

OAKLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

Office of Internal Accountability



2025 Internal Investigation Outcome and Discipline Report

June 2026

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
1. Executive Summary	3
Background	3
Proportion of Member Cases that were “Sustained”	4
Long-Term (5-Year) Perspective.....	4
Cases with an Internal Origin	5
Disciplinary Outcomes	6
Recommendations	6
2. Methodology	8
3. Breakdown of the Number of Allegations and Cases	11
3.1. Are Members of Any Group Being Investigated More Often?	11
3.2. Did Officers from Any Given Group Receive More Allegations Per Case?.....	15
3.3. Did the Type of Allegations Differ by Group?	18
3.4. Did the Seriousness of the Allegation (Class I Versus Class II) Differ by Group?	23
3.5. Did the Type of Investigation Differ by Group?	24
4. Proportion of Cases with a “Sustained” Finding	27
4.1. Is One Group More Likely to be Sustained?.....	27
4.2. Does Seniority or Age Impact Differences in Sustained Rates?	28
4.3. Do Division-Level Investigations Differ from Internal Affairs Investigations?	31
4.4. Do Cases with an External Origin Differ from Cases with an Internal Origin?	33
4.5. Do Sustained Rates Differ Based on the Seriousness of the Allegation (Class I versus Class II)?	36
4.6. Do Year-to-Year Fluctuations in Sustained Rates Average Out Over Time?	38
4.7. Did “Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint” Allegations Affect Sustained Rates in 2024?	38
5. Focusing on Fully Investigated Cases	40
5.1. Sustained Rates for Fully Investigated Cases	40
5.2. Allegation-Level Analysis for Fully Investigated Cases.....	44
5.3. Analysis by Type of Sustained Violation for Fully Investigated Cases.....	49
5.4. Did Seniority Or Age Explain The Differences In Sustained Rates for Fully Investigated Allegations?	57
5.5. Do Specific Investigators Stand Out in Fully Investigated Cases?.....	59
6. Discipline Analyses	66
Discipline by Class	66
7. Department Efforts	70

8. Recommendations	71
Appendix 1: Chi-Square Tests for Sustained Rates 2025	72
Appendix 2: Chi-Square Tests Cases Per Member and Allegations Per Case 2025	74
Appendix 3: Chi-Square Tests Allegations by Class 2025	76
Appendix 4: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Investigation Type and Origin 2025.....	77
Appendix 5: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Race Internally Discovered Allegations 2025	81
Appendix 6: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Allegation Class 2025.....	83
Appendix 7: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Fully Investigated Cases 2025.....	84
Appendix 8: 2025 Sustained Allegations with Discipline	89

1. Executive Summary

Background

The Oakland Police Department is committed to ensuring that internal affairs (IA) investigations and resulting discipline are fair, consistent, and transparent. The Department investigates complaints against personnel that, if substantiated, would constitute violations of the Manual of Rules. To identify and address potential disparities in investigative findings and disciplinary outcomes, Department General Order R-01 (Risk Management) requires an annual review of IA outcomes by race, along with a report summarizing the findings. The analysis follows the Department's Working Methodology for Internal Affairs Disparity Analyses (see Section 2: Methodology), with a focus on comparing findings and disciplinary outcomes across race, gender, and rank.

Since the Department first began analyzing investigative findings and discipline, it has implemented several measures to mitigate disparities, including policy revisions, enhanced training, and technology improvements. This annual report is one component of the Department's broader efforts to identify and address disparities. These efforts also include surveys of employee perceptions about the IA process, ongoing monitoring of IA data, and the work of the Department's Race and Equity Team.

The analyses in this report focus on internal investigation cases involving sworn personnel conducted either at the Division or at the Internal Affairs level¹, but exclude cases reviewed by pursuit, collision, or use of force boards. The cases included in the analyses came to a finding in 2025, but were initiated (date the Department became aware of the complaint) between January 2021 and November 2025. The 2025 analyses are based on a similar amount of data as in 2024: there were a total of 620 investigations in 2025 (versus 633 in 2024) involving one or more sworn members, yielding 1,336 member cases (versus 1,417) when broken down by individual member, comprising 2,203 separate allegations (versus 2,109). A total of 466 sworn members (versus 461) were involved in one or more cases, relative to a total number of 621 (versus 676) sworn members employed by the Department, estimated in December of each year.

In this report, we present tables for both the 2024 data and the 2025 data for comparison. To help avoid confusion, the 2025 table headings are highlighted in yellow, whereas the 2024 table headings are highlighted in gray. Throughout this report, proportions in tables that were tested for significance are shaded in blue, and any differences found to be statistically significant are marked in red. Thus in Table 1 below, the red font on the left indicates that statistically significant differences between races observed in 2024 were no longer significant in 2025. It is important to note the use of the terms significant and non-significant in this report refer to results of a chi-square statistical test (see [2. Methodology](#), **What counts as statistically significant?**) and are not intended as a subjective assessment of the difference between two groups.

¹ Cases investigated by staff assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) are categorized as Internal Affairs (IA) level cases. Division Level Investigations (DLI) are assigned to sergeants who work in divisions outside of IAB.

Proportion of Member Cases that were “Sustained”

Table 1: Sustained Rates at the Member Case Level 2024 versus 2025

	2024			2025		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	2%	4	223	5%	11	222
Black	7%	23	351	7%	21	303
Hispanic	6%	25	425	8%	33	406
Asian/Filipino	3%	11	342	4%	12	336
Other/Unknown	1%	1	76	7%	5	69
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336
Male	5%	54	1183	7%	74	1135
Female	4%	10	234	4%	8	201
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336
Officer	4%	57	1331	6%	67	1201
Sgt and Above	8%	7	86	11%	15	135
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336

The overall sustained rate increased by 1.6% between 2024 (4.5%, 64 of 1417) and 2025 (6.1%, 82 of 1336). As shown in Table 1, the sustained rates increased for all races except Black members, whose sustained rate stayed the same (7%, 21 of 303 in 2025 and 23 of 351 in 2024). The sustained rate for white sworn members more than doubled from 2% to 5% (4 of 223 to 11 of 222 cases). As a result, we did not observe in the 2025 data the same extent of disparity in sustained rates observed in 2024 between white and Black sworn personnel, nor between white and Hispanic sworn personnel. For Black members, the statistically significant 5-point difference with whites (7%, 23 of 351 versus 2%, 4 of 223) observed in 2024 shrank to a 2-point difference (7%, 21 of 303 versus 5%, 11 of 222) that did not meet the threshold for statistical significance; for Hispanics, the significant 4-point difference with whites (6%, 25 of 425 versus 2%, 4 of 223) reduced to a 3-point difference (8%, 33 of 406 versus 5%, 11 of 222) that also did not meet the bar for statistical significance.

Men were sustained at a higher rate than women in both 2024 and 2025, and while the difference was not significant, the gap in sustained rates widened in 2025. Sergeants and above continued to be sustained at a higher rate than officers in 2025, and while we were unable to test significance in 2024 due to low numbers, higher numbers in 2025 allowed us to test for significance and we found the difference to be significant. (See [4.1. Is One Group More Likely to be Sustained?](#))

Long-Term (5-Year) Perspective

Table 2 presents five-year trends in sustained rates by race, as well as 5-year combined sustained rates. Between 2021 and 2025, white and other/unknown members had the highest combined sustained rate (9%). The sustained rates for Black and Hispanic members aggregated over the 5-year span were close behind (7% and 8%). Asian members had the lowest combined sustained rate at 5%. (See [4.6. Do Year-to-Year Fluctuations in Sustained Rates Average Out Over Time?](#)). This suggests that the higher sustained rate for Black personnel observed in 2024 and 2025, while deserving of greater attention, does not seem to be a longstanding issue at OPD, at least in the last 5 years.

Table 2: Sustained Rates by Race 2021 to 2025

	2021		2022		2023		2024		2025		2021-2025
	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate
White	11%	51/457	11%	34/323	11%	37/348	2%	4/223	5%	11/222	9%
Black	9%	19/213	11%	23/212	6%	20/341	7%	23/351	7%	21/303	7%
Hispanic	9%	40/434	9%	30/317	8%	40/512	6%	25/425	8%	33/406	8%
Asian/Filipino	7%	18/251	7%	16/240	7%	26/379	3%	11/342	4%	12/336	5%
Other/Unknown	16%	9/57	18%	7/38	9%	6/68	1%	1/76	7%	5/69	9%
Grand Total	10%	137/1412	10%	110/1130	8%	129/1648	5%	64/1417	6%	82/1336	8%

Cases with an Internal Origin

One thing that we noted in the analysis of the 2024 data was that the greatest racial disparities arose in internally generated² cases. White members had no sustained findings (0%, 0 of 8) for internally generated cases, compared to Black and Hispanic members who had sustained rates of 47% (7 of 15) and 24% (4 of 17), respectively. However, because there were so few internal cases in 2024 (48 total), these differences could not be tested for statistical significance. In 2025, the number of member cases that were internally generated more than doubled (119 versus 48, or 9% of all member cases versus 3% in 2024), and the gap in sustained rates between white members and Black and Hispanic members decreased. The sustained rate for white members among internally generated cases increased from 0% (0 of 8) to 14% (5 of 35), whereas for Black members it dropped from 47% (7 of 15) to 30% (10 of 33). In other words, the gap between white and Black members for internally generated cases shrank by two thirds, from 47% to 16%. The sustained rate for Hispanic members increased from 24% (4 of 17) to 35% (12 of 34). The larger number of internally generated case in 2025 allowed for significance testing, which showed no statistically significant disparity between white members and Black or Hispanic members. The numbers were too low for Asian and Other/Unknown members to test (see [4.4. Do Cases with an External Origin Differ from Cases with an Internal Origin?](#)).

