

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE STATEMENT

Subject: Training Needs Assessment

Prepared by

ROSENBAUM & WATSON, LLP

Compliance Officer and Community Liaisons (COCL)

City of Portland, Oregon

July 1, 2016



This technical assistance statement is authorized by paragraph 161 of the Settlement Agreement, wherein “the COCL shall conduct the reviews specified in paragraph 173 of this Agreement *and such additional reviews* regarding the implementation of this Agreement as the COCL, the City, or DOJ deems appropriate” (emphasis added).

We issue this Technical Assistance Statement to the City and the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) regarding the requirements set forth in Section IV of the Settlement Agreement (Training) and specifically paragraph 79 and subsections (a) through (k) dealing with a Training Needs Assessment. This Technical Assistance Statement allows us to document our assessment of the current state of the Training Needs Assessment and provide guidance in the reform process. Such Technical Assistance Statements allow us to provide more context and detailed analysis of issues relevant to a particular topic than is possible in our semi-annual reports. The language of paragraph 79 and subsections (a) through (k) of the Settlement Agreement read as such:

79. The Training Division shall review and update PPB's training plan annually. To inform these revisions, the Training Division shall conduct a needs assessment and modify this assessment annually, taking into consideration:

- (a) Trends in hazards officers are encountering in performing their duties;
- (b) Analysis of officer safety issues;
- (c) Misconduct complaints;
- (d) Problematic uses of force;
- (e) Input from members at all levels of PPB;
- (f) Input from the community;
- (g) Concerns reflected in court decisions;
- (h) Research reflecting best practices;
- (i) The latest in law enforcement trends;
- (j) Individual precinct needs; and
- (k) Any changes to Oregon or federal law or PPB policy.

We have provided general updates to the Training Needs Assessment in our Compliance Assessment Reports and Outcome Assessment Reports, but we have yet to engage in a detailed discussion of the Training Needs Assessment. This Technical Assistance Statement provides a focused evaluation for paragraph 79 and subsections. We retain the authority to further comment on the Training Needs Assessment in later reports and TA Statements.

This TA Statement will go through each of the sections of the PPB's 2015 Needs Assessment (which informs the 2016 In-Service Training), including updates provided by PPB in their 2015 Q3, 2015 Q4, and 2016 Q1 DOJ Quarterly Update supporting documents, and will provide COCL recommendations for the 2016 Needs Assessment. In the end, this TA Statement will identify and recommend additional sources of information that may better enhance the overall Needs Assessment process. However, we first detail the overall function of a generic Needs Assessments and certain elements that should be present to better facilitate the collection of information.

There are many types of needs assessments (Rossi & Freeman, 1993) and, although there are certain concepts that should be included in all needs assessments, there is no perfect set of methods for

conducting them. Nevertheless, we are in a position to provide some guidance given our understanding of both research methods and police organizations. We provide this overview of needs assessments generally as a guiding tool to PPB before we comment on specific aspects of the 2015 Training Needs Assessment provided by PPB.

Needs assessments are conducted when there is recognition that an intervention is necessary to improve services to a particular population because of an identified problem or set of problems. The current situation for the PPB, as defined by the Settlement Agreement, implies that an intervention – including changes to police training – is needed because of dissatisfaction by stakeholders with the fairness, effectiveness or efficiency of the current services (“the problem”). An intervention may also be needed because a new problem is emerging and must be addressed.

The approach taken to resolve an issue or problem is contingent upon how the problem is defined and, by extension, who is defining it. For example, in a situation where a community member is experiencing a mental health crisis and calls 911 for service, does an intervention (training) focus on what an emergency communicator should ask or does the intervention focus on what the community member should be telling the emergency communicator? Essentially, which party’s actions should the intervention be addressing? Depending on who you might ask, the responses will be different. One person might say the emergency communicator should be informed regarding what questions to ask the community member. Another person might say the community member should be informed regarding what details would be most helpful to the emergency communicator. Thus the same issue might result in a number of ways of addressing the problem, “each highlight[ing] a different aspect of the problem” (Rossi & Freeman, 1993).

