HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Special Victims Division
Suspended Case Audit

September 2016

Honor • Integrity • Respect

MARTHA I. MONTALVO
ACTING CHIEF OF POLICE

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Special Victims Division
Suspended Case Audit

Martha I. Montalvo
Acting Chief of Police

D. R. McKinney, Assistant Chief
Criminal Investigations Command

Prepared for
D. F. Hitzman, Captain
Special Victims Division

Through
W. C. Staney, Captain
Inspections Division

D. S. Perales, Assistant Chief
Professional Standards Command

Project Coordinator
G. C. Helms, Lieutenant

Project Team
E. Gonzalez, Sergeant
B. J. Horowitz, Sergeant

Project #2016-3792

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **1**

INTRODUCTION **3**

SCOPE **3**

METHODOLOGY **4**

Disclaimer **4**

Case Management Suspension Procedures **5**

Disposition Review **6**

Findings 8

Recommendations 9

Criteria: Suspended Case Priorities **9**

Findings 10

Recommendations 10

Observation: Previously Cleared Cases **10**

Findings 10

Recommendations 10

Observation: Need for Division-wide SOP regarding Case Management **11**

Findings 11

Recommendations 11

Conclusion **12**

APPENDICES **13**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 1, 2016, Inspections Division was ordered to conduct an audit of the Special Victims Division (SVD) case management process. Specifically, auditors were instructed to review a sample of all suspended cases involving sex crimes during the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016, to determine whether those cases were suspended according to Special Victims Division guidelines. Suspended cases are those that have not been assigned to an investigator. SVD suspended 34.7% (550 cases out of 1,584) total cases involving sex offenses received during the audit time period.

Auditors learned that prior to April 8, 2016, case managers could only use *Suspended–No Leads* as a disposition to suspend a case in RMS. After April 8, 2016, *Suspended–Lack of Personnel* and *Suspended–Patrol Arrest* became RMS disposition options, in addition to *Suspended–No Leads*. This correlated to the three suspension types per **SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01, Case Assignment**, *Tasks (7)***,** issued April 8, 2016.

The SVD division commander stated that once the above SOP was issued, all SVD units were directed to consider one of the three criteria when suspending cases. When a case is suspended for any reason the supervisor must enter the case number into a case suspension tracking spreadsheet created by SVD along with the priority number it was assigned.

Auditors reviewed a 20% sample of all suspended sex crimes cases during the audit period along with the specific disposition information in RMS and in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

Key findings within this report:

- Auditors found six suspended cases where the threat of continued victimization by a suspect appeared evident according to the original offense report. These cases were presented by audit personnel to SVD management for a secondary review. In two of the six cases auditors found that the original incident reports lacked documentation that CPS had been notified. Screening personnel must ensure that child and elderly abuse cases have been properly reported to protective service agencies as required by law.

- Case managers are not consistently listing all cases suspended in RMS on the SVD internal case suspension tracking spreadsheets. Auditors concluded that of the 110 cases suspended in RMS 38 (34.5%) were not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

- Case managers are not consistently documenting RMS case priority codes and specific reasons for suspensions in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. This prevents accurate analysis of cases for assignment.

- **SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) 200/2.01, Case Assignment**, *Tasks*, issued April 8, 2016 is the only policy within SVD that provides any guidance in regard to suspension options and is specific only to the Adult Sex Crimes Unit. Auditors recommend that this policy be re-written to be inclusive of all SVD units and provide clear and comprehensive policy to mitigate the risk to victims, the community, as well as the department.

The Special Victims Division conducts difficult and sensitive work with the city's most vulnerable victims and must interact with its most dangerous predators. Recent audits have shown that SVD personnel are dedicated, responsible, and passionate in their work.

It is hoped that the recommendations in this report regarding policy development will provide comprehensive case screening and assignment guidelines, ensure cross reporting to protective service agencies as appropriate, and require second level review in cases where complainants are still at risk from perpetrators to help mitigate the risks in managing this difficult caseload.

The development of a unified case management database would allow SVD managers to consistently capture case assignment, suspension, and disposition data efficiently and provide metrics for decision making.

To help ensure that these process improvements are effective, a management reporting system must be developed to show active caseloads, suspension and assignment rates to gauge policy compliance, workload, as well as justification for future staffing purposes.

INTRODUCTION

On July 1, 2016, Inspections Division was ordered to conduct an audit of the Special Victims Division (SVD) case management process. Specifically, auditors were instructed to review a sample of all suspended cases involving sex crimes during the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016, to determine whether those cases were suspended according to Special Victims Division guidelines. SVD suspended 550 cases (34.7%) out of 1,584 total cases involving sex offenses received during the audit time period.

SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01, Case Assignment, *Tasks (7)***,** issued April 8, 2016, stated that cases must meet one of the following criteria before being suspended:

- Lack of personnel
- Patrol arrest (not sexual assault or high profile case)
- Lack of workable leads

The SVD division commander stated that once the above SVD Adult Sex Crimes SOP 200/2.01 was issued, all SVD units were directed to begin using one of the three criteria when suspending cases. Additionally, the directive included tracking of suspended case priority codes in case suspension tracking spreadsheets to assist in managing these cases for assignment.

Auditors reviewed a 20% sample of all suspended cases during the audit period along with the corresponding suspension reasoning in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. This review was conducted to determine whether case managers suspended these cases in accordance with one of the above three criteria listed in SVD SOP 200/2.01 before and after April 8, 2016.

SCOPE

The scope of the analysis is limited to the following parameters and does not constitute an evaluation of the overall internal control structure of Special Victims Division case management processes. Rather, this audit will involve the review of 110 sex crimes cases (20% sample) of all suspended sex crimes cases to determine whether those cases were suspended according to Special Victims Division guidelines. These cases were received by SVD between January 1, 2016 and June 30, 2016.

METHODOLOGY

Generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) were used to conduct this audit (Government Auditing Standards, 2011 Revision). Auditors reviewed and reconciled documentation as gathered from interviews, standard operating procedures, general orders, electronic data and written records.

Auditors obtained a list of all incident reports received by SVD during the audit time frame from the HPD portal. Auditors isolated all suspended sex crimes cases and obtained a 20% random sample (110 cases out of 550 suspended cases) from that list. Auditors then reviewed the details of each case to determine whether Special Victims Division employees are suspending cases in compliance with division guidelines. Auditors reviewed individual incident reports along with case details and supplements in RMS. Additionally, auditors reviewed case suspension tracking spreadsheets provided by SVD to determine reasons for case suspensions and to compare with the dispositions in RMS.

Auditors met with the SVD division commander to gain insight into the case management process. Auditors were provided with criteria used to suspend cases. Auditors used these criteria to review each case in the sample. Auditors did not analyze daily staffing, assignment rates or caseloads for this audit. Auditors did not attempt to correlate staffing levels and caseloads with case dispositions nor was a manpower study conducted.

Disclaimer

Because of the inherent limitations found in any internal auditing system, errors or irregularities may have occurred and may not have been detected. The procedures incorporated into this analysis are subject to the risk that they may have become inadequate due to changes in evolving conditions. This report reflects only a "snapshot" of the environment, processes, and procedures auditors observed during the analysis. These may have changed prior to this report's publication.

The Houston Police Department transitioned to Records Management System (RMS) on June 11, 2014. On this date, RMS replaced the department's On-Line Offense (OLO) report system. Many facets of case management were affected by this change. It should be understood that the recommendations in this report are to be considered within the context of this continuous change.

Due to the very important and sensitive nature of investigations, SVD is ultimately responsible for establishing an effective and meaningful method of managing the caseload of the division to ensure that each case is given due attention. This analysis was designed and intended to evaluate policy

compliance, procedures and internal controls related to administrative and investigative processes and to provide recommendations for improvement.

Case Management Suspension Procedures

SVD suspended 550 (34.7%) cases out of 1,584 of the total cases involving sex offenses received during the audit time period. Auditors learned that prior to April 8, 2016, case managers could only use *Suspended–No Leads* as a disposition to suspend a case in RMS. After April 8, 2016, *Suspended–Lack of Personnel* and *Suspended–Patrol Arrest* became RMS disposition options, in addition to *Suspended–No Leads*. This correlated to the three suspension types per **SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01, Case Assignment**, *Tasks (7)***,** issued April 8, 2016, **(Appendix B)** which states in part:

a. ***SL Suspended–Lack of Personnel***
b. ***SP Suspended–Patrol Arrest***
    i. *Suspects arrested on patrol for sexual assault shall have an investigator assigned to follow-up with the case.*
    ii. *Investigators shall also be assigned to follow-up in patrol arrest cases which could become high profile, generate media interest or are serial offenses of a less serious nature, ex: serial exposer in a park.*
c. ***SU Suspended–No Leads***

According to the SVD division commander, the above three criteria are also used by all other units within the division. Table 1 on the following page shows the number of SVD sex crime suspended cases alphabetized by offense description from January 1, 2016 thru June 30, 2016. The sample sizes are also depicted. This data is derived from the file "*CaseStatusSummaryByDivisionWithOffense*" obtained from the HPD Portal on July 1, 2016.

