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Operational Standing Rule on Category 2 Audits

The purpose of the audit of complaint investigations involving only Category 2 complaints is to provide civilian oversight to ensure that these investigations, typically conducted at the Division level:

- Are properly categorized as Category 2
- Are investigated thoroughly
- Accurately reflect all the concerns of the complainant
- Are fully documented
- Contain appropriate findings based on the evidence
- Discipline imposed for sustained findings is within the Discipline Matrix and appears to be appropriate for the offense

2. An audit is not a comprehensive formal review as the CRB conducts for cases involving Category 1 complaints; rather it is intended to be an assessment to ensure the standards indicated above have been met.

3. All cases involving Category 2 complaints only will be audited. Cases will be assigned to teams on a rotating basis, similar to Category 1 cases.

4. Case files for each complaint will be made available to the team. Additionally, if there is a sustained finding, a memorandum explaining the discipline will be provided.

5. If a team’s audit raises concerns or questions about how the complaint was handled, the Team may address concerns with IA who may then forward questions to the Divisional Command.

6. At the conclusion of the audit, the team shall write a brief (typically a single page) report, which will include
   - Complaint Number
   - Division
   - Date of complaint
   - Date of audit
   - Name of complainant
   - Name(s) of subject officer(s)
   - Name of investigating officer
   - Brief summary of the incident
   - List of allegations, with findings and rationale

APPROVED BY BOARD ON MARCH 26, 2019
Discipline imposed for sustained findings
Names of audit team members

7. The audit report will be read at the next Closed Meeting of the CRB. No vote is required.

8. If a team believes that the standards listed above have not been met, it may request that the Board authorize the team to conduct a full review. In this case, the review will be handled according to the same procedures used to review Category 1 complaints. If a full review is conducted, the case will be presented to the Board for a vote and the complainant will be informed of the outcome. Note that unlike Category 1 cases, Category 2 only cases are already closed prior to Board review and cannot be re-opened.

9. Statistics regarding the disposition of audited Category 2 complaints shall be included in the CRB’s semi-annual reports.
Date of Incident:  
Date of Complaint:  
Date SDPD Report Completed:  
Date of Audit:  
Audit Team Members:  
Division:  
Name of Investigating Officer:  
Name of Complainant:  
Name of Subject Officer(s):  

BRIEF INCIDENT SUMMARY:

ALLEGATIONS, FINDINGS AND RATIONALE:

DISCIPLINE IMPOSED FOR SUSTAINED FINDINGS (if applicable):

TEAM 1 EVALUATION OF 
XXXX-XXXX CAT II INVESTIGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the investigation accurately reflect the concerns of the complainant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the allegation(s) properly categorized as a Category II?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the investigation thorough and complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the information in the investigation report properly documented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the findings appropriate based on the evidence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the discipline imposed for any sustained findings within the Discipline Matrix and is it appropriate for the offense?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team Comments:  
[Comments are required to explain a “No” in the above table but may also address other issues.]  

Approved by the Board on 2.25.2020