While statistical testing revealed that the difference in sustained rates between white and non-white members for internally generated cases was not significant in 2025, we observed that white members were sustained at about half the rate of non-white members (14% versus 30-35%). This difference between white and non-white members in internally generated cases deserves continued monitoring (see [8. Recommendations](#)).

The 2024 analysis also revealed disparities in sustained rates by gender and rank for internally generated cases, but this was not observed in 2025. Men and women were sustained at similar rates for internally generated cases in 2025 (26%, 27 of 102 and 24%, 4 of 17), unlike in 2024 when women were sustained at a much higher rate than men (60%, 3 of 5 versus 21%, 9 of 43). Officers were sustained at a higher rate

² Internally generated cases are initiated by department employees (i.e., supervisor, co-worker, self-report by employee, etc.), as opposed to externally generated cases which are initiated by someone who does not work for the Department (member of the public or member of a different department or agency). Some cases that are initially generated externally may have allegations added by department supervisors or investigators. The case would be categorized as externally generated, but the added allegation would be categorized as an “internally discovered violation.”

than supervisors (29%, 19 of 65 versus 22%, 12 of 54), but the difference was not significant, and the gap was much smaller than in 2024 when officers were sustained at a rate of 30% (11 of 37) compared to supervisors who were sustained at a rate of 9% (1 of 11).

Disciplinary Outcomes

The number of member cases involving discipline increased by 32% between 2024 and 2025 (62 to 82 sustained findings). Of the 82 sustained cases in 2025, 60% resulted in more severe discipline (suspension, resignation/retirement³ or termination), compared to 52% in 2024, though disciplinary outcomes need to be broken down by severity of the violation to be meaningfully interpreted because Class I cases, involving more serious misconduct, usually result in heightened discipline, like suspension or termination.

We did not observe disparity in Class I discipline between white members and non-white members in 2025. All members sustained for Class I misconduct received a suspension or termination, except for one Hispanic member who received only a written reprimand. There was more variation in the level of discipline in Class II cases, with only 40% (21 of 53) of Class II cases resulting in discipline of a suspension or higher. Hispanic and Other/Unknown members had the highest rate of suspension or higher (50%, 11 of 22 and 60% 3 of 5) for Class II cases, followed by white members (43%, 3 of 7). Black and Asian members had the lowest rate of suspension or higher for Class II cases (27%, 3 of 11 and 13%, 1 of 8 respectively). (See [6. Discipline Analyses](#)).

Recommendations

1. **More closely monitor data entry and sustained rates for internally generated cases:** In some cases, it was difficult to determine how a case originated because information recorded in the complaint form was inconsistent across data fields. To improve data reliability, the Department should ensure consistent and accurate entry of complainant information and provide additional training to IAB personnel on properly classifying and documenting case origination. Additionally, the Department should continue to closely monitor sustained rates for internally generated cases to identify trends and potential areas of concern.
2. **Provide training on how to enter Internally Discovered Violations into the complaint form:** While “internally generated cases” are classified based on the origin of the case, “internally discovered violations” are classified at the allegation level. For example, an investigator may identify potential misconduct during a review of video evidence and add a new allegation to an existing case. In such instances, the allegation should be categorized as an “internally discovered violation,” even if the case itself originated from an external complaint. The Department recently updated the complaint form to expand data collection related to “internally discovered violations.” To ensure that internally discovered violations are consistently and accurately recorded, the Department should provide training to IAB staff on the definition of an “internally discovered violation,” explain updates to the complaint form in Vision, and emphasize the importance of complete and accurate data entry.

³ There were five cases in which the member resigned or retired prior to discipline being imposed. In all five cases, the officers who resigned or retired were facing suspension to termination at the time they separated from the Department, so are grouped with suspension and termination for the analysis.

3. **More closely monitor data entry for investigation type:** During the review of 2025 data, we identified cases that were reassigned between DLI and IA investigators, but the complaint form was not updated to reflect the change in investigation type. We also identified cases that were conducted by outside investigators; however, these cases were identified only through manual review because the complaint form does not include a field to indicate whether an investigation was outsourced. To improve the accuracy and reliability of data analysis, the Department should ensure that investigation type is updated whenever case assignments change and should add a data field to track whether an investigation was conducted by an outside investigator.

2. Methodology

The current report covers internal investigation cases involving sworn personnel that came to a finding in 2025 and includes an analysis of findings and discipline for sworn personnel. The analysis follows the *Department's Working Methodology for Internal Affairs Disparity Analyses*, which includes analyses of findings and discipline by race, gender, and rank, and moderating and mediating variables, including:

- Type of investigation (DLI versus IA),
- Case origin (externally versus internally generated),
- Case seriousness (Class I vs. Class II),
- Type of allegations,
- Seniority and Age of officer, and
- Identity of investigator.

What counts as a “finding.” For the purpose of the current analyses, we focused on findings for allegations made against sworn Department personnel that resulted from division-level investigations (DLI) or Internal Affairs Bureau investigations (IA). We therefore excluded findings based on the deliberations of collision, pursuit, and force boards because these findings are based on recommendations from a review board, not solely on the recommendations of an IA investigator or field sergeant. The investigative process for cases reviewed by a board is different from a typical internal investigation, involving more layers of review. Additionally, not all board findings are tracked by the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB). On-duty vehicle collisions, pursuits, and Level 2 uses of force that are found to be in compliance and have no concurrent Internal Affairs investigation are not tracked by IAB, and are therefore not included in our dataset. However, we did include six member cases involving incidents that were reviewed by a pursuit board, but where the IA investigation was for different, non-pursuit allegations.

What counts as “2025.” This report covers cases that were approved by the Chief or Internal Affairs Bureau Commander in 2025. Cases that were concurrently investigated by the Department and the Community Police Review Agency (CPRA)⁴ were included in the population, and for those cases, the date concurrence was reached between the Department and CPRA was used as the approval date. Some CPRA concurrent cases were completed by the Department in 2024 but reached concurrence with the CPRA in 2025, or OPD was notified by the CPRA in 2025 that they would not be investigating the case, and were therefore covered in this report. Cases approved in 2025 had complaint dates (date the complaint was received by the Department) going back to 2021.

What counts as a “case.” A “case” is defined as any number of allegations that fall under a single internal affairs case number for a single employee. A case is thus determined by removing additional allegations

⁴ The Community Police Review Agency (CPRA) is a civilian-run, community-centered police oversight agency that investigates allegations of misconduct by sworn officers. The CPRA generally investigates community complaints of serious misconduct. The CPRA is mandated by the City Charter to investigate public complaints about sworn officers involving police force, in-custody deaths, profiling based on a protected characteristic, untruthfulness, and First Amendment assemblies. All misconduct investigations conducted by the CPRA are also investigated by the Department. Findings and discipline for concurrently investigated cases are deliberated by IAB and the CPRA. In the event IAB and CPRA are unable to agree on a finding or the level of discipline, the case is presented to the Police Commission's Discipline Committee for a final decision. The findings included in this report are the final findings after agreement between IAB and CPRA, or review by the Discipline Committee.

against the same member in a case so the member is only counted one time per case. The case-level analysis avoids overweighing cases with multiple allegations – but precludes analyzing specific allegations. For this reason, the data in this report is analyzed at both the allegation level and the case level.

What counts as “sustained.” Internal investigations can be sustained, not sustained, exonerated, unfounded, informally resolved, or administratively closed. For purposes of this analysis, sustained findings are compared to all other findings (“sustained” versus “other than sustained”). An allegation of misconduct is sustained when the investigation discloses sufficient evidence to determine that the alleged conduct did occur and was in violation of law and/or Department rules, regulations or policies. A case is counted as “sustained” if any allegation against that particular officer in that case was sustained.

What counts as “internally generated” case. Internally generated cases are initiated by department employees (i.e., supervisor, co-worker, self-report by employee, etc.), as opposed to externally generated cases which are initiated by someone who does not work for the Department (member of the public or member of a different department or agency). Some cases that are initially generated externally may have allegations added by department supervisors or investigators. Such cases would be categorized as externally generated in analyses at the member case level, but the added allegation would be categorized as an “internally discovered violation” in allegation-level analyses. For the purposes of the present report, we relied on how IAB had initially designated the case in the “Complaint Made By” field (e.g., “Complainant” or “3rd Party”) and the “Complainant Name” field (e.g., “OPD”), as well as for Anonymous complaints, we reviewed the case summary manually to confirm how the case originated. Of the 1,336 member cases in 2025, 9% (119/1336) were coded as internally generated in 2025, versus 3% (48/1417) in 2024.