As PPB has expressed a desire to work collaboratively with the community (as defined in the Settlement Agreement), it is important that a diverse set of voices be brought to the table in order to highlight all aspects of the problem. This should include the faith community, businesses, schools, community organizations, the community in general, and segments of the population most adversely affected by police actions. This dialogue to define the problems and interventions relevant to police training should also include the voices of police personnel (e.g. chief, commanders, supervisors, and street-level officers) and Portland City government (Commissioners, City attorneys, Office of Equity, and Office of Neighborhood Relations). In this TA Statement, we identify the current “sources of information” for each section and believe that each section’s sources should be expanded to include diverse stakeholders. This method of evaluation tackles the problem from all angles. Rosenbaum and his colleagues (Rosenbaum, 2002; Rosenbaum & Schuck, 2011) have articulated the numerous benefits of collaborative initiatives for addressing public safety problems.

Based on the above considerations of a comprehensive Needs Assessment, we feel the PPB has made a serious effort to conduct the 2015 Needs Assessment in a manner consistent with accepted practices in the field of program evaluation. PPB has also attempted to use such data to inform PPB training needs. Additional work will be needed to finalize the approach for conducting future Needs Assessments, but we acknowledge that PPB is on the right track. We will continue to consult with them to improve future Needs Assessments. Here, we will provide our assessment on the 2015 Training Needs Assessment.

79(a) – Trends in Hazards Officers are Encountering in Performing Their Duties

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment evaluation of “Trends in Hazards” for patrol officers draws from a single question on an online survey that was distributed to officers who participated in the 2014 In-Service Training. This was an open ended question that asked, “In the last 12 months, have you encountered any new hazards while performing your duties? If so, please describe them here.” As indicated in our 2015 Q3/Q4 report, we maintain that this question does not necessarily capture the largest hazards faced or the hazard most often faced. Furthermore, evaluating “trends in hazards” should include an assessment of whether the most serious or pressing hazards from the previous year have continued. Therefore, we recommend that the survey include 2 or 3 questions that can help the PPB better assess hazards overall and hazard trends as opposed to only “new hazards.”

This section also includes trends in hazards as identified by Training Division Supervisors and Command Staff. These trends were identified through a meeting between supervisors and command staff. However, the Needs Assessment does not describe the format of this meeting, how command staff were instructed to participate, and what information (if any) command staff were asked to gather to prepare for the meeting (e.g. discussions with officers, review of records data, etc.). We recommend that the Needs Assessment include more information about the methods used to query supervisors and command staff for the benefit of both validity and transparency.

The “Training Topics” identified in this section do not indicate the source of the hazards (officers v. command staff). While the “Year Suggested” column provides some insight (e.g., officer survey occurred in 2014 while the command staff meeting occurred in 2015), the source should be identified to determine whether street-level officers and command staff have differences of opinion regarding hazards that are being faced.

Related to this, the Needs Assessment does not make clear whether trends in hazards have been repeated from previous years and whether previous training has adequately addressed such hazards. Furthermore, it is unclear whether PPB Needs Assessments, as a matter of practice, carries over identified trends in hazards that were not addressed from previous Needs Assessments. For instance, one identified need in the 2015 Needs Assessment is “PVO training on a track with intersections, decision making, radio use, etc.” This need is addressed by the statement “In consideration for a future in-service.” Since we have not yet reviewed the 2016 Needs Assessment as it is still being drafted at present, we will wait to see whether this need has been carried over.

As noted earlier, we do not believe that “trends in hazards” can adequately be captured by one or two survey questions or a single meeting between the Training Division and command staff. A wider variety of information sources should be consulted when trying to identify trends in hazards. For instance, the opening paragraph for this section of the 2015 Needs Assessment states that trends:

“include, but are not limited to, driving hazards, being assaulted during arrests and other policing encounters, exposure to pathogens and hazardous materials, issues with sleep disruption common for shift workers, exposure to excessive amounts of trauma, and exposure to the effects of gunfire. In addition to these hazards, officers may encounter new hazards due to changes in cars or equipment, road conditions or structure, coverage for their shift or precinct, policy, radio dead spots, crime or call types, etc.”

The Training Division has indicated that all of these sources are indeed reviewed for potential trends but if no trends are identified, they are not listed in the analysis. However, the Needs Assessment does not indicate that these sources were actually reviewed and we find it difficult to believe that a comprehensive review of such sources would not have resulted in any identified trends in hazards. Therefore, in addition to gathering information from officers and command staff, the Training Division should comprehensively evaluate and report trends that might be identified from the above sources, assuming the data are readily available.

