

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

March 3, 2016
13.5

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: 2015 BIASED POLICING AND MEDIATION ANNUAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE this report.

DISCUSSION

On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners directed Internal Affairs Group, Professional Standards Bureau, to report quarterly on biased policing investigations. Attached for your review is Internal Affairs Group's report for 2015, which includes updates on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program and the Department's training related to biased policing.

If you have any questions, please contact Commander Stuart A. Maislin, Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group, at (213) 485-1486.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report February 29, 2016

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) with an update on the Los Angeles Police Department's activities related to the investigation of Biased Policing allegations.¹ It includes data on complaints of Biased Policing and adjudications.

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated in 2015 and provides comparison data for 2013 and 2014.

This report includes information on Biased Policing complaints that have been referred to the Office of Operations (OO) to determine the final disposition when Internal Affairs Group (IAG) disagrees with the adjudication made by the employee's chain-of-command.

Updates on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation 36-Month Pilot Program and the Department's training on Biased Policing for employees are also included.

In order to provide timely, meaningful information, this report is based mainly on preliminary complaint information rather than complaints completed a year or more after initiation. As a result, the tables from the Complaint Management System based on closed complaints are not attached, though selected information is included herein.

Data

Biased Policing Complaints Initiated

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2010 through 2015 are shown below. The numbers for 2010 through 2012 are closed cases with Biased Policing allegations.² The data for 2013 represent Biased Policing cases identified at intake or at closing.³ Biased Policing complaints for 2014 through 2015 were identified manually based primarily on preliminary investigation at the time of intake.

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
281	263	226	272	217	191

In 2015, a total of 191 complaints were identified at intake as containing allegations of Biased Policing.

¹ On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners requested quarterly update reports.

² Generally, complaints are not classified by specific allegation types until the investigations are completed. Consequently, the numbers for 2010 through 2012 are based on Biased Policing allegations identified at closing.

³ The transition to identifying Biased Policing allegations at intake took place in 2013, so Biased Policing complaints in 2013 were identified both at intake and at closing.

The table below shows the number of Biased Policing complaints reported by geographic bureau of occurrence in 2015 compared to those of the last three years.

Bureau	2015 (%)				3-Year Average
		2014 (%)	2013 (%)	2012 (%)	
Central	44 (23.0)	49 (22.6)	66 (24.3)	53 (23.5)	56.0 (23.5%)
South	49 (25.7)	52 (24.0)	58 (21.3)	33 (14.6)	47.7 (20.0%)
Valley	51 (26.7)	60 (27.6)	85 (31.3)	71 (31.4)	72.0 (30.2%)
West	44 (23.0)	55 (25.3)	61 (22.4)	67 (29.6)	61.0 (25.6%)
Outside City/Unknown	3 (1.6)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.9)	1.7 (0.7%)
Total	191	217	272	226	238.3

Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. As a result, many total counts discussed below exceed the number of complaints initiated.⁴

Tables 1 through 6 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They each provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2013 through 2015.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the accused employees by gender/ethnicity, age, and length of service to the Department. The gender and ethnicity of accused employees could not always be determined based on information provided by complainants.

- Gender representation: Of the 262 accused employees for whom gender was known in 2015, female employees continue to form a smaller proportion of those accused in Biased Policing complaints (11.1%) compared to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.8%).⁵
- Ethnic representation: In 2015, the ethnic composition of accused employees was roughly similar to that of all sworn personnel. Of the 254 accused employees for whom ethnicity was known in 2015, Black employees made up 9.1 percent of the accused, slightly lower than their 10.8 percent representation among sworn employees, while Hispanic employees made up 48.4 percent of the accused, slightly higher than their 45.3 percent representation.
- The underrepresentation of female and Black employees among the accused, as well as the slightly higher representation of Hispanic employees was also present in complaints initiated in 2013 and 2014.

⁴ Because of rounding, percentages do not always equal 100.

⁵ Sworn Department employee makeup - Gender: Male 81.2% and Female 18.8%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.4%; Black 10.8%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 45.3%; White 33.6%; and Other 0.2% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, November 30, 2015).