What counts as a “fully investigated case.” Fully investigated cases go through the complete investigative process and exclude cases resolved via Summary Finding and Informal Complaint Resolution, and are the only cases that can result in a “Sustained” finding. Summary Findings are abbreviated investigations for which a finding of “Unfounded” or “Exonerated” can be determined by the existing documentation, evidence, statements, and crime information, with no or minimal follow-up required. An informal complaint resolution is an investigative outcome used under certain circumstances for Class II allegations that do not indicate a pattern of misconduct.

What counts as “investigated by OPD.” Our analysis covers complaints against OPD that came to a finding in 2025. However, in some high-profile cases, or to avoid perceived conflicts of interest or bias, some investigations were outsourced to outside investigators in 2025. We identified 7 such investigations involving 28 sworn member cases, which were contracted out to independent third-party law firms, constituting 25% of the 112 member cases recorded as fully investigated by IA. Since we did not single out such cases in our 2023 and 2024 analyses, we included these outside investigations in our 2025 analyses to maintain consistency with prior years. In order to assess what impact outside investigations may have had on observed sustained rates in 2025, we also calculated sustained rates after excluding these 28 outside investigated cases. When excluding these investigations, the sustained rate for Black members actually dropped by 1% while the rate for white members stayed the same, further reducing the difference between Black (6%) and white members (5%), whereas the gap between whites and Hispanics remained the same. In other words, retaining these outside investigations is “conservative” in that it does not seem to artificially obfuscate any disparities occurring in investigations conducted entirely by OPD, supporting our decision to retain them in the analysis.

What counts as “Class I versus Class II:” Class I allegations of misconduct are the most serious allegations which, if sustained, can result in disciplinary action up to and including termination and may serve as the basis for criminal prosecution (e.g., unlawful force, untruthfulness, insubordination, and harassment). Class II allegations include all minor misconduct offenses.⁵

What counts as a “disparity.” Throughout this report, we use the word disparity to refer to differences in rates between groups, such as the difference in proportion of cases that came to a “Sustained” finding when comparing white and Black sworn members. This only refers to a numerical difference between rates and does not carry any assumption about the cause of the observed difference, or any aspersion about the personnel or structural processes involved in the production of those numbers. Additional work on moderators in our analysis (e.g., internal vs. external origin) casts some light on where disparities are the greatest and may give us some insight on causes, but the claim of a “disparity” is simply a numerical fact that is hopefully not controversial. Throughout this report, we will try to highlight noteworthy disparities when they arise.

What counts as assigned to “Patrol.” All Patrol squad assignments, including officers and sergeants, as well as Patrol watch commanders (lieutenants) and Area Commanders (Captains) were categorized as “Patrol.”

What counts as “statistically significant.” We relied on 2 x 2 chi-square (χ^2) tests to assess the statistical significance of differences between proportions where a large enough sample size allowed it. Throughout this report, proportions in tables that were tested for significance are shaded in blue and any differences found to be statistically significant are marked in red. A chi-square test is a statistical test comparing observed frequencies (i.e., cell counts in a table) with expected frequencies in the absence of an association between the variables. We start with the hypothesis that any two variables of interest, for example race and whether a case is sustained or not, are *not* associated. In statistics, this is referred to as the Null hypothesis. The chi-square test helps determine if any observed differences can reasonably be attributed to chance alone, or whether it’s more appropriate to reject the Null hypothesis that the two variables are not associated – and conclude instead that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Chi-square tests can therefore help identify if there is evidence of disparity in a sample above and beyond the normal differences that can be expected between any two sets of observed numbers – even if they were sampled from the exact same population. The *p* or probability value computed in a chi-square test is a number describing how likely it is that the obtained sample difference could have occurred in the absence of any actual difference in the population the samples are drawn from, i.e., by chance alone (the Null). The level of statistical significance is expressed as a *p*-value between 0 and 1. The smaller the *p*-value, the less likely the results occurred by random chance. For purposes of this analysis, any *p*-value smaller than the conventional threshold of 0.05 (5%) was considered statistically significant, indicating a likely association between variables.

Note that because the simple 2x2 chi-square formula that we used only allows for pair-wise comparisons between any two categories, tests of significance for proportions involving race always contrasted non-white ethnicities against whites for the purpose of testing significance. Also, the Yates correction was used, which subtracts 0.5 from the numerical difference between the observed and expected frequencies and is made to account for the upward bias for a 2 x 2 contingency table when using the chi-square test.

⁵ Department General Order M-03, *Complaints Against Department Personnel*, II.E.

3. Breakdown of the Number of Allegations and Cases

Excluding cases that were reviewed by a board (see [2. Methodology, What Counts as a Finding](#)), there were 620 investigations of complaints approved in 2025 involving a sworn member. These 620 investigations had complaint dates (date the complaint was initially received by the Department) ranging between January 2021 and November 2025: 1 case with a complaint date in 2021, 2 in 2022, 9 in 2023, 317 in 2024, and 291 in 2025. The 620 investigations, each of which can involve multiple sworn members with potentially multiple allegations, covered a total of 2,203 allegations of misconduct, and resulted in 1,336 sworn member cases (See [2. Methodology, What Counts as a Case](#)).

3.1. Are Members of Any Group Being Investigated More Often?

Table 3 contains the demographic breakdown of the Department, and the number of allegations and cases (some of which may contain multiple allegations against a specific officer) that came to a finding. We present the tables for both the 2024 data and the 2025 data for comparison. To help the reader, the 2025 table headings are highlighted in yellow and the 2024 table headings are highlighted in gray.

The sworn member demographic breakdown between December 2024 and December 2025 changed only slightly, with the percentage of white and Black members dropping by around 2% and the percentage of Asian and Other/Unknown increasing by a corresponding amount. In 2025, Hispanic members made up the largest percentage of sworn personnel at 29% (same percentage as 2024), followed by white members at 24%, Asian members at 22%, and Black members at 20%. Male members made up 85% and rank-and-file officers made up 77% of sworn personnel.

Table 3: Demographic Breakdown of Department Personnel, Allegations, and Cases 2025

	Sworn Personnel in the Department*	Sworn Personnel Assigned to Patrol*	Allegations against Sworn Personnel	Cases involving a Sworn Member	Sworn Members with one or more cases**
	By Race				
White	24% (150)	19% (76)	17% (366)	17% (222)	20% (95)
Black	20% (126)	23% (90)	24% (527)	23% (303)	22% (104)
Hispanic	29% (182)	30% (118)	30% (662)	30% (406)	30% (138)
Asian/Filipino	22% (134)	23% (90)	24% (536)	25% (336)	23% (107)
Other/Unknown	5% (29)	5% (19)	5% (112)	5% (69)	5% (22)
	By Gender				
Male	84% (524)	85% (333)	85% (1877)	85% (1135)	85% (396)
Female	16% (97)	15% (60)	15% (326)	15% (201)	15% (70)
	By Rank				
Officer	77% (477)	81% (320)	88% (1942)	90% (1201)	82% (382)
Sgt and Above	23% (144)	19% (73)	12% (261)	10% (135)	18% (85)
TOTAL	621	393	2203	1336	466

*Source: December 2025 Police Staff Report.

***Some sworn members received complaints as a police officer and as a supervisor in 2025. This can happen if a member is promoted during the time-period of review. Therefore, when looking at Rank, the total number of members is slightly higher.*

Table 3: Demographic Breakdown of Department Personnel, Allegations, and Cases 2024

	Sworn Personnel in the Department*	Sworn Personnel Assigned to Patrol*	Allegations against Sworn Personnel	Cases involving a Sworn Member	Sworn Members with one or more cases**
	By Race				
White	25% (169)	21% (81)	15% (312)	16% (223)	21% (95)
Black	22% (145)	24% (95)	25% (537)	25% (351)	22% (103)
Hispanic	29% (197)	28% (112)	31% (649)	30% (425)	30% (139)
Asian/Filipino	20% (138)	23% (89)	23% (494)	24% (342)	22% (103)
Other/Unknown	4% (27)	4% (17)	6% (117)	5% (76)	5% (21)
	By Gender				
Male	86% (578)	86% (337)	84% (1778)	83% (1183)	85% (391)
Female	14% (98)	14% (57)	16% (331)	17% (234)	15% (70)
	By Rank				
Officer	78% (527)	82% (323)	94% (1991)	94% (1331)	88% (406)
Sgt and Above	22% (149)	18% (71)	6% (118)	6% (86)	13% (58)
TOTAL	676	394	2109	1417	461

**Source: December 2024 Police Staff Report.*

***Some sworn members received complaints as a police officer and as a supervisor in 2024. This can happen if a member is promoted during the time-period of review. Therefore, when looking at Rank, the total number of members is slightly higher.*

In 2025, white members received a lower percentage of allegations and cases (17%) than their representation in the Department (24%), however the gap was smaller than in 2024 (15% versus 25%). All other groups in 2025 had percentages of allegations and cases equal to or higher than their representation in the Department. When comparing the demographic breakdown in Patrol, where complaints tend to be higher, the percentage of allegations and cases is similar to the representation in Patrol across all races. This suggests that one reason why we see fewer allegations against white sworn personnel relative to their presence in the department may be because they are slightly underrepresented in Patrol, where most allegations are levied because of frequent and repeated interactions with community members. However, additional analyses revealed that both within patrol and within non-patrol, white members were under-represented among cases investigated, which suggests that assignment to Patrol alone does not explain away the under-representation of white members.