TABLE 1: SVD SEX CRIME SUSPENDED CASES BROKEN DOWN BY OFFENSE DESCRIPTION

Offense Description	Total Sex Crimes	Suspended Cases	Percentage of Total Cases	Sample Cases	Sampled Percentage of Suspended Cases
Aggr Sex Assault (Other Penetration-Child)	48	10	20.8%	4	40.0%
Aggravated Sex Assault (Force Intercourse)	121	20	16.5%	2	10.0%
Aggravated Sexual Assault (Other Penetrat)	21	2	9.5%	0	0.0%
Continuous Sexual Abuse Of Child	10	3	30.0%	0	0.0%
Human Trafficking - Commercial Sex Acts	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Indecency With Child (Felony)	118	53	44.9%	14	26.4%
Investigation - Other Sex Offenses	228	115	50.4%	20	17.4%
Investigation - Sexual Assault - Rape	279	122	43.7%	27	22.1%
Outside Case - Sexual Assault - Rape	16	7	43.8%	1	14.3%
Sex Act with Person In Custody-Felony	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex or Obscene Harassment - Misdemeanor	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Assault (Child) - Felony	19	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
Sexual Assault (Fondling) - Felony	84	45	53.6%	7	15.6%
Sexual Assault (Force Intercourse Attempt)	20	5	25.0%	2	40.0%
Sexual Assault (Force Intercourse)	359	67	18.7%	16	23.9%
Sexual Assault (Other Penetration Attempt)	5	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Assault (Other Penetration)(Adult)	69	17	24.6%	3	17.6%
Sexual Assault (Other Penetration)(Child)	110	47	42.7%	8	17.0%
Sexual Assault (Statutory Rape) - Felony	56	32	57.1%	6	18.8%
Sexual Assault Oth Penetration AttmptChild	4	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
Super Aggravated Sex Assault (Force Inter)	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grand Total	**1584**	**550**	**34.7%**	**110**	**20.0%**

*Data obtained July 1, 2016

The SVD division commander supplied a copy of a proposed *Suspended Case Standards and Reduction Plan* memo dated January 15, 2016 which outlines standards for prioritizing, suspending and reassigning child sexual abuse cases as well as reducing the number of cases currently suspended. The proposal outlines criteria to categorize and assign investigations based on the severity and safety of the victim. However, these proposals were not included in the revised case assignment SOP as previously discussed. See **Appendix B** for details of this proposal.

Disposition Review

Auditors read all 110 cases in the sample, reviewed case dispositions in RMS, and compared them with case suspension tracking spreadsheets to analyze case assignment policy compliance.

RMS Disposition Review

Auditors found that of the 110 sample cases (20%) reviewed, 90 cases (81.8%) were given the disposition of *Suspended–No Leads*, 19 cases (17.2%) *Suspended–Lack of Personnel* and one case (1.0%) was cleared *Suspended–Patrol Arrest*.

Auditors found that 75 (83.3%) of the 90 cases cleared *Suspended–No Leads* in RMS, were deemed to have workable leads based on individual case reviews. Auditors defined a workable lead as suspect identification or any information that could lead to the identification of a suspect. Fifteen cases (16.7%) were appropriately closed *Suspended–No Leads*.

Of the aforementioned 75 cases cleared *Suspended–No Leads* in RMS with leads evident in the report, 28 (37.3%) were given the disposition of *Suspended–No Leads* prior to April 8, 2016 (date of which new suspension options became available) and 47 (62.7%) were given the disposition of *Suspended–No Leads* after April 8, 2016 when additional suspension options were authorized.

SVD Case Suspension Tracking Spreadsheets Analysis

Auditors examined the case suspension tracking spreadsheets to obtain the disposition data for each case suspension. Of the 75 cases cleared *Suspended–No Leads* in RMS when leads were found evident by reading the report, 54 cases (72.0%) showed to have *Lack of Personnel* as the reason for suspending in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets and three cases (4.0%) appeared to display erroneous entries rather than a disposition. (example: 0, 6B20 and 9C20). Eighteen cases (24.0%) listed as *Suspended–No Leads* in RMS were not located in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

Out of the 15 other cases that auditors determined were appropriately suspended, 10 (66.7%) were not listed on the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. Additionally, the other 5 cases (33.3%) showing *Suspended–No Leads* in RMS (appropriately suspended) are listed as *Lack of Personnel* for the suspension reason in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

Out of the 19 cases cleared *Suspended–Lack of Personnel*, 10 (52.6%) were appropriately listed as *Lack of Personnel* in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. However, the other nine (47.4%) of those cases were not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

The one case cleared *Suspended–Patrol arrest* was not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. This particular case was an original report generated by an officer who assisted Webster Police in arresting a sexual assault suspect wanted out of their jurisdiction. No follow up was necessary.