- Age and length of service: Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 1, Part 2). In 2015, the distribution of the accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains relatively similar to that of the comparison group. Most frequently, accused employees were in their thirties and had less than ten years of service.

Table 2 shows the types of contact or police encounter that resulted in Biased Policing complaints along with a breakdown of the complainants by gender and ethnicity.

- In 2015, traffic stops led to 82 of the 191 Biased Policing complaints (42.9%), while the remainder resulted from 46 pedestrian stops (24.1%), 33 radio calls (17.3%) and 30 “Other” types of contact (15.7%).⁶
- The types of contacts or police encounters that result in Biased Policing complaints in 2015 are roughly similar to prior years.

Table 3 shows the distribution of discriminatory conduct reported. This refers to the law enforcement actions or conduct alleged to have been based on bias. Also included is a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity.

- Objectionable Remarks: Prior to 2015, ethnic or otherwise objectionable remarks were included in the “Was Discourteous” category. In 2015, “Objectionable Remark” was distinguished as a separate category of discriminatory conduct to isolate ethnic, racial and otherwise derogatory or discriminatory remarks. Of the 191 Biased Policing complaints initiated in 2015, objectionable remarks appeared as an allegation in eight of the complaints (4.2%) and accounted for 3.1 percent of discriminatory conduct alleged.⁷
- Over the last three years, the three most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions, discourtesy, and arrests. With the exception of the generic “Other” category, the remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently.⁸

⁶ “Other” types of contact in 2015 included crime reporting at police stations, citizen flag-downs, consensual encounters, third-party complaints, passers-by in public, a ride-along request denial, a DUI checkpoint, follow-up investigations, officers serving warrants, officers accompanying the Housing Authority on an inspection, a complainant who said he overheard an officer make a racial remark, a complainant asking to be allowed through a barricaded street, and unknown circumstances in which complainants did not provide information at intake.

⁷ In complaints of Biased Policing, complainants often make allegations of more than one type of discriminatory conduct. For example, in addition to being stopped because of his race, a complainant may also contend the officer searched and handcuffed him because of his race. In these types of cases, the percentage of total complaints would be different from the percentage of all discriminatory conduct alleged.

⁸ “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in 2015 included complaints regarding the dispatch of officers, proper handling of investigations, issuing of citations, being treated unfairly or not being given the same amount of attention during a collision investigation, planting of evidence, suppression of First Amendment rights, inquiries into or reporting of violations of parole/probation status, kidnapping, theft, the use of pepper spray or force, and harassment.

- Stops/Detentions: The most commonly complained of conduct continues to be the stop or detention itself. It appeared in 118 of the 191 Biased Policing complaints (61.8%) initiated in 2015 and accounted for 45.4 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2014, it appeared in 116 of the 217 complaints (53.5%), and 158 of the 272 (58.1%) in 2013.
- Discourtesy and Arrests: In the prior two years, the allegation that an employee was discourteous because of bias was the second most frequently reported discriminatory conduct, followed by arrests. With the creation of the “Objectionable Remark” category in 2015 to separate objectionable ethnic remarks from discourtesy allegations, the number of Biased Policing complaints with discourtesy allegations decreased.

As a result, arrest became the second most complained of conduct in 2015. It appeared in 35 of 191 complaints (18.3%) and accounted for 13.5 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. Discourtesy became the third most complained of discriminatory conduct in 2015. It appeared in 30 of 191 Biased Policing complaints (15.7%) and accounted for 11.5 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged.

Table 4 shows the types of bias alleged along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. With the exception of bias based on gender and national origin, the types of bias alleged have remained relatively consistent since 2013.

- Ethnic Bias: Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on ethnic bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent. In 2015, 173 of the 191 Biased Policing complaints (90.6%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity, accounting for 90.1 percent of all biases alleged. In 2014, 194 of the 217 Biased Policing complaints (89.4%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity, accounting for 84.3 percent of all biases alleged. In 2013, 245 of the 272 complaints (90.1%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic bias, accounting for 86.3 percent of all biases alleged. Few complaints fell within the remaining categories.
- “Other” biases are included in Biased Policing complaints only if alleged in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias.⁹ In 2015, two bias allegations were categorized as Other: one complainant alleged he was stopped because he was Hispanic and young, and another alleged he was stopped because he was Hispanic and not wearing a shirt.
- Based on information at intake, there were no allegations of bias based on gender or national origin in 2015.