To get a sense of the frequency of allegations against sworn personnel, and whether it differed by group, Table 4 provides the number of sworn personnel in each group who were investigated in at least one case that came to a finding as a function of the size of that group at three different time points covering the entire year, to account for the fact that group size can change over the course of the year with hires and

departures. For 2024, we looked at Dec 23, Aug 24, and Dec 24. For 2025, we looked at Dec 24, Jul 25 and Dec 25.

While it may at first glance seem straightforward to divide this number by the total number of sworn personnel in each group, this would be misleading because these cases could have originated in different quarters or even years, and the demographic composition of the Department is constantly changing with hiring, retirement, departures, etc. Having said this, we think the ratio of number of officers of a certain group being investigated at any given time is an important statistic to capture the experience of members of that group (to capture their perception of being targeted more/less than other groups), so we present these ratios below, but with the caveat that they do not capture actual proportions at any given time. We use the number of sworn members with one or more cases that came to a finding as the numerator in all ratios, but use 3 different snapshots as denominators.

Table 4: Ratio of Investigated Sworn Personnel in 2025, by Race

	Sworn Members with one or more cases closed during 2025	As a Ratio of the Number of Sworn Officers of that Group in...		
		Dec 24	Jul 25	Dec 25
By Race				
White	95	56% (of 169)	59% (of 162)	63% (of 150)
Black	104	72% (of 145)	78% (of 134)	83% (of 126)
Hispanic	138	70% (of 197)	72% (of 191)	76% (of 182)
Asian/Filipino	107	78% (of 138)	78% (of 138)	80% (of 134)
Other/Unknown	22	81% (of 27)	76% (of 29)	76% (of 29)
TOTAL	466	69% (of 676)	71% (of 654)	75% (of 621)

Table 4: Ratio of Investigated Sworn Personnel in 2024, by Race

	Sworn Members with one or more cases closed during 2024	As a Ratio of the Number of Sworn Officers of that Group in...		
		Dec 23	Aug 24	Dec 24
By Race				
White	95	49% (of 194)	54% (of 175)	56% (of 169)
Black	103	66% (of 156)	70% (of 148)	71% (of 145)
Hispanic	139	64% (of 217)	70% (of 198)	71% (of 197)
Asian/Filipino	103	69% (of 149)	73% (of 142)	75% (of 138)
Other/Unknown	21	72% (of 29)	78% (of 27)	78% (of 27)
TOTAL	461	62% (of 745)	67% (of 690)	68% (of 676)

While we again caution readers against taking these “proportions” too literally, these numbers interpreted broadly give us some insight into the experience of sworn personnel from each group. In both

2024 and 2025, a lower percentage of white members were investigated than their non-white colleagues, which seems only partly related to Patrol assignments, as noted in the previous section.

We also analyzed members who had multiple cases in 2025. To see if members of a specific race had a disproportionate number of multiple cases (among members with at least one case), we compare in Table 5 the number of members who had only one case to those who had more than one case. There were 466 members who had at least one case in 2025, compared to 461 in 2024. In 2025, 65% of those members had more than one case which was lower than in 2024 (70%).

In 2024, white members were the least likely to have multiple cases (57%, 54 of 95) which was significantly lower than Black, Hispanic and Asian members (74%, 76 of 103; 71%, 99 of 138; and 79%, 81 of 103). In 2025, white members were again the least likely to have multiple cases (54%, 51 of 95), which was significantly lower than Asian and Other/Unknown members (73%, 78 of 107 and 82%, 18 of 22). However, because the percentage of Black and Hispanic members with more than one case per member dropped in 2025 to 63% (65 of 104) and 67% (92 of 138), respectively, the difference between white members and Black and Hispanic was no longer significant in 2025.

Table 5: Cases per Sworn Member by Race 2025

Cases per Sworn Member	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/Filipino		Other/Unk		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn		Sworn		Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
1	46%	44	38%	39	33%	46	27%	29	18%	4	35%	162
2	24%	23	18%	19	22%	30	25%	27	18%	4	22%	103
3	17%	16	13%	14	13%	18	12%	13	32%	7	15%	68
4	3%	3	10%	10	9%	12	8%	9	18%	4	8%	38
5	0%	0	9%	9	9%	12	10%	11	5%	1	7%	33
6	3%	3	4%	4	8%	11	10%	11	0%	0	6%	29
7	0%	0	3%	3	4%	5	2%	2	5%	1	2%	11
8	2%	2	4%	4	1%	2	3%	3	5%	1	3%	12
9	2%	2	0%	0	1%	1	1%	1	0%	0	1%	4
10	2%	2	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	1%	4
12	0%	0	1%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Total	100%	95	100%	104	100%	138	100%	107	100%	22	100%	466
More than One Case per Member	54%	51	63%	65	67%	92	73%	78	82%	18	65%	304
One Case per Member	46%	44	38%	39	33%	46	27%	29	18%	4	35%	162

Table 5: Cases per Sworn Member by Race 2024

Cases per Sworn Member	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/Filipino		Other/Unk		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn		Sworn		Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
13	0%	0	2%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.4%	2
12	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.2%	1
10	1%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	5%	1	1%	3
9	0%	0	0%	0	1%	2	0%	0	10%	2	1%	4
8	0%	0	4%	4	3%	4	4%	4	0%	0	3%	12
7	3%	3	5%	5	4%	5	6%	6	5%	1	4%	20
6	4%	4	4%	4	7%	10	8%	8	5%	1	6%	27
5	4%	4	9%	9	8%	11	11%	11	0%	0	8%	35
4	6%	6	12%	12	12%	16	9%	9	19%	4	10%	47
3	12%	11	16%	16	14%	19	20%	21	10%	2	15%	69
2	26%	25	21%	22	23%	32	21%	22	14%	3	23%	104
1	43%	41	26%	27	29%	40	21%	22	33%	7	30%	137
Total	100%	95	100%	103	100%	139	100%	103	100%	21	100%	461
More than One Case per Member	57%	54	74%	76	71%	99	79%	81	67%	14	70%	324
One Case per Member	43%	41	26%	27	29%	40	21%	22	33%	7	30%	137

3.2. Did Officers from Any Given Group Receive More Allegations Per Case?

Because the bulk of our analyses in this report focuses on the “case” level of analysis, we first wanted to check whether there were any differences in the number of allegations within any case depending on the subject’s race, gender and rank. Note that, contrary to an officer being involved in multiple cases (described above), which has no effect on sustained rates per case, having multiple allegations in a case is likely to affect sustained rates directly because with more allegations in the case, there is a greater likelihood that at least one of them will be found sustained, which is all we need to count a case as sustained.

The number of allegations per case increased between 2024 and 2025. In 2024, 32% (452 of 1417) of members had more than one allegation per case and in 2025 that number increased to 39% (517 of 1336). There was no significant difference between white members and non-white members when comparing the percentage of those who had more than one allegation per case. Also, in 2025, there was no significant difference between male and female members. However, there was a significant difference when comparing ranks. Sergeants and above were significantly more likely to have more than one allegation per case (48%, 65 of 135 versus 38%, 452 of 1201). Tables 6 to 8 display the number of allegations by race, by gender, and by rank (“officer” and “sergeant and above”).

Table 6: Number of Allegations per Case by Race or Ethnicity 2025

# of Alleg Per Case	White Sworn		Black Sworn		Hispanic Sworn		Asian/Filipino Sworn		Other/Unk Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n
1	60%	133	57%	172	64%	261	63%	213	58%	40	61%	819
2	25%	56	29%	87	21%	86	22%	75	32%	22	24%	326
3	9%	19	9%	27	9%	36	10%	33	3%	2	9%	117
4	4%	9	2%	7	3%	13	3%	9	6%	4	3%	42
5	1%	2	1%	3	0.7%	3	0.6%	2	0%	0	0.7%	10
6	1%	3	1%	4	0.7%	3	0.6%	2	1%	1	1%	13
7	0%	0	0%	0	0.2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0.1%	1
8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.6%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
9	0%	0	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0.1%	2
10	0%	0	0.3%	1	0.5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0.2%	3
14	0%	0	0.3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.1%	1
Total	100%	222	100%	303	100%	406	100%	336	100%	69	100%	1336
1 Alleg per case	60%	133	57%	172	64%	261	63%	213	58%	40	61%	819
More than 1 Alleg per case	40%	89	43%	131	36%	145	37%	123	42%	29	39%	517

Table 6: Number of Allegations per Case by Race or Ethnicity 2024

# of Alleg Per Case	White Sworn		Black Sworn		Hispanic Sworn		Asian/Filipino Sworn		Other/Unk Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
1	71%	159	64%	226	68%	290	70%	239	67%	51	68%	965
2	22%	49	24%	84	19%	79	20%	68	20%	15	21%	295
3	4%	9	8%	29	9%	37	7%	25	9%	7	8%	107
4	1%	3	2%	7	3%	11	2%	7	1%	1	2%	29
5	1%	2	1%	4	1%	4	0.6%	2	1%	1	1%	13
6	0.4%	1	0%	0	0.7%	3	0.3%	1	1%	1	0.4%	6
7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
8	0%	0	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0.1%	2
Total	100%	223	100%	351	100%	425	100%	342	100%	76	100%	1417
1 Alleg per case	71%	159	64%	226	68%	290	70%	239	67%	51	68%	965
More than 1 Alleg per case	29%	64	36%	125	32%	135	30%	103	33%	25	32%	452