RMS and SVD Case Suspension Tracking Spreadsheets Reconciliation

Once the RMS and the case suspension tracking spreadsheets were reconciled, auditors determined that of the 110 cases suspended in RMS, 69 (62.7%) were *Suspended–Lack of Personnel*, 3 (2.7%) displayed erroneous entries and 38 (34.6%) were not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

Auditors were informed at an initial audit meeting with the SVD division commander that a process has been put in place to re-examine previously suspended cases and reopen them when possible to assign to investigators. On August 17, 2016, auditors rechecked the status of each of the 38 reports in RMS that are not listed on the case suspension tracking spreadsheets to see if there could be a situation or reason as to why these reports were not listed. Auditors

found through RMS that three of the cases previously suspended had been assigned to investigators and one case was cleared unfounded. The remaining 34 cases are still suspended according to RMS as of August 17, 2016.

Findings:

Case managers are not consistently documenting RMS case suspension information in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets 37.2% of the time. Upon discovering the inconsistencies between the RMS sample list and the case suspension tracking spreadsheets, auditors compared all 550 cases suspended during the audit period (obtained from the HPD portal) with the case suspension tracking spreadsheets provided by SVD. For the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016, the case suspension tracking spreadsheets shows 638 suspended cases. Out of the 550 suspended cases obtained from the RMS, 210 (38.2%) are not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets.

Through the course of reviewing the 110 cases, auditors found that 73 (66.4%) of the cases involved juvenile complainants. Of these 73 cases, it appeared that six (8.2%) of the juvenile complainants still reside with the suspect, thus presenting a potential threat of continued victimization. Auditors presented these six cases directly to SVD management so that a secondary review could be conducted to determine if these cases should be reactivated and assigned.

In two of the six juvenile cases auditors found that the original incident reports lacked documentation that CPS had been notified. Screening personnel must ensure that child and elderly abuse cases have been properly reported to protective service agencies as required by law.

Thirty-three (30.0%) cases involved adult complainants and none presented a potential threat of continued victimization. Four (3.6%) of the remaining reports did not need to be investigated (ex. warrant arrest, OLO transfers). At the time these cases were reviewed, no supplements or follow up activities had been documented in RMS.

SVD sex crimes units suspend cases at a lower rate (35%) than most other reactive investigative divisions. Table 2 on the following page details the total number of suspended cases per total cases received by each of the 5 reactive investigations divisions listed during the time period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. These figures were obtained directly from the HPD portal reports menu in the *RMS Case Management Complements - IN PROGRESS*.

TABLE 2: TOTAL NUMBER OF SUSPENDED CASES PER TOTAL CASES

Division	Total Primary Cases	Total Suspended	Percentage
Homicide	15638	14943	95.6%
Auto Theft	29845	27859	93.3%
Burglary and Theft	47758	38860	81.4%
Special Victims	19163	8620	45.0%
SVD Sex Crime Cases	**1584**	**550**	**34.7%**
Robbery	6313	0	0.0%

*Data obtained August 3, 2016

Recommendations:

Auditors recommend that a division-wide database be developed for division supervisors and case managers to document suspended cases. Data entry should be configured to include mandatory fields such as case number, priority, and suspension reason. The database would provide a way to prioritize and identify cases for assignment. An automated management report should be produced to provide information regarding suspension and assignment rates by unit and division.

A division-wide SOP should be developed to unify case screening criteria, prioritization, and suspension criteria. This policy should include a secondary review for all cases designated as high priority or involve the potential threat of continued victimization to a complainant or community. The SOP should define what will be required in management reports so that compliance can be tracked and measured.

Auditors recommend that case managers and supervisors ensure that elderly and child abuse cases have been properly referred to protective service agencies as required by law, if not previously done by the reporting officer. Additionally, cases involving cohabitation and/or the threat of continued victimization between a suspect and complainant receive a second level review prior to suspending the case. This second level review would help mitigate risk to the complainant, community, and to the department.

Criteria: Suspended Case Priorities

Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01, Case Assignment, *Tasks***,** issued April 8, 2016 states in part:

> *7. When a case is suspended for any reason, the supervisor shall enter the case number into the Case Suspension tracking spreadsheet along with the priority number it was assigned. When manpower allows, cases will be re-activated and assigned based on highest priority and then date (oldest first).*

Findings:

Case managers are not consistently documenting accurate case suspension priorities in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets over 76% of the time. Auditors reviewed the case suspension tracking spreadsheets provided by SVD and found that out of 72 suspended cases sampled (38 out of the 110 cases were not listed in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets), only 17 (23.6%) had a priority properly listed as required per **Adult Sex Crimes Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01, Case Assignment**, *Tasks*, issued April 8, 2016. Of the 72 suspended cases sampled, 49 (68.1%) contained erroneous data and had RMS unit identifiers (ex. SPAA, SPAB and SPAD) instead of priority numbers and 6 (8.3%) had a zero as a priority. As a result, analysis of suspended cases based on case priority is not possible to conduct accurately.