Ethnic Representation of Complainants: Tables 2, 3 and 4 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 92 of the 194 complainants (47.4%) in 2015; 111 of the 224 complainants (49.6%) in 2014; and 132 of the 289

⁹ In the past, “Other” biases included age, homelessness, appearing to be a criminal street gang member, political affiliation, prior arrests, prior lawsuits against the Department, size or stature, and location of residence.

(45.7%) in 2013. Most of their complaints resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and predominantly involved allegations that the stop or arrest itself was based on ethnic bias.

Table 5 provides a comparison of the ethnicities of accused employees and complainants only for cases involving alleged ethnic bias. As noted in prior reports, in the majority of cases, Black complainants accused Hispanic or White employees. This has remained constant since 2013.

Adjudication

To adjudicate complaints, Department managers must determine by a preponderance of evidence whether misconduct occurred. The findings must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation. The adjudication disposition terms used in the following discussion are defined below.

An allegation is “Sustained” when the investigation discloses that the act complained of did occur and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is “Unfounded.” “Not Resolved” is used when the evidence disclosed by the investigation does not clearly prove or disprove the allegations made. Not Resolved allegations were fully investigated, but without resolution. An allegation is designated “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate” when it could not be thoroughly or properly investigated. This may be caused by a lack of cooperation by the complainant or witnesses, or the absence of a critical interview that was necessary to proceed with the investigation, or the available physical evidence or witnesses’ statements being insufficient to adjudicate the complaint.

“Guilty” and “Not Guilty” are only used subsequent to a Board of Rights tribunal. The full range of adjudication dispositions is outlined in Department Manual Section 3/820.25.

Biased Policing Complaints Closed

In contrast to the section on Biased Policing complaints initiated, which was based on preliminary complaint information, this section presents information on closed complaints drawn from the Complaint Management System.

Table 6 shows how the adjudication of Biased Policing allegations in 2015 compared to those of the last three years. In 2015, 434 allegations of Biased Policing involving 264 complaints were adjudicated.

- A total of 339 Biased Policing allegations (78.1%) were adjudicated as Unfounded in 2015, a decrease in comparison to the prior three-year average of 85.7 percent.
- In 2015, 33 complaints involving 51 Biased Policing allegations closed with the Mediated disposition, or 11.8 percent of all Biased Policing dispositions in 2015.
- During 2015, 34 allegations closed with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate, a slightly higher rate (7.8%) when compared to the three-year average (6.6%).

- Eight Biased Policing allegations (1.8%) were adjudicated as Not Resolved in 2015.¹⁰ The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is slightly lower than the three-year average of 5.0 percent, but since 2012, the rate of Not Resolved dispositions has declined.
- In 2015, two allegations from the same complaint closed with the Out of Statute disposition.

Biased Policing Complaints Referred to the Office of Operations

As detailed in previous reports, Internal Affairs Group continues to forward Biased Policing complaints to the Director, OO, when it disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication. In 2015, IAG referred six Biased Policing complaints to the Director for final disposition; a summary of the six complaints appears below.

BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO OFFICE OF OPERATIONS FOR FINAL DISPOSITION			
2015 Quarter	Bureau Recommendation	Internal Affairs Group Recommendation	Office of Operations Adjudication
Qtr. 1	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not reviewed prior to 1-year-statute
Qtr. 2	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded
Qtr. 3	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate
Qtr. 4	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not Resolved
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded

Also in 2015, IAG disagreed with chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for two Biased Policing complaints but did not refer them to the Director because the complaints were too close to the statute date. For training purposes, IAG sent correspondence to the chain-of-command explaining the rationale.

In total, IAG recommended a different adjudication for eight Biased Policing complaints in 2015 (3% of the 264 complaints adjudicated in 2015). In 2014, IAG recommended a different adjudication for 16 Biased Policing complaints (5.7% of the 283 Biased Policing complaints adjudicated that year).

