



The Use of Service Improvement Opportunities

A Report by the Recurring Audit Workgroup of the Citizen Review Committee

November 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In August 2010, the Recurring Audit Workgroup of the Citizen Review Committee (CPC) reviewed a set of service improvement opportunity (SIO) records with the following goals:

- Determine how service improvement opportunities are utilized by the City Auditor’s Independent Police Review (IPR) division and the Portland Police Bureau (Police Bureau);
- Identify potential policy issues raised by the use of service improvement opportunities;
- Ascertain if service improvement opportunities are used to improve police services to Portland residents.
- Identify specific issues or themes that come up regularly in the incidents that result in service improvement opportunities.

Methodology

Independent Police Review staff randomly selected a set of 21 completed service improvement opportunities case files for the six-month period between October 1, 2009 – March 31, 2010. These correspond to case handling decision dates. All the incidents in the cases occurred in 2009.

The 21 case files were broken down into three separate groups of seven each. The three members of the Recurring Audit Workgroup – Ayoob Ramjan, Lewellyn Robison and Jeff Bissonnette – each reviewed two of the groups. This methodology reviewed a sample of cases that were statistically valid for the service improvement opportunities conducted in the sample period but the workgroup notes that the cases are not necessarily representative of all of the interactions that Portland Police Bureau members would have had with Portland residents and visitors in that same period.

Summary of Findings

The workgroup’s review identified the following findings and recommendations. More complete descriptions and narrative about each finding can be found in the body of the report.

Finding #1: Service improvement opportunities are being used appropriately. The workgroup found no instance in the sample cases it reviewed where it believed that the case-handling

decision should have been handled differently or not have been handled as a service improvement opportunity.

Recommendation #1a: The Citizen Review Committee, through its Recurring Audit Workgroup, shall conduct another review of SIOs within the next two years to examine whether the process is still working appropriately.

Recommendation #1b: At the time of the next review, CRC, through its Recurring Audit Workgroup, shall examine whether the average time to complete an SIO is 77 days.

Finding #2: A recorded rationale for handling cases as service improvement opportunities is rarely given by either the Independent Police Review division or by the Portland Police Bureau. Although the workgroup found no cases that were handled inappropriately, there was often no clear reasoning given for why a case was being handled as a service improvement opportunity. It would be helpful to ensure that the rationale is clearly outlined at the time the decision is made to treat a case as a service improvement opportunity. Providing this kind of rationale would also bolster the consistency for these cases and help ensure that cases that may be appropriate for full investigation are not somehow treated as SIOs.

Recommendation #2: IPR and IAD should begin to provide the reasoning for handling a case as an SIO immediately. In its future review, CRC shall include this topic as part of the review checklist.

Finding #3: It is unclear whether service improvement opportunities are used to improve police training or whether they are actively utilized as part of the Police Bureau's Employee Information System to identify problems or issues officers may be experiencing. Service improvement opportunities provide a useful insight into a broad array of interactions between Police Bureau personnel and members of the public in Portland. IAD does use the service improvement opportunities as a chance to look at individual officers and activities within a particular precinct. The Police Bureau's Office of Accountability and Professional Standards has also implemented a centralized action item in its tracking system.

Rather than being considered as isolated incidents, regular reviews of SIOs can indicate areas where additional training may be needed to address issues throughout the police force or could indicate difficulties that an individual officer may be having. The workgroup encourages SIOs be used as an active tool on an ongoing basis.

Recommendation #3: CRC shall send a letter to the Chief of Police communicating the importance of SIOs as a tool for training and broader employee relations and request feedback and dialogue about how the information from the SIO process is utilized to improve overall performance by the Police Bureau. CRC shall also increase communication with IPR on trends being identified through SIOs.

Finding #4: The use of the term “service improvement opportunity” is not utilized consistently. The term “service improvement opportunity” came into use in mid-2009. Formerly, the term was “service complaint.” While the workgroup offers no opinion on the terminology, even in the later cases we reviewed, there was still confusion about which term was being used. In some files, both were used interchangeably. It was apparently important for the terminology to be changed but it appears that the change either is slow in being adopted or is not being fully accepted. The debate on the specific term continues in various forums. Whatever term is chosen, that term should be consistently used.

Recommendation #4: In its future review, CRC shall include a question about the consistency of term use.