Recommendations:

Auditors recommend that case managers adhere to policy and accurately record the priority of cases documented in the case suspension tracking spreadsheets. Additionally, this requirement should be stipulated in a division-wide case management SOP.

Observation: Previously Cleared Cases

Findings:

Auditors found two cases in the sample (1155634-02 and 166485-88) that were both previously cleared arrested and charged. Both original reports were transferred from OLO to RMS so that crime lab personnel could supplement the original reports for an evidence record affidavit request by the Harris County District Attorney's Office. Both cases were subsequently given the disposition of *Suspended–No Leads* when they were previously cleared arrested and charged.

Recommendations:

Auditors recommend that cases with unique circumstances such as cases reopened to document evidence record affidavits be given a more appropriate disposition from the RMS disposition list (**Appendix D)**. For example, CBEX – Closed by Exceptional Means may have been more appropriate. This will prevent previously cleared cases from being inadvertently reactivated and allow them to remain properly disposed of.

Observation: Need for Division-wide SOP regarding Case Management

Findings:

Auditors requested division SOPs that provide guidelines as to the criteria in suspending cases. At the time of this audit, **SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit Standard Operating Procedure 200/2.01**, *Case Assignment,* was the only SOP providing case suspension guidance. However, SVD division commander stated that all SVD units are using the case suspension criteria set forth in **SVD Adult Sex Crimes Unit SOP 200/2.01**. Child Sex Crimes Unit was working under procedures outlined in a proposal dated January 15, 2016 stating in part (**Appendix B**):

> *Cases identified as **Priority I** cases (sic) and would require immediate attention include but are not limited to:*
>
> - *High Profile Investigations*
> - *Involving Strangers/Registered Sex Offenders/Serial Offenders/School Employees, Other Professionals*
> - *Cases of Media Interest*
> - *Most Aggravated Offenses (Cases involving consensual sex of victims 13 years or younger with an age mate or suspect no more than 3 years older will be considered Priority II investigations)*
> - *Any Forcible Offense*
> - *Investigations in which the perpetrator still has access to the victim*

Recommendations:

Auditors recommend SVD develop a comprehensive division-wide case management SOP. SVD's current policy must be re-written to be inclusive of all SVD units and provide clear and comprehensive policy to mitigate the risk to victims, the community, as well as the department.

Conclusion

The Special Victims Division conducts difficult and sensitive work with the city's most vulnerable victims and must interact with its most dangerous predators. Recent audits have shown that SVD personnel are dedicated, responsible, and passionate in their work.

It is hoped that the recommendations in this report regarding policy development will provide comprehensive case screening and assignment guidelines, ensure cross reporting to protective service agencies as appropriate, and require second level review in cases where complainants are still at risk from perpetrators to help mitigate the risks in managing this difficult caseload.

The development of a unified case management database would allow SVD managers to consistently capture case assignment, suspension, and disposition data efficiently and provide metrics for decision making.

To help ensure that these process improvements are effective, a management reporting system must be developed to show active caseloads, suspension and assignment rates to gauge policy compliance, workload, as well as justification for future staffing purposes.

APPENDICES

ENGAGEMENT LETTER……A

SUSPENDED CASE STANDARDS AND REDUCTION PLAN CORRESPONDENCE DATED JANUARY 15, 2016……B

SEX CRIMES UNIT STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE 200/2.01, CASE MANAGEMENT ISSUED APRIL 8, 2016……...C

RMS CASE DISPOSITION LIST ……..…..D

APPENDIX A

ENGAGEMENT LETTER

CITY OF HOUSTON

INTER OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: D. F. Hitzman, Captain
Special Victims Division

FROM: W. C. Staney, Captain
Inspections Division

VIA: D. S. Perales, Assistant Chief
Professional Standards Command

DATE: July 5, 2016

SUBJECT: **Review of Cases Suspended by Special Victims Division from January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016**

Inspections Division was ordered by Acting Chief of Police Martha I. Montalvo to perform an assessment of sex crimes incident reports suspended by Special Victims Division from January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016 in order to verify compliance with current division policy. The objective, scope, and methodology of the assessment are as follows:

Objective

The objective of this assessment is to verify that Special Victims Division employees are suspending cases in compliance with division policy and conversely, to identify any reports suspended outside of established division criteria.

Scope

The scope of this assessment includes the review of all sex crime-related offense reports identified as "suspended" between January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016 within the *Case Disposition Summary by Division* portal report.