Importantly, we feel the PPB is overlooking basic sources of information from the community. Citywide surveys, contact surveys, community member complaints should be considered as useful sources of information about police hazards and training needs. Given that community dissatisfaction with police encounters represents a major source of noncompliance with police commands, escalation, and use of force, such data should be examined for trends. We explore this concept in full in our “Further Information Needed” section of this TA Statement.

79(b) – Analysis of Officer Safety Issues

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment evaluation of Analysis of Officer Safety Issues draws from four sources. These sources include:

- 2014 injury data from the Bureau of Fire and Police Disability Retirement (FPDR)
 - o To evaluate “injuries that required medical treatment on work time and/or time loss”
- 2008-2014 data from the Professional Standards Division (PSD)
 - o To evaluate “injuries in use of force cases”
- A meeting between the Training Division and the “PPB Injury and FPDR Liaison Sergeant and Officer”
- A meeting between the “Training Division supervisors and command staff”

The review of FPDR data indicated that “back, fingers, knees, and shoulder are the most frequently injured body parts” and the most frequent cause of these injuries are “assault by human/altercation, falls on the same level, lifting, and vehicle collisions.” Based on the PSD data, “using takedowns and hands and feet defense” are the force types that most likely lead to injury.

PPB staff has done a respectable job of analyzing the officer injury data and some trends in safety issues are noted. However, the Needs Assessment goes on to say that “No specific training needs are identified from this data at this time. However, this information further supports training related to reducing collisions and injuries during physical altercations.” While these two statements appear to contradict each other, PPB has clarified to us, saying that while no “specific” training needs were identified, the results support a “general need for training related to officer safety.” We feel that a general need for training related to officer safety is the reason why this subsection was included in the Settlement Agreement in the first place. Thus we are not certain that this argument provides new insights for the Needs Assessment. The PPB analysis identifies (1) the most common injuries and (2) the most common situations where injuries occur (in general and during force events). These two elements appear to contain the basic information needed to identify a specific plan. PPB believes that further data

refinement is required, though we believe that, at a minimum, these findings are sufficient to stimulate a cursory discussion how to respond to them.

The results from the two source meetings indicate a number of training needs related to officer safety, though as with the “trends in hazards” evaluation, the Needs Assessment does not describe the format of this meeting, how command staff were instructed to participate, and what information (if any) command staff were asked to gather to prepare for the meeting. We recommend these points be included in this section.

While this section includes both quantitative and qualitative sources of information, we would recommend that In-Service attendees also have a chance to weigh in on the officer safety issues. This might be captured in the same survey used to gather responses on trends in hazards. A question might be something to effect of, “What specific aspect of your job do you feel involves the greatest risk to your safety?” While officers may also identify force and collisions, other themes may also arise that may be incorporated into the Needs Assessment.

While covered to some extent in the responses from the two meetings, the Needs Assessment should include a comprehensive assessment to alleviate officer injuries. For instance, the finding that takedowns contribute to a large number of officer injuries has implications for both takedown mechanics as well as communication skills that may negate the need for a takedown. To be sure, in some situations, officers simply cannot respond effectively and appropriately without engaging in a takedown. However, needs assessment, in response to such data, should cover all contributors to injuries, including takedown mechanics, positive communication skills, and other potentially contributing factors such as stress management. For instance, PPB might look at Force Data Collection Report (FDCR) data and see whether de-escalation was listed as a tactic utilized. PPB might find that de-escalation was used in a majority of cases, thus reducing the potential need for including it as a training topic. However, the current needs assessment does not reflect such an analysis took place.

79(c) – Misconduct Complaints

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment draws from Independent Police Review (IPR) data and Internal Affairs (IA) data to evaluate misconduct complaints. These two sources of information appear sufficient to identify the scope and rate of complaints against PPB officers. The current Needs Assessment provides an overview of complaint trends, stating that complaints overall have decreased, force complaints in specific have decreased, and that the majority of complaints are dismissed by IPR. The Needs Assessment continues by showing the most common allegations (1) overall, (2) that lead to full investigations, and (3) lead to Service Improvement Opportunities (SIO). These findings are very informative and should continue to be utilized in the Needs Assessment. PPB might consider adding two categories -- allegations that lead to officer discipline, and allegations that involve violations of specific PPB policies, though we are not certain that these incidents occur with enough frequency that meaningful findings can be identified. We would request PPB consult with COCL on the frequency of these events and the extent of redundancy or overlap with existing analysis categories. Directives where officers find it the most difficult to follow would seem to be a natural target for training needs.