Table 7: Allegations per Case by Gender 2025

# of Alleg Per Case	Male Sworn		Female Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
1	61%	691	64%	128	61%	819
2	25%	283	21%	43	24%	326
3	9%	102	7%	15	9%	117
4	3%	31	5%	11	3%	42
5	1%	9	0%	1	1%	10
6	1%	10	1%	3	1%	13
7	0.1%	1	0%	0	0.1%	1
8	0.2%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
9	0.2%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
10	0.3%	3	0%	0	0.2%	3
14	0.1%	1	0%	0	0.1%	1
Total	100%	1135	100%	201	100%	1336
1 Alleg per case	61%	691	64%	128	61%	819
More than 1 Alleg per case	39%	444	36%	73	39%	517

Table 7: Allegations per Case by Gender 2024

# of Alleg Per Case	Male Sworn		Female Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
1	67%	798	74%	167	68%	965
2	22%	261	15%	34	21%	295
3	7%	88	8%	19	8%	107
4	2%	26	1%	3	2%	29
5	1%	12	0%	1	1%	13
6	0.5%	6	0%	0	0.4%	6
7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
8	0.1%	1	0%	1	0.1%	2
Total	100%	1192	100%	225	100%	1417
1 Alleg per case	67%	798	74%	167	68%	965
More than 1 Alleg per case	33%	394	26%	58	32%	452

Table 8: Allegations per Case by Rank 2025

# of Alleg Per Case	Officer Sworn		Sgt and Above Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
1	62%	749	52%	70	61%	819
2	24%	291	26%	35	24%	326
3	9%	104	10%	13	9%	117
4	2%	29	10%	13	3%	42
5	1%	8	1%	2	1%	10
6	1%	12	1%	1	1%	13
7	0.1%	1	0%	0	0.1%	1
8	0.2%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
9	0.2%	2	0%	0	0.1%	2
10	0.2%	3	0%	0	0.2%	3
14	0%	0	0.7%	1	0.1%	1
Grand Total	100%	1201	100%	135	100%	1336
1 Alleg per case	62%	749	52%	70	61%	819
More than 1 Alleg per case	38%	452	48%	65	39%	517

Table 8: Allegations per Case by Rank 2024

# of Alleg Per Case	Officer Sworn		Sgt and Above Sworn		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
1	68%	900	76%	65	68%	965
2	21%	281	16%	14	21%	295
3	8%	104	3%	3	8%	107
4	2%	25	5%	4	2%	29
5	1%	13	0.0%	0	1%	13
6	0.5%	6	0.0%	0	0.4%	6
7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
8	0.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.1%	2
Total	100%	1331	100%	86	100%	1417
1 Alleg per case	68%	900	76%	65	68%	965
More than 1 Alleg per case	32%	431	24%	21	32%	452

3.3. Did the Type of Allegations Differ by Group?

Next, allegations were reviewed by type to see if a particular race, gender, or rank received a disparate proportion of a particular violation. In 2024, we presented the top 10 allegations, which made up nearly 96% of all allegations. In 2025, because there was more of a spread in allegation types, we decided to present the top 12 allegations among the 2,203 (using whether an allegation appeared 20 times or more

as our cut point), which captured over 90% of allegations. Tables 9-11 include the top allegations by race, gender and rank.

The top five allegations in 2025 (which comprised 80% of all 2,203 allegations) were the same as in 2024: *Performance of Duty Unintentional/Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest*; *Performance of Duty General*; *Use of Force*; *Conduct Toward Others*, and *Performance of Duty - Care of Property*. Note that for *Conduct Towards Others* we aggregate “Demeanor,” “Harassment and Discrimination” (3 types), “Workplace Violence,” and “Unprofessional Conduct”, whereas for *Use of Force* we aggregate “Level 1-4” (4 types), and “Non-reportable use of force.”

The types of allegations levied against sworn personnel did not vary much by race (Table 9). When comparing genders (Table 10), in 2025, males had a higher percentage of *Use of Force* allegations (14%) compared to female members (9%). In both 2024 and 2025, there were larger differences for rank, which is likely explained by the difference in job function. Officers make arrests more often than their superiors and are therefore more often the target of allegations related to improper search, seizure and arrest and use of force. Tables 9 to 11 display the breakdown of violation type by race, gender and rank.

Table 9: Top Allegations by Race 2025

Allegation	White		Black		Hispanic Sworn		Asian/Filipino		Other/Unk		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn				Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	27%	99	27%	141	33%	218	35%	186	38%	43	31%	687
Performance of Duty – General	20%	74	22%	114	19%	125	20%	105	21%	23	20%	441
Use of Force	11%	40	12%	61	12%	82	18%	94	11%	12	13%	289
Conduct Towards Others	12%	43	16%	82	10%	65	10%	51	14%	16	12%	257
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	4%	15	3%	17	5%	35	4%	24	7%	8	4%	99
Performance of Duty – Intentional Search, Seizure, or Arrest	3%	11	2%	9	3%	18	4%	22	4%	5	3%	65
General Conduct	2%	8	2%	10	2%	11	1%	4	0%		1%	33
Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class I)	2%	6	1%	7	1%	8	1%	8	0%		1%	29
Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	5	2%	8	1%	8	1%	5	0%		1%	26
Performance of Duty – PDRD	1%	3	2%	8	1%	8	1%	4	0%		1%	23

Truthfulness	1%	4	1%	5	2%	10	1%	3	1%	1	1%	23
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1%	3	1%	5	1%	9	1%	4	0%		1%	21

Table 9: Top Allegations by Race 2024

Allegation	White		Black		Hispanic Sworn		Asian/Filipino		Other/Unk		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn		%	n	Sworn		Sworn		%	n
	%	n	%	n			%	n	%	n		
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	46%	142	41%	219	44%	286	41%	201	42%	49	43%	897
Performance of Duty – General	18%	56	19%	102	17%	113	21%	103	20%	23	19%	397
Use of Force	17%	54	18%	96	16%	106	19%	96	23%	27	18%	379
Conduct Towards Others	8%	25	9%	47	9%	58	9%	42	9%	10	9%	182
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	2%	7	4%	22	3%	17	5%	23	1%	1	3%	70
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	3%	8	1%	6	1%	8	0%	2	0%	0	1%	24
Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	3	1%	5	1%	4	1%	6	2%	2	1%	20
Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation	1%	2	1%	4	1%	6	1%	6	0%	0	1%	18
Performance of Duty – PDRD	0%	0	1%	5	0%	3	1%	4	3%	4	1%	16
Truthfulness	0%	1	1%	3	1%	7	0%	1	0%	0	1%	12

Table 10: Top Allegations by Gender 2025

Allegation	Male		Female		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	31%	579	33%	108	31%	687
Performance of Duty – General	20%	370	22%	71	20%	441
Use of Force	14%	260	9%	29	13%	289
Conduct Towards Others	11%	211	14%	46	12%	257
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	5%	86	4%	13	4%	99
Performance of Duty – Intentional Search, Seizure, or Arrest	3%	54	3%	11	3%	65
General Conduct	1%	26	2%	7	1%	33
Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class I)	2%	29	0%		1%	29
Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	24	1%	2	1%	26
Performance of Duty – PDRD	1%	22	0%	1	1%	23
Truthfulness	1%	20	1%	3	1%	23
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1%	18	1%	3	1%	21

Table 10: Top Allegations by Gender 2024

Allegation	Male		Female		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	42%	747	45%	150	43%	897
Performance of Duty – General	19%	331	20%	66	19%	397
Use of Force	18%	323	17%	56	18%	379
Conduct Towards Others	9%	158	7%	24	9%	182
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	4%	64	2%	6	3%	70
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	1%	19	2%	5	1%	24

Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	15	2%	5	1%	20
Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation	1%	13	2%	5	1%	18
Performance of Duty – PDRD	1%	13	1%	3	1%	16
Truthfulness	1%	12	0%	0	1%	12

Table 11: Top Allegations by Rank 2025

Allegation	Officer		Sgt and Above		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	34%	651	14%	36	31%	687
Performance of Duty – General	20%	398	16%	43	20%	441
Use of Force	14%	279	4%	10	13%	289
Conduct Towards Others	12%	227	11%	30	12%	257
Performance of Duty – Care of Property	5%	95	2%	4	4%	99
Performance of Duty – Intentional Search, Seizure, or Arrest	3%	62	1%	3	3%	65
General Conduct	1%	22	4%	11	1%	33
Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class I)	1%	20	3%	9	1%	29
Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	23	1%	3	1%	26
Performance of Duty – PDRD	1%	21	1%	2	1%	23
Truthfulness	1%	19	2%	4	1%	23
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (Unintentional)	1%	10	4%	11	1%	21

Table 11: Top Allegations by Rank 2024

Allegation	Officer		Sgt and Above		Total	
	Sworn		Sworn			
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Performance of Duty – Unintentional/ Improper Search, Seizure or Arrest	44%	871	22%	26	43%	897
Performance of Duty – General	19%	371	22%	26	19%	397
Use of Force	18%	364	13%	15	18%	379
Conduct Towards Others	8%	169	11%	13	9%	182

Performance of Duty – Care of Property	3%	63	6%	7	3%	70
Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint – Unintentional	1%	16	7%	8	1%	24
Refusal to Provide Name or Serial Number	1%	20	0%	0	1%	20
Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation	1%	17	1%	1	1%	18
Performance of Duty – PDRD	1%	16	0%	0	1%	16
Truthfulness	1%	12	0%	0	1%	12

3.4. Did the Seriousness of the Allegation (Class I Versus Class II) Differ by Group?

We reviewed the seriousness of the allegations (Class I versus Class II) to see if a particular race, gender, or rank disproportionately received Class I or Class II allegations. Class I allegations are the most serious allegations that can result in discipline up to termination, while Class II allegations involve less serious misconduct. Tables 12-14 include the breakdown of allegations by Class for race, gender and rank.