Finding #5: The SIO process may need to include some additional oversight from CRC for complainants who have concerns about how their case is handled. When someone files a complaint against a member of the Portland Police Bureau, they generally do not do so lightly. While complainants who were specifically asked appeared to be satisfied with both the decisions to handle the cases as a service improvement opportunity as well as the ultimate outcome of the process, there were some who were not. These complainants should be heard and need to have their concerns taken seriously. While the workgroup does not wish to place unnecessary administrative barriers on either IPR or the Police Bureau, some kind of review process should be adopted for those complainants who feel that a decision to handle their case as a service improvement opportunity is not adequate.

Recommendation #5: CRC shall initiate a dialogue with IPR to create a pilot mechanism for additional CRC input on the decision to handle a case as a service improvement opportunity.

Finding #6: The most common complaints focused on perceived rudeness or other police officer behavior in interactions with members of the public. The workgroup recognizes that police officers have a difficult job. Every interaction brings the possibility of a dangerous situation. However, by and large, the police interact with ordinary members of the general public in the performance of their duties. Police officers need to ensure that courtesy is the

hallmark of their interactions with the public. Police Bureau members also need to be well-trained in de-escalation techniques to ensure that routine situations do not devolve into more hostile or serious matters.

Recommendation #6: CRC shall find regular opportunities to monitor Police Bureau progress in improving communication techniques with the public and shall make this issue a key focus of its future review.

REPORT

Overview

When someone files a complaint against a member of the Portland Police Bureau, the Director or the Assistant Director of Independent Police Review division reviews the issues raised and makes a determination on whether to dismiss the complaint or refer it to the Internal Affairs Division of the Police Bureau. If a complaint is not dismissed and if the complaint qualifies, a complainant is offered the option of mediation to meet with the officers involved in conjunction with a trained mediator to work out the differences created by the incident. If the complainant does not choose to pursue mediation and if the complaint is serious enough, the Internal Affairs Division will pursue a full investigation of the complaint with IPR playing an oversight role. However, for those cases where the issues raised in a complaint are minor, in that they would likely not lead to disciplinary action or are not a violation of Police Bureau policy, the complaint can be handled as a service improvement opportunity.

An SIO entails a supervisory officer getting information about the incident that led to the complaint directly from the complainant. The supervisor also meets with the officer or officers involved to communicate the concerns raised by the complainant and discuss how similar incidents could be handled differently in the future to avoid further complaints. The results of this discussion are then reported back to the complainant, if possible. The supervisory officer must then write a "Service Improvement Opportunity Resolution Memo" to be approved by his or her Commander, the Captain of Professional Standards and the Director or Assistant Director of IPR. This memo needs to explain efforts made to resolve the complaint, including details of the conversations with the complainant and the corrective action taken with the officer. This concludes the service improvement opportunity process. The complaint is closed and there is no additional chance for appeal or further redress. The service improvement opportunity does remain a part of an officer's record and is entered in the shared complaint database used by IPR and IAD to offer the possibility of ongoing monitoring.

Although the Citizen Review Committee does not currently have a role in service improvement opportunity cases, CRC is charged by city ordinance to "recommend policy changes" by assisting the IPR Director to "identify specific patterns of problems and to participate in the development of policy recommendations "and also to "advise on operations....to review methods for handling complaints and advise on criteria for dismissal, mediation, and investigation. " [PCC 3.21.090 (A)(3) and (4)] To fulfill this charge, CRC undertakes reviews such as this current study of service improvement opportunities.

Attached as Appendix #1 to this report is a copy of the checklist for the review the workgroup performed for SIOs. If anyone wishes to view the raw summary that was used for the report, a copy can be provided by the staff of Independent Police Review.

Case Studies

Complaints come from all sorts of interactions between members of the public and members of the Portland Police Bureau. Some examples of the types of complaints that become service improvement opportunities may be useful. Following are two examples from the 21 cases reviewed for this report. They demonstrate how a service improvement opportunity is generated, how an SIO is resolved and they also provide an insight how an SIO can provide an avenue for supervisory officers to discuss other issues that an officer may be having.

Case Study #1: An off-duty law enforcement officer from a jurisdiction within the region was pulled over by a Portland police officer. The off-duty officer had entered an area where a neighborhood parade was going to begin but the parade had not yet begun and the streets had not yet been blocked off.

The off-duty officer took offense at the Portland police officer's demeanor during the traffic stop, saying he spoke in a "very demanding voice" and demonstrated "aggressive behavior." He said he did not see any indications of the impending parade. At no time during the stop did the off-duty officer identify himself as a law enforcement official.