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program

In 2015, the Department completed the second year of the 36-month Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program (Program). In conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office (LACA), selected complaints of Biased Policing are being mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. Beginning September 9, 2015, Discourtesy complaints also became eligible for mediation if they meet the criteria for Alternative Complaint

¹⁰ The prior update incorrectly reported that 11 allegations had closed as Not Resolved because a complaint with multiple allegations was counted twice. Adjusting for the double-counted allegations, a total of four complaints with eight Biased Policing allegations closed as Not Resolved in 2015.

Resolution: the discourtesy alleged is minor in nature and the employee has no pattern of similar behavior.

Of the 195 cases referred to the Program in 2015 for mediation, 87 were eligible, a 44.6 percent eligibility rate. Of the 87 eligible complaints, 61 (70.1%) were reassigned for investigation. The reasons for reassignment included: officers declined to participate in 16 of 87 complaints (18.4%); an officer was on long-term leave in one complaint (1.1%); complainants declined to participate in 23 complaints (26.4%); complainants could not be located in 20 complaints (23%); and in one complaint, the circumstances made mediation inappropriate (1.1%). The table below summarizes the complaints referred to the Program in 2015 as compared to 2014.

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program	2015	2014
Total Complaints Referred	195	217
Not Eligible	108	111
Eligible	87	106
Closed with Mediated Disposition ¹¹	34	21

A total of 34 complaints involving 52 employees and 36 complainants closed as Mediated in 2015. Eight of the 34 complaints (involving 12 employees and nine complainants) closed as Mediated because the complainants did not attend the scheduled mediation sessions.¹² The remaining 26 complaints underwent mediation. Though fewer cases were eligible for mediation in 2015, the number of cases that closed as Mediated increased in the second year of the Program. At the end of 2015, the Mediation Coordinator had scheduled one eligible case for mediation and was talking with parties to three other eligible cases in an effort to obtain their agreement to participate in the Program.

Of the 26 mediation sessions held in 2015, satisfaction surveys involving 71 participants (41 officers and 30 complainants) were received. The table below summarizes the participants' responses to four of the survey questions relating to participant satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

¹¹ Ten of the complaints mediated in 2015 were referred to the Program late in 2014, and complaints referred late in 2015 may be mediated in early 2016.

¹² Under the Program guidelines, when a complainant does not appear for scheduled mediation twice without good cause, the complaint closes as Mediated.

Category	Rating	Complainants (30)		Officers (41)		Total (71)	
		Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	15	50.0%	17	41.5%	32	45.1%
	Somewhat Satisfied	6	20.0%	20	48.8%	26	36.6%
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	6	20.0%	3	7.3%	9	12.7%
	Not Satisfied At All	3	10.0%	1	2.4%	4	5.6%
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Completely Fair	19	63.3%	31	75.6%	50	70.4%
	Somewhat Fair	7	23.3%	8	19.5%	15	21.1%
	Not Very Fair	3	10.0%	1	2.4%	4	5.6%
	Not Fair At All			1	2.4%	1	1.4%
	Did Not Answer	1	3.3%			1	1.4%
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Increased a Great Deal	9	30.0%	5	12.2%	14	19.7%
	Increased Somewhat	7	23.3%	16	39.0%	23	32.4%
	Increased a Little	3	10.0%	6	14.6%	9	12.7%
	Did Not Increase	10	33.3%	13	31.7%	23	32.4%
	Did Not Answer	1	3.3%	1	2.4%	2	2.8%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	17	56.7%	25	61.0%	42	59.2%
	Somewhat Likely	9	30.0%	9	22.0%	18	25.4%
	Not Very Likely	2	6.7%	6	14.6%	8	11.3%
	Did Not Answer	2	6.7%	1	2.4%	3	4.2%

Satisfaction with the process: In total, 58 of 71 participants (81.7%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process. Officers (90.2%) were more likely to be satisfied with the process than complainants (70%).

Fairness of the process: Out of 71 participants, 65 (91.5%) found the outcome of the mediation process to be “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” In this category, officers (95.1%) were slightly more likely to believe the process to be fair than complainants (86.7%).

Understanding of the Other Party: Of the 71 participants, 37 (52.1%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after the mediation. The percentage of participants who reported an increase in understanding was about the same for officers (51.2%) and complainants (53.3%).