The Needs Assessment should take into account other aspects of complaints that might indicate the need for organization-wide training or precinct specific training. For instance, the data should be examined for trends in the demographics of complainants and officers, by district, and by shift. By including these aspects of complaints, PPB can be sure that is covering all facets of complaints: “who” (demographics), “what” (allegation type), “when” (shift), and “where” (precinct) and “why” (which results from a combination of variables).

The Needs Assessment identifies four areas of communication as needs, each of which appears to respond to the commonality of complaints discussed. We feel this is reflective of the purpose of this section and do not have any recommendations related to this other than that the training plan should indicate how these needs have been incorporated into training.

79(d) – Problematic Uses of Force

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment combines Problematic Uses of Force with a second category, Trends in Force Application, and places them under an overarching category of Applied Use of Force Data. We believe this is a good idea as it includes a broader picture of force and allows for better insights regarding training needs. We recommend PPB continue using both of these categories in the Applied Use of Force Data category.

Under the Problematic Uses of Force category, data are taken from two sources. These include “all use of force cases that were reviewed and/or investigated by the Internal Affairs, regardless of whether they were found to be in or out of policy” and Officer Involved Shootings (OIS). Both of these data sources are informative for identifying training needs and we believe should continue to be used.

Use of force cases that were considered “relevant to one or only a small portion of officers” were not included for analysis of training needs. While we understand the logic behind the decision to not use training time for topics that do not apply to all or most officers, it is confusing exactly how this is determined. We request PPB discuss with us how such determinations are made and whether this is examined only with respect to the force option or whether this includes other potential contributors. Furthermore, we challenge this logic on the grounds that seemingly rare incidents (experienced by a small percentage of the force) are oftentimes the most impactful, with high costs measured in terms of human lives, taxpayers’ dollars in law suits, and PPB legitimacy with the public. Furthermore, given that we cannot always predict which officers will find themselves involved in one of these high-impact incidents, the training should be applied to everyone.

We also recommend PPB remove the statement “Problematic uses of force are typically defined as cases that are determined to be unconstitutional...and are therefore outside of the Portland Police Bureau policy.” PPB has repeatedly stated that its force policy is stricter than the constitutional standard. Thus problematic uses of force may include some cases that are unconstitutional and others that are constitutional but problematic by PPB standards. The Needs Assessment inclusion of “all use of force cases that were reviewed” regardless of whether they were in or out of policy is a much better approach. The reference to constitutionality is therefore confusing and should be removed.

For officer involved shootings, the Needs Assessment provides some general characteristics of the case (in/out of policy, lethality, presence of weapon) and remarks that, due to the small number of OIS’s,

trends are difficult to identify. However, the Needs Assessment goes on to comment on trends (faster medical care, assessment of action, risk exposure, supervisor responsibilities) and identifies training implications to address these trends. This appears to be a result of OIS trends being evaluated over a number of years which we would recommend PPB continue to do.

For the Trends in Force Application section, data are taken from two sources. The first is a Training Division review of Use of Force After Action Reports (AARs) that are forwarded by the Inspector or “anyone else during the After Action review process.” These AAR’s are forwarded to the Training Division if potential training needs were identified by the forwarding party. A total of 19 cases were forwarded to the Training Division for the 2015 Needs Assessment. The COCL team has spoken with the Inspector and Training Division regarding the process of forwarding cases. We recommend that the PPB continue to incorporate this source of information into the Needs Assessment.

The second source of information identified in the Trends in Force Application section is the Professional Standards Division (PSD) review of FDCR and After Action Reports as part of the Force Audit. The data gleaned from the Force Audit will then be used by the Training Division to identify potential training needs. As the Force Audit and presentation of data are still being discussed between COCL and the Inspector, we will not comment on it here except to say that we believe it to be beneficial for Force Audit findings to be included in the Needs Assessment and recommend PPB continue with plans to incorporate findings.

