Comments

[Back to Menu](#)

[Submit Audit](#)

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent

Assistant Superintendent – Field Operations Bureau

Assistant Superintendent – Investigative Services Bureau

Assistant Superintendent – Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Assistant Superintendent - Public Integrity Bureau

Assistant Superintendent - Management Services Bureau

Captain – Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

City Attorney – City Attorney's Office

Assistant City Attorney – Superintendent's Office