Likelihood of Recommending to Others: Overall, 60 of 71 participants (84.5%) indicated they were either “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The percentage of participants who would recommend the mediation process to others was about the same for both officers (82.9%) and complainants (86.7%).

To illustrate the range of outcomes for complaints referred to the Program in 2015, the results of three complaints referred in the last quarter of 2015 are summarized below:

- In a discourtesy complaint, the complainant believed the officer was rude when he treated her as a possible DUI suspect after she crashed her vehicle into some parked cars late at night.

When the Mediation Coordinator contacted the complainant to see if she would agree to participate in mediation, she declined, stating that she only intended for her complaint to prompt a supervisor to speak with the officer about his approach. She said, "You guys are taking this too seriously. He was rude and short with me, but I don't want it to go this far. He is a police officer and puts his life on the line." Though her complaint was eligible for mediation, the complainant declined to participate and the complaint was reassigned for investigation.

- In a Biased Policing complaint, the complainant agreed to mediation, but indicated in her survey that she was "not satisfied at all" with the result. The complainant was involved in a traffic collision, and the other party consisted of three Hispanic people who did not speak English. The complainant claimed the officer who responded showed bias toward the other party because he was also Hispanic and spent more time with the other party. During mediation, the officer explained that it took longer to speak with the other party because there were three people to interview, and there was a language barrier as he did not speak Spanish. The complainant did not believe the officer and began focusing her comments on the problems of illegal immigration. Though the officer offered an apology for not having explained more clearly what he was doing at the scene, the complainant was not interested in further discussion and requested an end to the mediation session. Though the complainant was not satisfied, the officer wrote in his survey that he appreciated the opportunity to speak directly with the complainant.
- In another Biased Policing complaint referred to the Program in the last quarter of 2015, the mediation had a significant impact on the complainant, a young Latino college student who had been stopped and cited for a vehicle code violation. He grew up in the Hollenbeck Area and, prior to the mediation, viewed law enforcement as oppressors who unfairly targeted Latino males. He said that perception affected his everyday life, and when he observed officers pulling others over, he would immediately conclude they were engaged in biased policing. As a result, when he was stopped, he initiated a Biased Policing complaint against the officers. Though he was initially hesitant to participate in mediation, after follow-up by the Mediation Coordinator, the complainant agreed. Afterward, the complainant said that being able to sit in a neutral location with the officers, out of uniform, allowed for an open dialogue in a safe environment. He said mediation completely changed his perspective because he gained an understanding of police stops and tactics. He also said it was a liberating experience because the psychological burden of always feeling targeted was lifted, which helped him perform better on his final exams. He wanted to share his story with others in his community and offered to make himself available for future training or endorsement purposes.

To increase awareness of the Program with the community, the LACA and the Department forwarded a summary of the successful mediation described above to the office of the Council Member who represents the district in which the complainant resides. The Council Member's office liked the story and suggested that in the future, the LACA and the Department forward such stories to other Council offices. The Department will work with the LACA to identify such cases and provide summaries to the appropriate Council offices. The Department also continues its effort to increase awareness of the Program internally by conducting outreach at Department

training such as at Basic Supervisor Schools, Supervisory Update Schools, and divisional Training Days.

Department Training on Fair and Impartial Policing

In addition to ongoing training on the subject of Biased Policing, in 2015, all sworn employees participated in a five-hour training about the evolution of the Department's approach to policing, from a "warrior" mentality to a community guardian, relationship-based approach. The training, titled "Public Trust and the Preservation of Life," included discussion about public contacts, de-escalation, and how public perceptions resulting from officer contacts with the public affect efforts to build trust with the community.

Since the beginning of the Consent Decree, the Department has infused concepts related to the removal of bias in policing throughout many Department courses. Currently, the Department is updating its training on the subject of Biased Policing to refocus on the foundational elements of Fair and Impartial Policing (FIP). Police Training and Education (PTE) is taking the lead on this effort. The FIP concepts were first presented to Command Staff in December of 2014 as part of an eight-hour course titled "Bias Based Policing: Remaining Fair and Impartial." The training covered how personal bias affects an officer's day-to-day work in law enforcement, and included training on remaining fair and impartial, decision-making, and legal, ethical, and community considerations. The training further challenged commanding officers to consider how to address bias in the workplace and to build leadership practices that minimize the impact of bias. Since then, sworn and civilian employees have been selected to become part of the training cadre responsible for teaching and integrating the FIP concepts into all of the Department's existing training.