From the language of the Needs Assessment, we see no wording to suggest that data on all force events are included in the discovery of trends. While there appear to be discussions on problematic uses of force, OIS’s, complaints of excessive force, cases forwarded on from PSD and others, and the Force Audit, the Needs Assessment does not provide an overall picture of force events. We maintain that the Needs Assessment should provide an examination of all force events, including type of force, community member demographics, crime type, indications of de-escalation/disengagement, and other aspects of force that may have implications for training. The existing approach runs the risk of developing training around selective incidents that are brought to the attention of the Training Division, but are not typical or indicative of any larger pattern. Furthermore, findings from the Force Audit should help to identify training needs with respect to complete and accurate reporting and review of force events. We look forward to consulting with PPB regarding the scope of force variables that might be included for this section.

79(e) – Input from Members at All Levels of PPB

While the Training Division gathers input from members at all levels of PPB for the Trends in Hazards aspect of the 2015 Training Needs Assessment, in no other section of the Needs Assessment are street-level officers identified as a contributing source. Informally, we suspect that some input of street-level officers probably makes its way through the proper channels to be communicated to the Training Division. However, this is akin to a game of “Telephone” wherein the channels along the way can distort the original message from the street-level officer. Furthermore, the sample is likely to be biased and not representative of the typical officer on the street.

In nearly every section of the 2015 Needs Assessment, there is the opportunity for the Training Division to gather input from street-level officers, supervisors, and command staff. One exception might be Misconduct Complaints, as this is more related to input from the community and may not require input from officers other than asking, “How can we avoid complaints of misconduct?” However, all other sections of the Needs Assessment can benefit from direct input at all levels of PPB. For instance, one aspect of the Needs Assessment where street-level officer input would be helpful is the section on the DOJ Agreement. In many conversations with street-level officers, we hear the comment, “I’m sure I had to read it, but I’m not really sure what’s in there.” The Settlement Agreement delineates how officers are required to conduct themselves, yet through conversations, it appears some officers are wholly unfamiliar with it. The same might be said for changes in PPB Policy. Conversations with officers have indicated that Police Officer Holds, Mental Health Crisis Response, and the criteria for dispatching ECIT officers may not fully be understood. The decision about “which directives warranted a future training need for in-service” was made by “several of the Training Division’s sergeants and command staff.” While we carry no doubt that the Training Division engages in substantial data review and is well informed, we hesitate to make the assumption that what the Training Division believes is informative to the officers is necessarily what the officers feel would be most informative. Ways to gather input from all levels of PPB for future Needs Assessments are discussed below in the Further Information Needed Section.

79(f) – Input From the Community

The Training Division has combined input from the community with input from other external stakeholders. We believe this is good practice as it provides a wider net to gather input from entities outside the PPB. The 2015 Training Needs Assessment draws from five sources. These include the City of Portland’s Biennial Service, Efforts, and Accomplishments (SEA) survey, the Annual City of Portland Community survey, the 2015 Auditor’s Report on the Training Division, the Training Advisory Council (TAC), and training requests provided by external sources that are sent to PSD.

For the two surveys, the Training Division indicates that the survey reports were “reviewed as part of the 2014 Needs Assessment”, however this does not indicate that the result were then reconsidered for the 2015 Needs Assessment. Provided that the SEA was last conducted in 2010 and the Annual City of Portland Community survey was conducted in 2014, the findings may be outdated. However, the results should still be reviewed to identify whether issues appear to have lingered since the surveys were conducted. We also recommend that future Needs Assessments include results from the COCL-COAB community survey that was conducted in 2015 collaboration with the City. This survey gives greater attention to the components of police-community interaction and should be helpful for identifying training needs in this area.

The Training Advisory Council (TAC) is a valuable resource for community input and we recommend should be a continuing source of community input. While TAC did not make recommendations for the 2015 Needs Assessment, recommendations were made for the 2016 Needs Assessment. Any recommendations by TAC should be reviewed to determine whether they can be incorporated in any sense into current and future Needs Assessments.

The Professional Standards Division (PSD) List of Open Tasks Assigned to Training Division includes a variety of training topics and sources, including the Police Review Board (PRB), the DOJ, the 2015 Auditor's Report on the Training Division, and other sources including "city attorneys...and community advisory groups." As COAB and COCL recommendations were not submitted in time to be considered for the 2015 Needs Assessment and 2016 In-Service Training, we understand why such recommendations were not included here. However, we would expect that the 2016 and future Needs Assessments would incorporate recommendations from these two entities.