The off-duty officer alleged that the Portland officer "continued with his aggressive behavior to the point that I believed he was attempting to entice me into a confrontation." The officer also said, "I'm just going to write you a bunch of tickets." Then the officer said, "in a very demeaning, aggressive tone," according to the deputy, "Get out of here."

The off-duty officer said as part of his complaint that "if I deserved a ticket, I would have accepted it like any other citizen. However, in this case, there was absolutely no probable cause for the stop nor should I, or any other citizen, be subject to such rude and condescending behavior."

In the complaint resolution memo written by the Portland officer's supervisor, the supervisor reported on his conversations both with the off-duty officer as the complainant and the Portland officer involved. The supervisor reported that the Portland officer said that he perceived the off-duty officer entered a crowd of "100 pedestrians," who were waiting for the parade to begin and thought he had presented some danger to them. The Portland officer said the off-duty officer "seemed oblivious" to the fact that there were people in the street and that he had almost hit some of them. The Portland officer also said that the matter was complicated by the fact that the off-duty officer did not identify himself as an off-duty police officer. The Portland officer admitted that he did "chew (the off-duty officer) out a little" and did tell him he could write him several tickets. The officer said he only wanted the deputy to take responsibility for his actions. The Portland officer said that he ended the situation without citing the off-duty officer because the parade was about to start and he needed to return to his post to block traffic for it. He said that when he returned to his post, several people thanked him for stopping the vehicle.

The supervisor noted that he agreed with the Portland officer's reasoning for stopping the off-duty officer and understood the time constraints that prevented him from running the off-duty officer's name through the computer and not issuing any citations. The supervisor also agreed with the Portland officer that if the off-duty officer had identified himself as a member of law enforcement, it may have eased some tension and relieved some of the Portland officer's suspicions.

However, he did discuss the "chewing out" that the Portland officer gave to the off-duty officer and identified ways that the interaction could have been accomplished in a more positive manner. The supervisor also took the opportunity to discuss some other performance issues that he and some other sergeants in the precinct had observed with the Portland officer. He noted that the officer was receptive to suggestions for improvement. The supervisor reinforced the expectations on how officers should conduct themselves on traffic stops and during other interactions with citizens.

The supervisor also noted in his report that he had had a follow-up conversation with the off-duty officer subsequent to his discussion with the Portland officer and said that the he "thanked me for looking into this matter" and that the he was "satisfied with how this complaint was handled."

Case Study #2: A business owner filed a complaint that her business had been burglarized, despite the fact that a neighbor had noticed some strange activity and had called the police to come and investigate. The neighbor reported during her call to 911 that she noticed that security lights that were normally lit were not on. The neighbor reported that a police car did arrive but went by without stopping. The complaint was based on the belief that if the officer who came by had actually stopped, the burglary might have been prevented.

In the resolution memo, the officer's supervisor noted that, after listening to the recording of the 911 call made by the neighbor on the night in question, he thought that the call should have been categorized as a higher priority by the 911 operator and passed that observation on to the Police Bureau of Emergency Communications (BOEC) to be addressed.

The supervisor also talked to the officer who responded to the call. The officer responded that he thought he was simply doing an area check for a person running through the yard of the business. The supervisor told him that the business had actually been burglarized and that the business owner was unhappy with the police response. The officer acknowledged that, looking back on the incident, he should have done a more thorough check of the business and that his response to the call was not sufficient. The officer said he would learn from this incident.

The supervisor followed up with the business owner and reported on his actions. He noted the concern about the 911 prioritization of the call, said it had affected the time it took for police to respond and said he had raised the issue with the BOEC. He also discussed the actions of the officer on the scene and said that the officer was aware that his response was insufficient. He explained that the officer was relatively new and that he thought that the officer would

respond positively to the constructive criticism provided by the incident. The supervisor reported that the business owner said she understood and thanked him for following up. The supervisor asked if there were any other questions or concerns he could address about the incident and was told no.

Also as part of this case, another neighbor of the business contacted the Police Bureau – separate from the complaint – raising concerns about the burglary that was the subject of the complaint and said that there had been other burglaries in the area as well. The supervisor noted that, as a courtesy, he was writing a letter to this neighbor as well to address the concerns raised.