Methodology

A sample of 20% of sex crime-related offense reports will be randomly selected. This sample will include offense reports as they were titled in the above referenced portal report on July 1, 2016 including reports of sexual assaults, indecency, investigation sexual assaults, investigation other sex offenses, and trafficking.

Assessors will review each report in the sample and verify that it was suspended based upon criteria as provided by Special Victims Division including related SOP(s), directives or any other written instruction. As such, please identify a division employee to act as a liaison with the assessment team. If you have any questions, please contact me at 713-308-9080.

W. C. Staney, Captain
Inspections Division

wcs:gch

Inspections Project # 2016-3792

APPENDIX B

SUSPENDED CASE STANDARDS AND REDUCTION PLAN

From the Desk of
S. D. Victorian
Lieutenant
Special Victims Division
832-394-1976 FAX 832-394-1972
Friday, January 15, 2016

To: **D. F. Hitzman, Captain, Special Victims Division**

Subject: **Suspended Case Standards and Reduction Plan**

Captain,

Please consider the following proposals for the Child Sexual Abuse Unit's (CSAU) case standards for suspending and reassigning cases, and the plan for reducing the number of currently suspended cases. There are currently 1831 suspended cases in CSAU, broken down by RMS codes/squads as follows:

	233	SPA – Lieutenant's Box
	391	SPAA – Sgt. White (Squad 23 – CAC North)
	449	SPAB – Sgt. Katie Reiser (Squad 21 – Mykawa South)
	482	SPAD – Sgt. Ester Stewart (Squad 20 – Mykawa North)
	276	SPAE – Sgt. Thurston Roberson (Squad 24 – CAC South)
Total#	1831	

SPAC – ICAC Cases are assigned as reported with a current average officer caseload of 8 cases per officer.

The 233 cases in my box (SPA) so far have all patrol related arrests. Sergeants Reiser and Stewart have also identified a small number of patrol arrests cases in their box. The estimated total of unassigned investigations is 1598.

All cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse are considered a priority and warrant investigation. However, due to manpower issues and the complexity and time needed to thoroughly investigate most child sexual abuse cases, it is necessary to categorize and assign investigations by severity and the safety of the victim. As a result, all other investigations, are unfortunately suspended (postponed) and assigned at a later date. Below are the proposed case standards and protocols for suspending and reassigning suspended cases.

Proposed Case Standards for Suspending and Reassigning Cases

An excel spreadsheet entitled, *CSAU Suspended Case Tracking*, located in the CSAU Suspended Case list folder on the Special Victims Division's Q – Drive has been created to record all suspended investigations. Sergeants will be instructed to read each case assigned to their boxes daily to determine which investigations to assign and which investigations meet the criteria for

suspension. Cases identified as **Priority I** cases and would require immediate attention include but are not limited to:

- High Profile Investigations
  - Involving Strangers/Registered Sex Offenders/Serial Offenders/School Employees, Other Professionals
  - Cases of Media Interest
  - Most Aggravated Offenses (Cases involving *consensual* sex of victims 13 years or younger with an age mate or suspect no more than 3 years older will be considered Priority II investigations)
  - Any Forcible Offense
  - Investigations in which the perpetrator still has access to the victim

The above cases should be assigned immediately. Cases considered **Priority II** and meet the criteria for suspending may include but are not limited to:

- Indecency (Acquaintance/Stranger)
- Criminal Solicitation/Online Solicitation (will be forwarded to ICAC)
- Consensual Boyfriend/Girlfriend, with a victim less than 13 years of age and a suspect 4 years or more older

Cases considered **Priority III** and meet the criteria for suspending may include but are not limited to:

- Boyfriend/Girlfriend (consensual) victim 14 years of age or older with a suspect more than 3 years older
- Consensual Boyfriend/Girlfriend (within 3 years), with a victims 13 years of age or younger
- No leads
- Victim Uncooperative
- Information and Referrals (INRs) (not to include CPS referrals)
  - Unless victim is pregnant and less than 14 years of age
- Insufficient Evidence to determine if crime occurred
- No Crime

This list is not all inclusive and depends on the many variables including the evidence supporting any of the above offenses. If the title of an offense meets the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) definition of an offense listed as a Priority I and the assigned sergeant suspends the case, the sergeant will be required to add a note justifying the case suspension. Sergeants with questions regarding the categorization of any offense should immediately consult with the lieutenant to determine if the case should be assigned or suspended.