The percentage of Class I and Class II allegations was relatively consistent across race and gender in 2024. This was also the case in 2025. However, the gap widened a bit for Other/Unknown members in Class I cases (20%, 22 of 112 versus the next lowest 26%, 135 of 527) and men (28%, 532 of 1877 versus 23%, 76 of 326 for women). When comparing ranks, sergeants and above had a significantly higher rate of Class I allegations than officers (35%, 91 of 261 versus 27%, 517 of 1942), compared to 2024 when the rate was the same for both groups.

Table 12: Allegations – Allegation Class Percentages by Race 2024 Versus 2025

	Class I Allegations 2024		Class II Allegations 2024		Class I Allegations 2025		Class II Allegations 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	23%	71	77%	241	29%	106	71%	260
Black	25%	133	75%	404	26%	135	74%	392
Hispanic	25%	162	75%	487	28%	187	72%	475
Asian/Filipino	25%	123	75%	371	29%	158	71%	378
Other/Unknown	26%	31	74%	86	20%	22	80%	90
Grand Total	25%	520	75%	1589	28%	608	72%	1595

Table 13: Allegations – Allegation Class Percentages by Gender 2024 Versus 2025

	Class I Allegations 2024		Class II Allegations 2024		Class I Allegations 2025		Class II Allegations 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Male	25%	444	75%	1334	28%	532	72%	1345
Female	23%	76	77%	255	23%	76	77%	250
Grand Total	25%	520	75%	1589	28%	608	72%	1595

Table 14: Allegations – Allegation Class Percentages by Rank 2024 Versus 2025

	Class I Allegations 2024		Class II Allegations 2024		Class I Allegations 2025		Class II Allegations 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Officer	25%	490	75%	1501	27%	517	73%	1425
Sgt and Above	25%	30	75%	88	35%	91	65%	170
Grand Total	25%	520	75%	1589	28%	608	72%	1595

3.5. Did the Type of Investigation Differ by Group?

It is important to assess the breakdown in type of investigations before getting to the analysis of sustained rates because Summary Findings or Informally Resolved Cases can by definition never result in a “sustained” finding. Thus, before a full investigation is conducted, the decision to investigate a case as a Summary Finding or an Informal Compliant Resolution (ICR) is determinative of the finding (i.e., other than sustained). We therefore focus on this upstream breakdown here and return to the issue of type of investigation as a moderator when we conduct our analysis of sustained rates in Section [4. Proportion of Cases with a “Sustained” Finding](#) and Section [5. Focusing on Fully Investigated Cases](#).

As described above (see [2. Methodology](#)), fully investigated cases go through the complete investigative process and exclude cases resolved via Summary Finding and ICR, and are the only cases that can result in a “Sustained” finding. Summary Findings are abbreviated investigations for which a finding of unfounded or exonerated can be determined by the existing documentation, evidence, statements, and crime information, with no or minimal follow-up required. An ICR is an investigative outcome used under certain circumstances for Class II allegations that don’t indicate a pattern of misconduct.

Table 15 shows the percentage of each investigation type by race. In 2025, the percentage of fully investigated cases was relatively similar for white (33%, 74 of 222), Black (34%, 103 of 303) and Hispanic (31%, 128 of 406) members. Asian members had the lowest percentage of fully investigated cases (18%, 61 of 336) followed by Other/Unknown members (26%, 18 of 69). In 2024, Other/Unknown members had the lowest percentage of fully investigated cases and Asian members were more in line with the rest of the race groups. It is notable that in 2025, white members had the highest percentage of Internal Affairs fully investigated cases (15%, 33 of 222) compared to Black members who had the next highest (9%, 26 of 303) – but white members also had fewer cases investigated fully within Divisions (DLI), explaining the

relative similarity in the proportion of fully investigated cases with Black and Hispanic members when adding up both types of full investigations.

Table 15: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Race 2025

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	60%	134	3%	7	3%	7	18%	41	15%	33
Black	59%	179	4%	11	3%	10	25%	77	9%	26
Hispanic	63%	257	2%	10	3%	11	23%	94	8%	34
Asian/Filipino	76%	254	2%	6	4%	15	13%	45	5%	16
Other/Unknown	72%	50	1%	1	0%	0	22%	15	4%	3
Grand Total	65%	874	3%	35	3%	43	20%	272	8%	112

Table 15: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Race 2024

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	74%	164	1%	3	1%	2	17%	39	7%	15
Black	70%	244	1%	3	2%	6	23%	82	5%	16
Hispanic	70%	299	2%	10	2%	10	21%	88	4%	18
Asian/Filipino	74%	252	1%	2	3%	11	19%	65	4%	12
Other/Unknown	75%	57	1%	1	1%	1	21%	16	1%	1
Grand Total	72%	1016	1%	19	2%	30	20%	290	4%	62

Tables 16 and 17 show the same breakdowns for gender and rank. Similar to 2024, in 2025 male and female members had nearly the same percentage of fully investigated cases (29%, 324 of 1135 and 30%, 60 of 201). Rank, however, is strongly correlated with the kind of investigation, which was true in both 2024 and 2025. In 2025, 61% (82 of 135) of cases for sergeants and above were fully investigated compared to 25% (302 of 1201) for officers. Sergeants and above were investigated by IA at a much higher rate than officers (47%, 63 of 135 versus 4%, 49 of 1201), even higher than in 2024.

Table 16: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Gender 2025

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Male	65%	742	3%	29	4%	40	20%	226	9%	98
Female	66%	132	3%	6	1%	3	23%	46	7%	14
Grand Total	65%	874	3%	35	3%	43	20%	272	8%	112

Table 16: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Gender 2024

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Male	71%	843	1%	15	2%	28	20%	242	5%	55
Female	74%	173	2%	4	1%	2	21%	48	3%	7
Grand Total	72%	1016	1%	19	2%	30	20%	290	4%	62

Table 17: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Rank 2025

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Police Officer	69%	831	2%	27	3%	41	21%	253	4%	49
Sgt and Above	32%	43	6%	8	1%	2	14%	19	47%	63
Grand Total	65%	874	3%	35	3%	43	20%	272	8%	112

Table 17: Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Rank 2024

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Police Officer	73%	975	1%	18	2%	30	20%	266	3%	42
Sgt and Above	48%	41	1%	1	0%	0	28%	24	23%	20
Grand Total	72%	1016	1%	19	2%	30	20%	290	4%	62

4. Proportion of Cases with a “Sustained” Finding

As specified in the [2. Methodology](#), a case was considered sustained if any of the allegations targeted at the officer in question for this incident were sustained. Sustained rates were calculated for each independent variable (race, gender, rank) and broken down by moderating variables (investigation type and case origin). Chi-square tests were used to determine whether any differences between sustained rates were statistically significant.

4.1. Is One Group More Likely to be Sustained?

The overall sustained rate was nearly the same in 2024 and 2025. As presented in Table 1 (repeated below, see [1. Executive Summary](#)), 6.1% of all member cases (82 of 1336) were sustained in 2025, compared to 4.5% (64 of 1417) in 2024. The gap between sustained rates across races narrowed in 2025. The sustained rate for white members had dropped dramatically from 11% (37 of 348) in 2023 to 2% (4 of 223) in 2024, which was significantly lower than the sustained rates for Black and Hispanic members. In 2025, the white member sustained rate rose to 5% (11 of 222) which was not significantly different than Black members (7%, 21 of 303) or Hispanic members (8%, 33 of 406). Asian members had the lowest sustained rate (4%, 12 of 336).