Findings

The workgroup identified six main findings from its review. Those findings are highlighted here with accompanying narrative to underscore the points the workgroup believed were highlighted by each finding. In addition, the workgroup provides a recommendation with each finding in order to help define a future course of action for each finding.

Finding #1: Service improvement opportunities are being used appropriately. In its review checklist, the workgroup included an item asking “Do you feel this was a justified case-handling decision (to treat the complaint as a service improvement opportunity)?” With one exception (where the response was “maybe”), the workgroup felt that there were no instances where the complaint should have been given a full investigation by the Police Bureau. Thus, the workgroup found no clear instance in the sample cases it reviewed where it believed that the case-handling decision should have been handled differently or not have been handled as a service improvement opportunity.

This is a significant finding. While the workgroup firmly believes that every complaint against the Portland Police Bureau is important and must be taken seriously, neither the Police Bureau nor IPR has the resources to provide an investigation into each complaint. The service improvement opportunity process ensures that a complaint is indeed taken seriously and requires supervisory officers to coordinate between complainants and officers to find resolutions to complaints. It is also important to note that in a plurality of the cases reviewed (43%), the complainant expressed satisfaction with the outcome. Only one complainant in the reviewed cases expressed dissatisfaction. The remaining responses were either not indicated (26%) in the completion memo or the supervisory officer was not able to contact the complainant after the discussion with the involved officer or officers (26%). The workgroup’s only comment here is that more effort could be made to ensure that a complainant’s view of

the outcome is recorded as part of the case documentation so that the usefulness of the SIO process can be verified on an ongoing basis.

Additionally, the average time to complete a service improvement opportunity – from the time a complaint is filed to when a final disposition letter is written by IPR staff to the complainant – was just over three months (95.9 days) for this sample of cases. This is significantly shorter than other complaints that are pursued by a full investigation. The SIO process does allow both complainant and the involved officer or officers to have an issue addressed in a reasonable amount of time. The workgroup hopes that IPR and IAD realize how important it is to have that mechanism so that minor issues do not fester and become major issues. The closer to the actual incident that the SIO process can be completed, the better it is for both the complainant and the officer(s) involved. To that end, the workgroup urges both IPR and IAD to work together to reduce by 20 percent the average time to complete an SIO, resulting in completed SIO within 77 days on average.

Recommendation #1a: The Citizen Review Committee, through its Recurring Audit Workgroup, shall conduct another review of SIOs within the next two years to examine whether the process is still working appropriately.

Recommendation #1b: At the time of the next review, CRC, through its Recurring Audit Workgroup, shall examine whether the average time to complete an SIO is 77 days.

Finding #2: A recorded rationale for handling cases as service improvement opportunities is rarely given by either the Independent Police Review division or by the Portland Police Bureau. Although the workgroup found no cases that were handled inappropriately, there was often no clear reasoning given for why a case was being handled as a service improvement opportunity. This is different than in other cases that are given full investigations. Reasons for findings by commanders in those cases are very clearly spelled out since that reasoning could be the basis for further appeals and consideration by CRC.

While the SIO cases are by definition being handled as a lower level case, it is still important to provide a rationale for the decision to handle the case as a service improvement opportunity. Providing this kind of rationale would also bolster the consistency for these cases and help ensure that cases that may be appropriate for full investigation are not somehow treated as SIOs. In short, providing such reasoning as part of the case file at the time of decision would establish a record of precedent that could be followed in the future. Additionally, providing the reason for a decision to pursue a complaint as an SIO would likely facilitate better

communication between IPR staff and IAD personnel by building an improved common understanding of how similar cases should be handled.

To put it as directly as possible, it would be helpful to ensure that the rationale be clearly outlined at the time the decision is made to treat a case as a service improvement opportunity.

Recommendation #2: IPR and IAD should begin to provide the reasoning for handling a case as an SIO immediately. In its future review, CRC shall include this topic as part of the review checklist.

Finding #3: It is unclear whether service improvement opportunities are used to improve police training or whether they are actively utilized as part of the Police Bureau's Employee Information System to identify problems or issues officers may be experiencing. Service improvement opportunities provide a useful insight into a broad array of interactions between Police Bureau personnel and members of the public in Portland. IAD does use the service improvement opportunities as a chance to look at individual officers and activities within a particular precinct. The Police Bureau's Office of Accountability and Professional Standards has also implemented a centralized action item in its tracking system.