If it is determined that a case meets the criteria for suspension, the sergeant must complete the *CSAU Suspended Case Tracking* log and include the following information:

- Incident Number
- Date of Offense
- RMS Offense Title
- Suspended Date
- Reason the case is Suspended
- Reopen Priority
- Date Reassigned
- Notes, if necessary

Sergeants should begin assigning suspended cases as soon as possible beginning with any case with sufficient evidence to proceed which meets the UCR definition of an offense followed by the most dated Priority II investigation. It will be the sergeant's responsibility to ensure that phone calls and/or contact letters are sent and the investigation supplemented for all Priority III investigations. If it is determined that a Priority III case requires further follow-up, the case will be assigned to a CSAU investigator. If after attempting contact or determining a case does not require further investigation, the case will be assigned to the sergeant or investigator making contact, supplemented and cleared in RMS and the CSAU Case Management System (CMS).

Plan for Reducing Current Suspended Cases

In an effort to reduce the total number of suspended cases the following recommendations are proposed:

- The CSAU is anticipated to receive three new positions in the coming months. Once assigned to the unit, during the course of their training, officers will be assigned and trained to investigate currently suspended cases meeting the UCR definition of an offense. Subsequent to training, these investigators will continue to investigate suspended cases until further notice. New investigators may receive current investigations as needed. It is imperative that at least two of these positions are filled by Spanish speaking officers.
- CSAU sergeants will continue to assign current CSAU investigators suspended cases and current cases as investigators dispose of investigations. CSAU sergeants will also remain diligent in assigning suspended cases as requested by complainants, reportees, and outside agencies.
- A couple of the CSAU sergeants and officers have agreed to work past their shift or come in on their off days for comp time to make phone calls, prepare contact letters, supplement suspended cases, and follow-up, if required. In an effort to maintain a manageable number of suspended cases, it will likely be necessary to have something like this in place on a continuous basis. Especially since the total number of cases received monthly are significantly more than we are able to assign. An increase in the overtime budget may motivate more officers to work overtime in an effort to reduce the number of suspended cases.

- Sergeants are also willing to increase investigator's caseloads in an effort to reduce the number of suspended cases assigned to their squads. Increasing caseloads will however increase the chances of officers having a large number of investigations over 90 days and may also increase the number of investigations not being supplemented within the 30 day expected time frame. This should be expected if officers are holding high profile cases or complex cases requiring more time to investigate. In these instances, sergeants should provide the lieutenant with a blue note explaining why this has occurred.
- Request officers assigned to patrol divisions interested in a future in investigations or those interested in building comp time to assist in making phone calls and/or sending letters and supplementing suspended cases. Cases in which contact is made should be forwarded to a sergeant for assignment or cleared (in RMS and CSAU CMS) depending on the response from the contact.
- Desk officers and Police Service Officers will also be used to send contact letters or make contact calls when time allows during their assigned shifts.

These are the collaborate suggestions/recommendations from myself and the sergeants currently assigned to the CSAU. We appreciate you reviewing these suggestions and making any further recommendations or suggestions. As you know, the CSAU sergeants suspend these cases reluctantly each day due to manpower issues and to decrease the burden of overwhelming officers with increased unmanageable caseloads, which result in poor morale and increased employee turnover, otherwise each case would be assigned immediately. Our unit is prepared to implement any of these or suggested courses of action in an effort to standardize the protocol for suspending and reassigning suspended cases and decreasing the current number of suspended cases.

Respectfully,

Sheryl D. Victorian

APPENDIX C

SVD ADULT SEX CRIMES UNIT S.O.P. 200/2.01
CASE ASSIGNMENT, ISSUED NOVEMBER 19, 2015

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS COMMAND

SPECIAL VICTIMS DIVISION

CATEGORY:	DATE ISSUED:	EFFECTIVE DATE:	PROCEDURE NUMBER
ADULT SEX CRIMES UNIT	11-19-15	11-19-15	200/2.01
SECTION:	**DATE OF REVISION:**	**REVISION NUMBER:**	**PAGE NUMBER:**
OPERATIONS	4/8/2016	**1**	**2** of **29**
SUBJECT/EVENT: CASE ASSIGNMENT			

PURPOSE:

To guide the case assignment and management process in order to optimize the use of investigative resources and assist in crime analysis and statistical reporting

TASKS:

1. On a daily basis, the Case Manager will review each case in the Special Victims (SP) box in RMS and assign it to the appropriate investigative follow-up unit within the division.
2. The Case Manager will advise unit supervisors of any cases that involve people or circumstances that could be a media event or involve anyone of special interest.
3. Within the Adult Sex Crimes Unit (ASCU) the investigators will be divided between two squads, East and West.
    a. East Squad will handle incidents reported in districts 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, and 24.
    b. West Squad will handle incidents reported in districts 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20.