The Department's current training on FIP and the efforts to update the existing training are summarized below.

- Regular Basic Course: Police recruits in the Academy receive training on issues related to bias in policing throughout their time in the Academy, and the FIP concepts have been fully integrated into the Academy curriculum. While most of the training for recruits on this topic is done by the Museum of Tolerance, concepts are reinforced throughout their time in the Academy, including for example, 3.5 hours focused specifically on issues of bias in the context of officers making pedestrian stops. Topics covered during the 3.5 hours include defining Biased Policing, the history of the Civil Rights movement, legal considerations, and the impact of Biased Policing on individuals in the community.
- Police Sciences and Leadership I: Beginning in November of 2015, probationary officers who have been in the field for 11 months undergo additional training to build on their Academy experience. In addition to leadership and investigative skills, the training includes two hours of FIP concepts that have been integrated into the course. The curriculum for Police Sciences and Leadership II is currently being developed and will also incorporate FIP concepts.

- In-Service Training: As part of ongoing training, all officers must complete updated training on the subject of Biased Policing every five years. Currently, officers undergo updated training through a Museum of Tolerance course made up of two blocks. The first six-hour block, “Beyond Diversity: Integrity as a Tool for Building Community Trust,” covers building trust in diverse communities. The second four-hour block, “Racial Profiling Update,” enhances an officer’s understanding of Biased Policing issues, including the Civil Rights movement, and legal, ethical, and community considerations. Continued dialogue with the Museum of Tolerance in keeping training current and relevant is ongoing.
- Field Training Officer (FTO) Update: Because FTOs must understand their own bias and be able to address bias in a new officer, PTE is revising the FTO Update Course to add three to four hours of FIP training. It will be implemented at the same time as the increased state mandates regarding training on mental illness.
- Supervisor Courses: The curriculum for supervisors is being reviewed to determine where FIP concepts can be further elaborated in both the Basic Supervisor and Supervisor Update courses.
- Command Development: The curriculum for the Command Development course, intended for lieutenants on the Captain’s List, already has FIP concepts but will be updated with the new materials in the next class scheduled for Fall, 2016.
- Civilians: The curricula for the Civilian Supervisor School and training for Police Service Representatives are also being revised by civilians trained in FIP concepts. For 2016, curriculum is being developed for a one-day training that will include two hours of FIP for all civilians.

Addenda

1. Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics: Ethnicity and Gender; Age at Date of Incident; Length of Service at Date of Incident; and Age and Length of Service Comparisons
2. Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter
3. Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged
4. Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged
5. Table 5 - Accused and Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only
6. Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)

Ethnicity and Gender

Year	Gender	Ethnicity							Gender Total	
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Fillpino	Hispanic	White	Other		Unknown
2015	Female		2	3		15	9			29
	Male	1	22	20		108	74		8	233
	Unknown								28	28
	Ethnicity Total	1	24	23	0	123	83	0	36	290
2014	Female		4			18	10		1	33
	Male	1	19	19		128	99	1		267
	Unknown								27	27
	Ethnicity Total	1	23	19	0	146	109	1	28	327
2013	Female		5	2		29	15			51
	Male	3	34	27	1	164	133		1	363
	Unknown								19	19
	Ethnicity Total	3	39	29	1	193	148	0	20	433

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Age at Date of Incident

Year	Age in Years				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50/+	Unknown
2015	55	112	61	18	44
2014	73	110	84	25	35
2013	122	170	89	31	21

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20/+	Unknown
2015	46	107	35	36	26	40
2014	53	116	36	57	34	31
2013	138	133	53	56	33	20

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015	2014	2013
20-29	757	21.8%	22.4%	25.0%	29.6%
30-39	1501	43.1%	45.5%	37.7%	41.3%
40-49	954	27.4%	24.8%	28.8%	21.6%
50/+	268	7.7%	7.3%	8.6%	7.5%