Table 1 (Repeated from Page 4): Sustained Rates at the Member Case Level 2024 versus 2025

	2024			2025		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	2%	4	223	5%	11	222
Black	7%	23	351	7%	21	303
Hispanic	6%	25	425	8%	33	406
Asian/Filipino	3%	11	342	4%	12	336
Other/Unknown	1%	1	76	7%	5	69
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336
Male	5%	54	1183	7%	74	1135
Female	4%	10	234	4%	8	201
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336
Officer	4%	57	1331	6%	67	1201
Sgt and Above	8%	7	86	11%	15	135
Total	5%	64	1417	6%	82	1336

Cases involving men were sustained at a higher rate than cases involving women (7%, 74 of 1335 versus 4%, 8 of 201), but the difference was not significant. Cases involving sergeants and above were sustained at a significantly higher rate than officers (11%, 67 of 1201 versus 6%, 14 of 135). Note that for both gender and rank, the pattern echoed what we observed above ([3.2. Did Officers from Any Given Group Receive More Allegations Per Case?](#)): men and sergeants received more allegations on average, and it was more likely (significantly for rank only) that at least one of these allegations would stick.

4.2. Does Seniority or Age Impact Differences in Sustained Rates?

In 2025, the most junior and most senior members were sustained at 8% compared to members with two to ten years sustained at 5%. White members were sustained at about the same rate across all seniority levels, while the most senior Black members were sustained at the highest rate (14%).

Table 18: Sustained Rates by Seniority 2025

		Sustained		Other than Sustained		
Seniority	Race Clean	%	n	%	n	Total
Less than 2 yrs	White	5%	2	95%	37	39
	Black	9%	7	91%	69	76
	Hispanic	9%	9	91%	93	102
	Asian/Filipino	6%	5	94%	72	77
	Other/Unk.	6%	1	94%	17	18
< 2 yrs Total		8%	24	92%	288	312
2-5 yrs	White	5%	2	95%	42	44
	Black	2%	2	98%	111	113
	Hispanic	8%	11	92%	119	130
	Asian/Filipino	2%	2	98%	105	107
	Other/Unk.	11%	2	89%	16	18
2-5 yrs Total		5%	19	95%	393	412
5-10 yrs	White	4%	2	96%	54	56
	Black	8%	5	92%	60	65
	Hispanic	6%	7	94%	107	114
	Asian/Filipino	2%	2	98%	87	89
	Other/Unk.	7%	2	93%	26	28
5-10 yrs Total		5%	18	95%	334	352
Over 10 yrs	White	6%	5	94%	78	83
	Black	14%	7	86%	42	49
	Hispanic	10%	6	90%	54	60
	Asian/Filipino	5%	3	95%	60	63
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	5	5
> 10 yrs Total		8%	21	92%	239	260
Grand Total		6%	82	94%	1254	1336

Table 18: Sustained Rates by Seniority 2024

		Sustained		Other than Sustained		
Seniority	Race Clean	%	n	%	n	Total
Less than 2 yrs	White	0%	0	100%	59	59
	Black	6%	9	94%	148	157
	Hispanic	7%	11	93%	141	152

	Asian/Filipino	4%	4	96%	95	99
	Other/Unk.	3%	1	97%	29	30
< 2 yrs Total		5%	25	95%	472	497
2-5 yrs	White	0%	0	100%	25	25
	Black	9%	7	91%	74	81
	Hispanic	6%	8	94%	117	125
	Asian/Filipino	2%	2	98%	103	105
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	15	15
2-5 yrs Total		5%	17	95%	334	351
5-10 yrs	White	3%	2	98%	78	80
	Black	5%	4	95%	70	74
	Hispanic	2%	2	98%	115	117
	Asian/Filipino	4%	4	96%	85	89
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	30	30
5-10 yrs Total		3%	12	97%	378	390
Over 10 yrs	White	3%	2	97%	57	59
	Black	8%	3	92%	36	39
	Hispanic	13%	4	87%	27	31
	Asian/Filipino	2%	1	98%	48	49
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	1	1
> 10 yrs Total		6%	10	94%	169	179
Grand Total		5%	64	95%	1353	1417

Table 19 breaks down sustained rates by age of the member and race. Like 2024, in 2025 we see that there is no clear relationship between age and sustained rates, as the progression by age group is 8%, 4%, 6%, 3%, and 11%.

Table 19 – Sustained Cases by Age of Officer 2025

Age	Race Clean	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total
		%	n	%	n	
20-25	White	10%	1	90%	9	10
	Black	0%	0	100%	13	13
	Hispanic	13%	5	87%	34	39
	Asian/Filipino	4%	1	96%	24	25
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	1	1
20-25 TOTAL		8%	7	92%	81	88
25-30	White	5%	2	95%	35	37
	Black	1%	1	99%	76	77
	Hispanic	6%	7	94%	107	114
	Asian/Filipino	3%	2	97%	66	68

	Other/Unk.	4%	1	96%	25	26
25-30 TOTAL		4%	13	96%	309	322
30-35	White	7%	2	93%	27	29
	Black	8%	7	92%	83	90
	Hispanic	6%	8	94%	121	129
	Asian/Filipino	4%	4	96%	109	113
	Other/Unk.	6%	1	94%	16	17
30-35 TOTAL		6%	22	94%	356	378
35-40	White	2%	1	98%	65	66
	Black	2%	1	98%	58	59
	Hispanic	7%	4	93%	55	59
	Asian/Filipino	1%	1	99%	66	67
	Other/Unk.	14%	2	86%	12	14
35-40 TOTAL		3%	9	97%	256	265
Over 40	White	6%	5	94%	75	80
	Black	19%	12	81%	52	64
	Hispanic	14%	9	86%	56	65
	Asian/Filipino	6%	4	94%	59	63
	Other/Unk.	9%	1	91%	10	11
Over 40 TOTAL		11%	31	89%	252	283
Grand Total		6%	82	94%	1254	1336

Table 19 – Sustained Cases by Age of Officer 2024

		Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total
Age	Race Clean	%	n	%	n	
20-25	White	0%	0	100%	17	17
	Black	0%	0	100%	25	25
	Hispanic	11%	5	89%	39	44
	Asian/Filipino	6%	1	94%	16	17
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	5	5
20-25 TOTAL		6%	6	94%	102	108
25-30	White	0%	0	100%	33	33
	Black	4%	4	96%	102	106
	Hispanic	4%	5	96%	127	132
	Asian/Filipino	4%	3	96%	70	73
	Other/Unk.	3%	1	97%	29	30
25-30 TOTAL		3%	13	97%	361	374
30-35	White	0%	0	100%	49	49
	Black	7%	8	93%	102	110
	Hispanic	7%	8	93%	110	118
	Asian/Filipino	4%	4	96%	110	114

	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	20	20
30-35 TOTAL		5%	20	95%	391	411
35-40	White	0%	0	100%	47	47
	Black	15%	7	85%	40	47
	Hispanic	3%	2	97%	72	74
	Asian/Filipino	0%	0	100%	70	70
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	16	16
35-40 TOTAL		4%	9	96%	245	254
Over 40	White	5%	4	95%	73	77
	Black	6%	4	94%	59	63
	Hispanic	9%	5	91%	52	57
	Asian/Filipino	4%	3	96%	65	68
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	5	5
Over 40 TOTAL		6%	16	94%	254	270
Grand Total		5%	64	95%	1353	1417

4.3. Do Division-Level Investigations Differ from Internal Affairs Investigations?

The second moderator variable we looked at was by investigation type. The data was split into two categories: Division Level Investigations (DLI) together with DLI Summary Findings⁶ on the one hand and Internal Affairs (IA) investigations together with IA Summary Findings on the other. DLIs are generally conducted by field sergeants and typically contain less serious allegations. IA investigations involve the most serious allegations and are conducted by supervisors assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB). The purpose of looking at the investigative type is to determine if there are differences in sustained rates based on the entity conducting the investigation. Informally resolved⁷ cases were not included in this analysis because they usually proceed through a different process that does not usually involve a DLI or IA investigation.

Note that some cases are transferred from DLI to IA or vice versa during the course of the investigation, which means they may have portions of the investigation conducted by a DLI supervisor and portions investigated by an IAB investigator. Additionally, when a case is transferred, the designation is not always properly updated in the complaint for in Vision (the Department's record-keeping software), resulting in possible error in the investigation type for some cases. Except when we were able to identify and correct obvious errors by reviewing the case summary, the present analyses rely on the initial designation of the case by IAB.

Table 20 presents sustained rates broken down by race and type of investigation. In 2024, there was significant disparity in DLI investigations between white and Black members. While the number of IA investigations was too small to test, there was a large gap in the sustained rate between white members

⁶ A Summary Finding is an abbreviated internal investigation in which a finding can be reached without conducting a full formal internal investigation because the correct finding can be determined with no or minimal follow-up and be based on the existing documentation, evidence, statements, and crime information data.

⁷ An informal complaint resolution is an investigative outcome used under certain circumstances for Class II allegations that don't indicate a pattern of misconduct.

and Black or Hispanic members (6% versus 26-29%). In 2025, by contrast, there was no significant disparity in DLI investigations between white and non-white members. There was also no significant difference in IA investigations between white (13%, 5 of 40) and Black (24%, 9 of 37) or Hispanic (27%, 12 of 44) members; even though the rate for Hispanics was more than twice the rate for whites, these fluctuations are not conclusive for such small numbers. Tests could not be performed on Other/Unknown members for both DLI and IA investigations and Asian members for IA investigations.