Rather than being considered as isolated incidents, regular reviews of SIOs can indicate areas where additional training may be needed to address issues throughout the police force or could indicate difficulties that an individual officer may be having. The workgroup believes that SIOs should be used as an active tool on an ongoing basis. In addition to the increased communication noted above between IPR and CRC, the workgroup would also welcome communication between the Police Bureau and the full CRC as to how SIOs may or may not be currently impacting training curriculum or how it is being used as part of the Employee Information System that is intended to identify officers who may be in need of assistance and ensure they get the help they need in order to be successful in their work. It may be that information from the SIO process is indeed used in these areas and others but, again, it is not clear to the workgroup whether that is the case.

Recommendation #3: CRC shall send a letter to the Chief of Police communicating the importance of SIOs as a tool for training and broader employee relations and request feedback and dialogue about how the information from the SIO process is utilized to improve overall performance by the Police Bureau. CRC shall also increase communication with IPR on trends being identified through SIOs.

Finding #4: The use of the term “service improvement opportunity” is not utilized consistently. The term “service improvement opportunity” came into use in mid-2009. Formerly, the term for the process was “service complaint.” While the workgroup offers no opinion on the terminology, even in the later cases we reviewed, there was still confusion about which term was being used. In some files, both were used interchangeably. It was apparently important for the terminology to be changed but it appears that the change either is being slow in being adopted or is not being fully accepted. In any case, one term should be consistently used.

Recommendation #4: In its future review, CRC shall include a question about the consistency of term use.

Finding #5: The SIO process needs to include some additional oversight from CRC for complainants who have concerns about how their case is handled. When someone files a complaint against a member of the Portland Police Bureau, they generally do not do so lightly. While complainants who were specifically asked appeared to be satisfied with both the decisions to handle the cases as a service improvement opportunity as well as the ultimate outcome of the process, there were some who were not and those need to be considered within the larger context.

In order for the service improvement opportunity process to be trusted by the public, it is important that it not be seen as a mechanism for simply sweeping complaints “under the rug.” It also must not be seen as a way to avoid investigating more serious issues.

All complainants should be heard and need to have their concerns taken seriously. In order to underscore the integrity of the process, there should be some ability for an outside check of the decision to refer a complaint as a service improvement opportunity. While the workgroup does not wish to place unnecessary administrative barriers on either IPR or the Police Bureau, some kind of appeal or review process should be adopted for those complainants who feel that a decision to handle their case as a service improvement opportunity is not adequate.

The workgroup does not have a specific recommendation to offer but its discussions did yield some suggestions that are worthy of exploration. Currently, when a complaint is filed, it is first reviewed by IPR staff. If it is not dismissed, it is referred to IAD, sometimes with a suggestion as to how to handle it and sometimes not. IAD then makes the determination whether to handle the complaint as an SIO or as a full investigation and then communicates that decision to IPR.

IPR then writes a letter with a status update to the complainant as to where her/his case stands. At that time, the complainant may raise a concern about how her/his case is being handled – specifically, the complainant may express dissatisfaction with the decision to pursue an SIO process or express that he or she think there should be a full investigation.

In these cases, and they are rare, it seems to the workgroup that at this point would be an appropriate point for some subset of CRC – perhaps three or four members – to be able to weigh in as to whether the SIO determination was appropriate. This subset, either chosen at random or assigned on a rotating basis, could quickly review the case and offer feedback as to whether treating the case as a service improvement opportunity was appropriate. It should be noted that the need for the rationale, as discussed in Finding #2, would be particularly important here and it would also provide CRC with an ongoing opportunity to monitor a key tool in handling complaints against the Police Bureau or its members.

This is just one suggestion that the workgroup developed. The key point is that there should be a way for some additional input on SIO decisions from the CRC within the existing structure that avoids adding an unnecessary process or layer but still increases the integrity and public trust in the process. The workgroup would welcome more discussion on this point among the full CRC and with IPR management and staff.

Recommendation #5: CRC shall initiate a dialogue with IPR to create a pilot mechanism for additional CRC input on the decision to handle a case as a service improvement opportunity.

Finding #6: The most common complaints focused on perceived rudeness or other police officer behavior in interactions with members of the public. The workgroup recognizes that police officers have a difficult job. Every interaction brings the possibility of a dangerous situation. However, by and large, the police interact with ordinary members of the general public in relatively routine situations in the performance of their duties. Police officers need to ensure that courtesy is the hallmark of their interactions with the public. Police Bureau members also need to be well-trained in de-escalation techniques to ensure that routine situations do not devolve into more hostile or serious matters.