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015	2014	2013
0-4	799	23.0%	18.4%	17.9%	33.4%
5-9	1348	38.7%	42.8%	39.2%	32.2%
10-14	454	13.0%	14.0%	12.2%	12.8%
15-19	553	15.9%	14.4%	19.3%	13.6%
20/+	326	9.4%	10.4%	11.5%	8.0%

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Accused having unknown Age or Years of Service are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

Rank	Officers	Percentage
PO 1	250	7.2%
PO 2	2519	72.4%
PO 3	711	20.4%

Function	Officers	Percentage
Patrol	2829	81.3%
Specialized Enforcement	261	7.5%
Traffic	390	11.2%

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report
 Addenda

Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 1)

Year	Total Biased Policing Complaints Initiated	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2015	191	46 (24.1%)	33 (17.3%)	82 (42.9%)	30 (15.7%)
2014	217	42 (19.4%)	45 (20.7%)	95 (43.8%)	35 (16.1%)
2013	272	56 (20.6%)	46 (16.9%)	133 (48.9%)	37 (13.6%)

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian	M	1			1	
Black	F	113	3	3	11	4
	M		22	11	46	13
Filipino	F	2			1	
	M		1			
Hispanic	F	35	3	4	3	
	M		7	5	11	2
White	F	15		3	2	1
	M		1	4	2	2
Other	F	9	1	1		2
	M		2	1	1	1
Unknown	F	19	2	1		2
	M		5		5	4

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report
Addenda

Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 2)

2014		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
American Indian	M	1	1			
Asian	F	6		3		
	M			1	2	
Black	F	147	4	8	18	6
	M		26	14	55	16
Hispanic	F	30	1	6	3	2
	M		3	3	11	1
White	F	15	3	3	1	
	M		1	4	1	2
Other	F	8		3	3	1
	M					1
Unknown	F	17	2		1	2
	M		3	2	1	5
	Unk			1		

2013		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
Asian	F	4	1	1		
	M				2	
Black	F	172	3	9	20	8
	M		37	13	71	11
Filipino	F	1				
	M					1
Hispanic	F	52	1	4	4	
	M		7	7	23	4
	Unk		1			1
White	F	26	3	5	2	3
	M		1	5	5	2
Other	F	11		2		2
	M			3	3	1
Unknown	F	23	1	1	2	2
	M		3	2	8	1
	Unk			1		2

(Upd. 9/21/2015)

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report
Addenda

Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
2015	35 (13.5%)	118 (45.4%)	11 (4.2%)	4 (1.5%)	8 (3.1%)	3 (1.2%)	9 (3.5%)	30 (11.5%)	42 (16.2%)
2014	36 (12.2%)	116 (39.5%)	17 (5.8%)	9 (3.1%)	n/a	7 (2.4%)	15 (5.1%)	49 (16.7%)	45 (15.3%)
2013	24 (7.4%)	158 (48.6%)	16 (4.9%)	15 (4.6%)	n/a	11 (3.4%)	12 (3.7%)	34 (10.5%)	55 (16.9%)

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

2015		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender										
American Indian	M		1		1					
Black	F	5	16		1	1		1	6	4
	M	19	62	7	1	3	1	7	7	18
Filipino	F		1							
	M		1							
Hispanic	F	1	5	2		1			4	3
	M	5	17	1	1	1		1	4	4
White	F		2						2	2
	M	2	3				1		1	3
Other	F	1	1				1		1	2
	M	1	1						3	
Unknown	F		3	1					2	
	M	1	8	1		2			2	5

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report
Addenda

Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

2014		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender									
American Indian	M		1					1	
Asian	F	1						1	2
	M		2						1
Black	F	7	17	2	1		4	7	10
	M	20	72	10	6	5	4	20	13
Hispanic	F	2	6					6	3
	M	3	8	4	1		6	5	4
White	F	3	1					2	2
	M	1	2	1			1	3	2
Other	F		3					3	2
	M							1	1
Unknown	F		2		1			1	2
	M		4			2			5
	Unk		1					1	

