


# 2018 IPA Year End Report




# 248 Complaints Received




# Complaints/Concerns Received in 2018

Matter Received	Total	%
Conduct Complaints	203	81%
Policy Complaints	11	4%
Non-Misconduct Concerns	6	2%
Decline to Investigate	7	3%
Other	21	8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>


**Force  
Complaints  
Received –  
Five Year  
Overview  
(2014-2018)**



**Force  
Allegations  
Received –  
Five Year  
Overview  
(2014 – 2018)**



# Five-Year Trend Types for Most Complained of Force Applications (2014-2018)



## Location of Force Applications in Allegations Closed in 2018

Locations of Force Applications	Number	%
Head	4	9%
Neck	1	2%
Torso	19	44%
Limbs	19	44%
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Allegations of Force Applications to the Head (2014-2018)

Year	Number	%
2014	37	23%
2015	35	24%
2016	15	16%
2017	15	20%
2018	4	9%

# Dispositions of all Allegations Closed in 2018

Type of Dispositions	Dispositions of Allegations									
	AD	BBP	C	CUBO	F	ND	P	SS	Total	%
Sustained	0	0	3	0	1	2	34	2	42	5%
Not Sustained	0	0	1	5	0	1	13	1	21	3%
Exonerated	93	0	33	1	73	6	161	35	402	52%
Unfounded	1	52	35	14	11	17	59	1	190	25%
No Finding	5	3	8	8	1	6	17	1	49	6%
Complaint Withdrawn	1	0	3	0	1	3	6	0	14	2%
Complaint/Sup Review	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	8	1%
Other	8	6	5	1	9	4	10	1	44	6%
<b>Total Allegations</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>100%</b>



# Issues Reviewed During IPA Audit


ISSUES REVIEWED DURING IPA AUDIT	
Timeliness / tolling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the investigation completed in a timely manner?</li> </ul>
Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the case properly classified?</li> </ul>
Presence/absence of allegations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the listed allegations adequately capture the concerns voiced by complainant?</li> </ul>
Presence/absence of supporting documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pertinent, did the investigator obtain and review documentation such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAD (SJPD Computer-Aided Dispatch logs)</li> <li>Medical records</li> <li>Photographs</li> <li>Body-Worn Camera video</li> <li>Police reports/citations</li> <li>TASER activation logs</li> <li>Use of force response reports</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Presence/absence of interviews conducted by Internal Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses — what efforts were taken to identify and contact witnesses?</li> <li>Witness officers — what efforts were taken to identify and interview officers who witnessed the incident?</li> <li>Subject officers — what efforts were taken to identify and interview subject officers?</li> </ul>
Presence/absence of logical objective application of policy to the facts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the policy/Duty Manual section that governs the conduct in question?</li> <li>Is this authority applicable to the case or is other authority more pertinent?</li> <li>Does the analysis apply all the factors set forth in the authority to the facts?</li> </ul>
Presence/absence of objective weighing of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What weight was given to officer testimony? Why?</li> <li>What weight was given to civilian testimony? Why?</li> <li>Does the analysis use a preponderance standard?</li> <li>Does the analysis logically address discrepancies?</li> </ul>



# Audit Determinations

- **Agreed** with the Department's investigation of the case after initial review (122 (69%) of cases audited in 2018),
- **Agreed After Further** action, such as receiving from IA a satisfactory response to an IPA inquiry or request for additional clarification or investigation (39 (22%) of cases audited in 2018);
- **Closed with Concerns**, which means the IPA had issues with the Department's investigation and/or analysis, but the concerns did not warrant a formal disagreement (six (3%) of audited cases); or
- **Disagreed**, meaning the IPA determined that the Department's investigation and/or analysis were not thorough, objective, and fair (ten (6%) of audited cases).

# IPA Audit Determinations in 2018



# 2018 IPA Policy Recommendations to the SJPD

1. Track When an Officer Points a Firearm at a Person
2. Implement a Robust Early Intervention System
3. Record All Interviews and Interrogations
4. Provide Progress Report on 2017 UTEP Recommendations
5. Install Surveillance Cameras in Evidence Room at Substation

# SJPD Public Dashboard on Use of Force

## Force Tactics Used and Injuries Sustained

**Year**

2018 ▼

**Subjects**

**Gender**

(All) ▼

**Race**


(All) ▼

**Age**

(All) ▼

**Home**

(All) ▼




**Incidents**

**662**


**District**

Lincoln	97
Charles	62
Edward	61
Yellow	54
Paul	46
X-ray	46
Sam	45
Adam	35
Mary	33
Tom	32
King	31
Nora	31


### Type of Force Used



### Officers Present




### Officers Using Force



### Division

Western	192
Southern	167
Foothill	162
Central	141

# SJPD Public Dashboard on Use of Force



# Outreach Innovations

## sjipaengage.com



[Home](#) [IPA Insights](#) [Community Conversations](#) [IPA Report](#)

## San José Independent Police Auditor

We promote accountability to strengthen the relationship between the San José Police Department and the community it serves.



### IPA Insights

View data visualizations of SJPB-initiated stops. See themes from IPA forums.

[View Insights](#)



### Community Conversations

Make your voice heard! Let us know what you think about your police.

[View Conversations](#)



### IPA Year End Report

View the online version of the San José IPA's Annual Report.

[View Report](#)