In addition to the formal recommendations provided by COAB related to the Needs Assessment, PPB should incorporate future recommendations from the COAB in identifying training needs. For instance, in the near future, COAB will be engaging the community for ideas about police-community relations. This has been referred to as the "3 Big Questions." The work of the COAB in gathering information related to the three questions should be considered a valuable resource for community input. The number of sources to gather community input is extensive and, we believe, shows the Training Division's commitment to a collaborative relationship between the police and the policed. However, we direct the reader's attention to the Further Information Needed Section of this TA Statement for one additional source of community input that we believe would be beneficial for identifying training needs.

79(g) – Concerns Reflected in Court Decisions

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment and PPB Quarterly Updates indicate that information related to this section is currently being enhanced. In 2014, PPB's Strategic Services Division (SSD) reviewed court cases in "binding court jurisdictions (e.g. Oregon Court of Appeals, Oregon Supreme Court, Ninth Circuit, US Supreme Court, etc.). This review contributed to the "legal updates" portion of the 2015 In-Service. As of the 2015 Needs Assessment, the process was being refined and "formalized", including each case being "tracked, reviewed, briefed, and approved by the City Attorney's Office, to assist the Chief's Office in constructing PPB policy." As we do not have a finalized process for this review, we cannot comment upon it here. We recommend PPB consult with COCL on any updates to the process and before the process is finalized.

79(h) – Research Reflecting Best Practices

79(i) – Latest in Law Enforcement Trends

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment has combined these two subsections of the Settlement Agreement into a single category. We would agree with this decision as these two subsections are likely to overlap and inform one another. Before commenting on this section of the Needs Assessment, we feel it important to make one distinction regarding the use of the term "best practices". Unfortunately, in the world of municipal policing, "best practices" are not always the same as "evidence-based practices." Following what we call the "sheep mentality," particular programs or policies go viral and "spread like wildfire" simply because other agencies are adopting it. These are called "best practices" but are better defined as "popular practices." Our preference is for "evidence-based" practices – programs or policies based on good scientific evidence -- and we believe that was the intent of the SA. Unfortunately again, such evidence-based training programs are few and far between. However, there is a body of

substantial body of social science research across several academic disciplines that can be used to construct new “evidence-based” programs in police training. We would be happy to share subject matter experts with the PPB.

This section of the Needs Assessment draws information from a large number of sources, including external trainings, conferences, agency visits, peer-reviewed research journals, policing collaboratives, COPS, PERF, and agency reports, among other sources. The Training Division indicates they have begun “tracking information obtained from these events...[and] developing a system reviewing and tracking literature findings pertaining to law enforcement training research, equipment, and trends.” As of the 2015 Needs Assessment, the “review of this literature and related trends is still in progress.”

We believe that the wide scope of sources and, reported methodology for tracking and reviewing the information gleaned from those sources, are a good start for PPB. We would encourage PPB and the Training Division to continue in these efforts while also incorporating elements identified in the “Further Information Needed Section” found below. However, the overall efforts made by the PPB and Training Division in this section are commendable. Through the continuation of these efforts, PPB has the potential for becoming their own research site as an agency on the cutting edge of policing.

79(j) – Individual Precinct Needs

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment relied on the Operations Branch meetings held in 2014 and 2015 to identify training needs. The Precinct Command Staff identified training topics relevant to their Precinct; however, which specific training topic applies to which Precinct is not found within the document, making it impossible to determine whether and how training needs varied by Precinct. This also leaves us unable to validate any claims about precinct-specific training needs. Furthermore, all recommendations do not have an accompanying response, leaving us to question how they might be incorporated into training or whether they will be covered in future trainings. Apart from these two issues, the Needs Assessment appears to be sufficient in identifying needs that are specific to individual precincts.

79(k) – Any Changes to Oregon or Federal Law or PPB Policy

The 2015 Training Needs Assessment identifies changes to Oregon and Federal law as well as changes to PPB policy. Changes in law or policy were evaluated to determine their potential contribution to in-service training or whether an alternate route of information dissemination would be possible (e.g. “Tips and Techniques” memo). Based on the Needs Assessment, these evaluations were conducted by the Training Division’s sergeants and command staff.” The laws and policies are listed in the Needs Assessment, as well as PPB’s response for how they might be incorporated into training. However, some changes in law or policy do not have an accompanying response, leaving us to question how they might be incorporated into training or whether they will be covered in future trainings. Especially with changes to law or policy, officers need to be aware of the specific change and be able to demonstrate their knowledge in some way. We have discussed with PPB methods for testing officers’ knowledge of new/changed policies and recommend such testing also occur for changes in Oregon and Federal Law. (See the evaluation methods discussed in the “Further Information Needed Section”).