2013		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender									
Asian	F		1					1	
	M		2						
Black	F	4	20	3	2	1		4	10
	M	12	93	8	9	2	10	10	14
Filipino	F								
	M								1
Hispanic	F		5			1		1	2
	M	3	26	2	1		1	7	9
	Unk					1		1	
White	F		4	2		3	1	1	5
	M	2	4			1		5	5
Other	F								4
	M	2	4	1	2	1			
Unknown	F		1			1			4
	M	3	7		2	1		7	1
	Unk							1	2

(Upd. 9/22/2015)

2015 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report
Addenda

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Disability	Ethnic*	Gender	LGBTQ**	National Origin	Other	Unspecified	* Ethnic bias includes race & religion. ** LGBTQ includes lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender & questioning.
2015	4 (2.1%)	173 (90.1%)		5 (2.6%)		2 (1.0%)	8 (4.2%)	
2014	5 (2.2%)	194 (84.3%)	6 (2.6%)	5 (2.2%)		8 (3.5%)	12 (5.2%)	
2013	2 (0.7%)	245 (86.3%)	10 (3.5%)	7 (2.5%)	2 (0.7%)	9 (3.2%)	9 (3.2%)	

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	M		1					
Black	F		22					
	M		90		1			1
Filipino	F		1					
	M		1					
Hispanic	F		7		2			
	M		22				2	2
White	F		5					1
	M	2	6		1			
Other	F		3		1			
	M		5					
Unknown	F	1	4					
	M	1	9					4

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

2014 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	M		1					
Asian	F		3	1				
	M		3					
Black	F		34					2
	M	3	104	1			5	5
Hispanic	F		10		1			1
	M		17		2		1	
White	F		4	1	1			1
	M	2	5				1	1
Other	F		5					2
	M		1					
Unknown	F		4	2	1			
	M		9	1			1	
	Unk		1					

2013 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
Asian	F		2	1				
	M		2					
Black	F		38		1			1
	M		128	1	1		4	3
Filipino	F							1
	M							
Hispanic	F		6		2	1		
	M		37		1			2
	Unk		1				1	
White	F	2	8	3	1		1	
	M		10	2	2		1	
Other	F		2	1	1			
	M		6			1	1	
Unknown	F		5	2				
	M	1	11				1	2
	Unk		3					

(Upd. 9/22/2015)

Table 5 - Accused & Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only

Year	Accused Ethnicity	Complainant Ethnicity							
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown
2015	American Indian			1					
	Asian	1		16		3			2
	Black			12		6	3	1	1
	Filipino								
	Hispanic			77		18	7	5	7
	White	2		53	2	9	4	3	3
	Other								
	Unknown			21		5		1	7
2014	American Indian			1					
	Asian			15		4	4		
	Black			10		3	2	1	
	Filipino								
	Hispanic	2	4	103		13	5	3	9
	White		3	72		15	1	2	6
	Other			1					
	Unknown			16		3	1		6
2013	American Indian			2			1		
	Asian		1	22		7	3	1	5
	Black			9		4	8		4
	Filipino			1					
	Hispanic		3	142		25	5	5	15
	White		3	93		27	10	3	7
	Other								
	Unknown			8		4		1	4

(Upd. 1/15/2016)

Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Disposition	2015				3-Year Average
		2014	2013	2012	
Demonstrably False					
Exonerated					
Guilty					
Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	34 (7.8%)	25 (5.1%)	32 (8.4%)	32 (6.6%)	29.7 (6.6%)
Mediated	51 (11.8%)	27 (5.5%)			9.0 (2.0%)
No Department Employee				2 (0.4%)	0.7 (0.2%)
No Misconduct			1 (0.3%)		0.3 (0.1%)
Not Guilty			2 (0.5%)		0.7 (0.2%)
Not Resolved	8 (1.8%)	14 (2.8%)	15 (3.9%)	39 (8.0%)	22.7 (5.0%)
Out of Statute	2 (0.5%)		5 (1.3%)	1 (0.2%)	2.0 (0.4%)
Sustained					
Sustained - No Penalty					
Unfounded	339 (78.1%)	427 (86.6%)	326 (85.6%)	412 (84.8%)	388.3 (85.7%)
Total Allegations	434	493	381	486	453.3

(Upd. 2/15/2015)