    The division case manager will assign cases to the East or West squad of the ASCU based on the above district criteria.
4. On a daily basis, the squad sergeant will review, prioritize, and assign all cases which are the responsibility of the squad's area.
5. Squad Sergeants will prioritize cases according to the below guidelines:
    a. **Priority 1** - These cases should be assigned ASAP. Sexual Assaults that include the following:
        i. CODIS hit
        ii. Police, First Responder or City Employee Involved
        iii. Family Violence component
        iv. Elderly or Mentally Disabled complainants
        v. SBI
        vi. Identified Suspect
        vii. High Profile or media interest

REFERENCES:

b. **Priority 2** – These cases should also be assigned ASAP but are slightly lower than Priority 1. Sexual Assaults that include:
   i. SAK
   ii. Workable Leads
   iii. Complainant requesting follow-up on case not previously assigned
   iv. Any Injury
   v. Non-SA and Serious Misdemeanors
   vi. High Profile or media interest
   vii. Incidents that occur near a school, library or other place w/children
c. **Priority 3 -** Non-SA and Less Serious Misdemeanors:
   i. Workable Leads
   ii. Refer to File Class C
   iii. Complainant requesting follow-up on case not previously assigned
   iv. Any Injury
d. **Priority 4**
   i. Cases with no workable leads
   ii. Refer to File Class C
e. **Priority 5** – Cases that have no reason to be assigned. Examples:
   i. It wasn't a crime
   ii. Courtesy Reports that occurred outside the COH.
   iii. Property Disposition

6. The Squad Sergeant will determine whether each case will be assigned to an investigative police officer, suspended, or redirected to a more appropriate investigative unit, division, or agency.
7. When cases are suspended in RMS, they may be suspended in one of three ways:
   a. SL Suspended - Lack of Personnel
   b. SP Suspended - Patrol Arrest
      i. Suspects arrested on patrol for Sexual Assault shall have an investigator assigned to follow-up with the case.
      ii. Investigators shall also be assigned to follow-up in patrol arrest cases which could become high profile, generate media interest or are serial offenses of a less serious nature, ex: serial exposer in a park.
   c. SU Suspended - No Leads Suspend

   When a case is suspended for any reason, the supervisor shall enter the case number into the Case Suspension tracking spreadsheet along with the priority number it was assigned. When manpower allows, cases will be re-activated and assigned based on highest priority and then date (oldest first).
8. Each case assigned in RMS will be imported into the Adult Sex Crimes Case Management Database to assist in case tracking and for later use in crime analysis and statistical reporting.
9. In instances when a Squad Sergeant knows they will be using scheduled time off, the sergeant will be responsible for getting with another sergeant to assign cases for the time they are scheduled off and ensuring that the case manager and the ASCU

REFERENCES:

Lieutenant are aware of who will be assigning cases for their squad during their absence.

10. When cases are cleared, the case disposition and clearance date will be updated in the Adult Sex Crimes Case Management Database by the investigative supervisor.
11. Cases assigned for follow-up in the Adult Sex Crimes Unit will have an approved copy filed in the division or placed into storage in accordance with department records management procedures.

REFERENCES:

APPENDIX D

RMS CASE DISPOSITION LIST

Key	Description
AC	Accept Confidentiality from Other Div.
AS	Assign Secondary Case
CACA	Cleared - Arrest Charges - Adult
CACJ	Cleared - Arrest Charges - Juvenile
CAOA	Cleared - Arrest Other Case - Adult
CAOJ	Cleared - Arrest Other Case - Juvenile
CBEX	Closed By Exceptional Means
CC	Make Case Confidential for a Division
CDOD	Cleared - Death of Defendant
CDRA	Cleared - D.A. Refused - Adult
CDRJ	Cleared - D.A. Refused - Juvenile
CEDO	Suspended by Emergency Detention Order
CINV	Closed By Investigation
CLPA	Cleared - Lack of Prosecution - Adult
CLPJ	Cleared - Lack of Prosecution - Juvenile
CROA	Closed By Referral to Outside Agency
CUNF	Cleared - Unfounded
DC	Decline Confidentiality from Other Div.
DS	Decline by Supervisor
FOL	Follow Up Request
INAC	Inactive - No Further Leads
INAW	Inactive - Arrest Warrant Filed
INGJ	Inactive - Pending Grand Jury Referral
INLA	Inactive - Pending Lab Analysis
OPNI	Open - Pending New Information
PFOL	Property Release/Disposition Form
PRIM	Reassign Primary to Secondary or Back
RA	Reassigned - Investigation
RC	Remove Confidentiality
RI	Reassigned - Office Case
RO	Reopened Case (Must use Remarks)
SA	Supervisor Approval
SL	Suspended - Lack of Personnel
SP	Suspended - Patrol Arrest
SU	Suspended - No Leads
SZM	Seizure of Money
SZV	Seizure of Vehicle
TR	Transfer Confidentiality to Other Division