As a reader can see from the checklist used by the workgroup, a variety of policy issues for both IPR and the Police Bureau are listed. A review of the issues for the Police Bureau is dominated by comments like the following:

“(Need for) Training to be aware of trigger points in a conversation.”

“Better communication. Share reasons why one is being stopped.”

“Management training to explain better communication technique with citizens/civilians.”

“Officers need to follow rules of etiquette when dealing with emotional stress (domestic complaints).”

“Need more training in dealing with citizens. Crudeness and yelling (etc.) are simply not acceptable.”

“Officers need to learn to come across as concerned...Share business cards, make citizen feel they are taken seriously in the dialogue.”

While it is true that police are enforcing laws, they are also performing a public service. The need to be authoritative or to take control in emergency situations does not exclude the need to be effective communicators and operate with basic courtesy. Most interactions that police officers have with members of the public can be handled with polite conversation, clear explanations of the officer’s perception of a situation and the ability of a citizen to offer their perspective.

Recommendation #6: CRC shall find regular opportunities to monitor Police Bureau progress in improving communication techniques with the public and shall make this issue a key focus of its future review.

Conclusion

The members of the Recurring Audit Workgroup wish to thank the Independent Police Review staff for their assistance in this review of Service Improvement Opportunities. In particular, Senior Management Analyst Derek Reinke was instrumental in collating both the material for review and the results of the review.

Service improvement opportunities can provide an efficient and effective way to deal with a broad array of complaints against Police Bureau members. However, this is true only if there is public trust in the process itself. This review shows that there is a strong basis of “consumer satisfaction,” upon which to demonstrate how effective service improvement opportunities can be. With the ongoing monitoring, clearly defined reasoning for treating these cases as SIOs, demonstrating how the information is used in other areas of the Police Bureau, and additional input from CRC where concerns are raised can ensure that service improvement opportunities meet their full potential.

APPENDIX #1

IPR Case Number: _____

CRC Reviewer: _____

Date of Review: _____

Checklist for Workgroup Review of Service Improvement Opportunities

*Note: Review **only** the allegations **actually assigned** by IAD for Service Improvement Opportunity review*

- 1. During the IPR Intake Investigation, did the complainant agree to the service improvement opportunity (SIO) process?**
 - Complainant agreed

 - Complainant objected

 - Complainant's position not indicated

- 2. Who first recommended that the allegation(s) be handled as an SIO?**
 - IPR

 - IAD

 - Other (please identify)

- 3. Did the person cite a particular reason in handling this complaint as an SIO?**
 - No

 - Yes (please list the reason)

- 4. Do you feel like this was a justified case-handling decision?**
 - Yes, justified by the facts of the case (after initial review)

 - No, the case-handling decision was not justified (please explain)

- 5. Did IPR correctly identify and classify all of the possible allegations?**
 - Yes

 - No (please list the missed allegations)

6. Did the *SIO Resolution Memo* document an adequate review of the facts?

Adequate

Inadequate (please explain)

7. Did the *SIO Resolution Memo* document an adequate debriefing of the officer(s)?

Adequate

Inadequate (please explain)

8. Did the Reviewing Supervisor (the author of the *SIO Resolution Memo*) communicate directly with the complainant?

Yes

If "Yes," was the Reviewing Supervisor's communication and explanation adequate? (please mark your choice and explain)

Adequate

Inadequate

No

If "No," did the Reviewing Supervisor document adequate efforts to contact the complainant? (please mark your choice and explain)

Adequate

Inadequate

9. Did the complainant express satisfaction with the outcome?

Satisfied

Dissatisfied

Not indicated in *SIO Resolution Memo*

Complainant not contacted

10. How long did the SIO process take (from filing the complaint to receiving feedback that the supervisor had discussed the situation with the officer)?

_____ months and _____ days (roughly)

11. Was the final outcome justified by the facts of the case?

Justified

Not justified (please explain)

12. Was there additional (or follow-up action) taken on the case?

No (if you feel more should have been done, please explain)

Yes (please describe the follow-up and whether it seems adequate)

13. Does this case raise IPR or PPB policy issues you wish to identify for future consideration?

a. Policy issues for IPR:

b. Policy issues for PPB:

14. Other comments, if any:

15. Total time to review this file: _____ minutes