Other Included Sections

In addition to subsections (a) through (k) of Par. 79, the 2015 Training Needs Assessment includes sections related to Oregon re-certification requirements, the DOJ Agreement, and areas referred to as the “five core law enforcement disciplines” – defensive tactics, electronic control equipment, firearms, patrol tactics, and police vehicle operations. These sections include a significant number of training needs, though suffer from the same issues that are found within other sections of the Needs Assessment, namely a lack of variety in sources.

If PPB is intent on identifying defensive tactics, electronic control equipment, firearms, patrol tactics, and police vehicle operations as the “five core law enforcement disciplines” that it subscribes to, we would ask whether subsections (a) through (k) might be incorporated into the five disciplines. For instance, can different identified trends in hazards officers are facing be defined for each of the five disciplines? If one identified trend in hazards relates to ECW use, can that be incorporated in the curriculum for that core discipline?

Our concern stems from the potential for the five core disciplines being primary in the eyes of PPB, with subsections (a) through (k) of Par. 79 being considered “something the Settlement Agreement says we have to do.” We have observed this type of “silo mentality” or compartmentalization arise in other aspects of PPB operations (see our TA Statement regarding Force Audits). As a result, we are seeking clarification as to why the requirements of Par. 79 are discussed separately from the five disciplines rather than as a source of information for the five disciplines. This is something we would like to discuss with PPB to evaluate the pros and cons of the current Needs Assessment format.

Further Information Needed

While the 2015 Training Needs Assessment contains a number of pieces of information necessary to craft a comprehensive Training Plan, we noted at the start that a Needs Assessment cannot be considered comprehensive unless it gathers insight from all key stakeholder groups and interested parties. In particular, we recommend a methodology for gathering broader input that should be applied to both PPB and the community at large. As one example, we recommend the Training Division implement a “Training Suggestion Box” as defined herein.

Between the categories identified by PPB and the categories included in the Settlement Agreement, the Needs Assessment is a text rich with opportunity for input from various individuals and parties. However, in most of these sections, the input comes from either Command Staff and/or Training Division Supervisors. Input opportunities for first-line officers outside the Training Division or for community stakeholders needs to be more fully developed.

Subsections (e) and (f) of Par. 79 (input from members at all levels of PPB and input from the community) is not something that should be limited to a single section or discriminately applied to a few sections. Each aspect of the Needs Assessment can benefit from officer and community input. Therefore, we recommend an online tool be created wherein officers and community members can access a “Training Suggestions Box” (TSB) and make recommendations. The TSB process should not be a

blank text field without instructions or guidance (although open comments should be welcomed), but rather a series of questions relevant to the goals of the Training Division. . We also recommend that the TSB be implemented with a fair degree of marketing so that officers and the community members are aware of its existence. This can be done by including a reference to it on all emails soliciting input on directives as well as by including a link on PPB's directives webpage. This will allow for a single point of deposit for training recommendations for officers and the community.

PPB should also actively seek the input of members of the community in other ways, both directly and indirectly. This may include a variety of methodologies, including police contact surveys, citywide surveys, and focus groups of mental health professionals, people of color, and youth. Findings from these outreach efforts could inform the needs assessment by evaluating the pulse of the community. This would also result in a seamless feedback connection – PPB, working in collaboration with COCL and COAB, would generate data from various community engagement strategies. This would then feed into PPB's assessment training needs and curriculum development. Through training evaluations, PPB could identify the impact on the community, with another feedback loop that identifies new training needs. This approach both improves police-community relations and provides valuable insights about training from the vantage point of the community.

PPB has begun to implement steps in the Kirkpatrick model of training evaluation, though as we have stated in other reports, the full implementation of all steps in the model has yet to be made. We will be issuing a separate TA Statement on PPB's implementation of the Kirkpatrick model. This TA Statement will be available for evaluating the September 2016 In-Service and should therefore be included as a source of information for the 2017 Training Needs Assessment. For the moment, we recommend PPB utilize whatever Kirkpatrick evaluation information is currently available for inclusion in the 2016 Needs Assessment.