Table 20: Sustained Rate by Race 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Findings			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	5%	11	222	3%	6	175	13%	5	40
Black	7%	21	303	5%	12	256	24%	9	37
Hispanic	8%	33	406	6%	21	351	27%	12	44
Asian/Filipino	4%	12	336	2%	7	299	23%	5	22
Other/Unknown	7%	5	69	6%	4	65	25%	1	4
Total	6%	82	1336	4%	50	1146	22%	32	147

Table 20: Sustained Rate by Race 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	2%	4	223	1%	3	203	6%	1	18
Black	7%	23	351	6%	18	326	26%	5	19
Hispanic	6%	25	425	4%	17	387	29%	8	28
Asian/Filipino	3%	11	342	3%	10	317	7%	1	14
Other/Unknown	1%	1	76	1%	1	73	0%	0	2
Total	5%	64	1417	4%	49	1306	19%	15	81

Tables 21 and 22 present similar breakdowns by gender and rank. In 2024, there were no significant differences observed. In 2025, there were no significant differences in the DLI sustained rate between male and female members. While we could not test IA investigations for gender, males did have a higher sustained rate than females (23%, 29 of 127 versus 15%, 3 of 20). When analyzing rank, we were unable to test DLI investigations, but the sustained rate for officers was 5% (49 of 1084) compared to sergeants and above at 2% (1 of 62). There was no significant difference between officers and sergeants and above for IA investigations (24%, 18 of 76 versus 20%, 14 of 71).

Table 21: Sustained Rate by Gender 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Findings			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	7%	74	1135	5%	45	968	23%	29	127
Female	4%	8	201	3%	5	178	15%	3	20
Total	6%	82	1336	4%	50	1146	22%	32	147

Table 21: Sustained Rate by Gender 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	5%	54	1183	4%	41	1085	19%	13	70
Female	4%	10	234	4%	8	221	18%	2	11
Total	5%	64	1417	4%	49	1306	19%	15	81

Table 22: Sustained Rate by Rank 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Findings			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	6%	67	1201	5%	49	1084	24%	18	76
Sgt and Above	11%	15	135	2%	1	62	20%	14	71
Total	6%	82	1336	4%	50	1146	22%	32	147

Table 22: Sustained Rate by Rank 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			DLIs and DLI Summary Findings			IA Investigations and IA Summary Findings		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	4%	57	1331	4%	46	1241	18%	11	60
Sgt and Above	8%	7	86	5%	3	65	19%	4	21
Total	5%	64	1417	4%	49	1306	19%	15	81

4.4. Do Cases with an External Origin Differ from Cases with an Internal Origin?

We next wanted to determine if disparities in sustained rates would differ depending on who initiated the case. A case was categorized as internal if it was originally initiated by an allegation made by a member of the Department. A case was categorized as external if a member of the public or a member of another organization/department made the first allegation which initiated the investigation. (See [2. Methodology](#) **What Counts as “Internally Generated” Case.**)

It is important to note that while a complaint may be initiated by a member of the public, investigators may add allegations to a case if additional misconduct is suspected or discovered during the investigation (e.g., while reviewing Body Worn Camera footage). In these circumstances, although the allegation would be internally discovered, the case would still be categorized as external. Allegations that are discovered and added during the course of the investigation are supposed to be labeled as “internally discovered” by investigators (which is a different designation from the “Internal/External” category analyzed here, which only refers to the origin of the original allegation) and tracked as such in the case record. Table 23 presents sustained rates at the case level broken down by race and origin of investigation.

In 2025, the sustained rates for both internally generated cases (26%, 31 of 119) and externally generated cases (4%, 51 of 1217) remained nearly the same as 2024. There was no significant difference in sustained rates by race in 2024 or 2025 for externally generated cases. Other/Unknown members had the highest

sustained rate (8%) compared to white members (3%), but we were unable to test for significance. Among internally generated cases, the gap in sustained rates between white members and Black and Hispanic members narrowed in 2025 and the difference was not significant. However, we observed that white members were sustained at half the rate of Black, Hispanic and Asian members (14% versus 30-35%).

Table 23: Sustained Rate by Race 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Cases			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	5%	11	222	14%	5	35	3%	6	187
Black	7%	21	303	30%	10	33	4%	11	270
Hispanic	8%	33	406	35%	12	34	6%	21	372
Asian/Filipino	4%	12	336	31%	4	13	2%	8	323
Other/Unknown	7%	5	69	0%	0	4	8%	5	65
Total	6%	82	1336	26%	31	119	4%	51	1217

Table 23: Sustained Rate by Race 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	2%	4	223	0%	0	8	2%	4	215
Black	7%	23	351	47%	7	15	5%	16	336
Hispanic	6%	25	425	24%	4	17	5%	21	408
Asian/Filipino	3%	11	342	13%	1	8	3%	10	334
Other/Unknown	1%	1	76	0%	0	0	1%	1	76
Total	5%	64	1417	25%	12	48	4%	52	1369

Table 24 presents the same breakdown by gender. Unlike in 2024, there was no disparity between male and female members for either internally generated (26%, 27 of 102 versus 24%, 4 of 17) cases or externally generated cases (5%, 47 of 1033 versus 2% 4 of 184).

Table 24: Sustained Rate by Gender 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Cases			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	7%	74	1135	26%	27	102	5%	47	1033
Female	4%	8	201	24%	4	17	2%	4	184
Total	6%	82	1336	26%	31	119	4%	51	1217

Table 24: Sustained Rate by Gender 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	5%	54	1183	21%	9	43	4%	45	1140
Female	4%	10	234	60%	3	5	3%	7	229
Total	5%	64	1417	25%	12	48	4%	52	1369

Table 25 presents the same breakdown by rank. While overall in 2025, sergeants and above were sustained at a significantly higher rate than officers, when analyzing complaint origin, officers were sustained at a higher rate than sergeants and above for internally generated cases (29%, 19 of 65 versus 22%, 12 of 54). The difference was not significant and the gap was much smaller than in 2024. For externally generated cases, the sustained rate was the same for officers and sergeants and above in 2025 which was a change from 2024, when sergeants and above were sustained at twice the rate of officers.

Table 25: Sustained Rate by Rank 2025 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Cases			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	6%	67	1201	29%	19	65	4%	48	1136
Sgt and Above	11%	15	135	22%	12	54	4%	3	81
Total	6%	82	1336	26%	31	119	4%	51	1217

Table 25: Sustained Rate by Rank 2024 (Full Investigations and Summary Findings)

	All Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	4%	57	1331	30%	11	37	4%	46	1294
Sgt and Above	8%	7	86	9%	1	11	8%	6	75
Total	5%	64	1417	25%	12	48	4%	52	1369

As mentioned above, we coded an allegation as “internal” or “external” solely based on whether the case was *initiated* by an internal or external complainant. But since allegations can actually be added in the course of an investigation to a case that was externally generated, there is also a field in the complaint form for coding each allegation as “internally discovered” or not. In 2025, this field was completed at a higher rate than in 2024 (87% in 2025 versus 67% in 2024). Despite the improvement, the field still required us to track down the correct data for the missing fields, and for completed fields, we identified inconsistencies in how the data was being entered. Hence, the analysis only represents an estimate for sustained rates based on internally discovered allegations. Table 26 presents the sustained rate by race for all allegations based on whether each allegation was internally discovered or received by an external complainant (non-OPD).

Table 26: Sustained Rates for Internally Discovered Allegations vs Externally Discovered Allegations 2025 (All Allegations)

	Internally Discovered Allegations			Externally Discovered Allegations		
	Sust Rate	# Sust	Total	Sust Rate	# Sust	Total
White	17%	15	87	2%	5	279
Black	34%	37	108	3%	11	419
Hispanic	34%	38	113	3%	17	549
Asian/Filipino	24%	10	41	2%	8	495
Other/Unknown	0%	0	5	5%	5	107
Grand Total	28%	100	354	2%	46	1849

Table 26: Sustained Rates for Internally Discovered Allegations vs Externally Discovered Allegations 2024 (All Allegations)

	Internally Discovered Allegations			Externally Discovered Allegations		
	Sust Rate	# Sust	Total	Sust Rate	# Sust	Total
White	11%	2	18	1%	3	294
Black	67%	22	33	3%	14	504
Hispanic	48%	30	63	3%	16	586
Asian/Filipino	21%	4	19	1%	7	475
Other/Unknown	0%	0	2	1%	1	115
Grand Total	43%	58	135	2%	41	1974

There were far more internally discovered allegations in 2025 compared to 2024 (354 versus 135). This was also true for internally generated cases. However, for internally discovered allegations, we did find that white members were sustained at a significantly lower rate than Black and Hispanic members (17%, 15 of 87 versus 34%, 37 of 108). Once again, it's important to note that the data may not be reliable given missing data and inconsistencies in how the data is entered.

The 2024 IA Outcome study recommended that the Department improve data collection on internally discovered allegations, including the addition of new fields to capture more detailed information (who added violation, who approved violation, dates, and how allegation was discovered). These new fields were added to the Vision complaint form on May 15, 2026. The Department will need to provide training on these new fields, as well as clarify what constitutes an “internally discovered violation.”

4.5. Do Sustained Rates Differ Based on the Seriousness of the Allegation (Class I versus Class II)?

To determine if there was disparity in the seriousness of the allegations between groups, we assessed the sustained rates for Class I and Class II allegations for race, gender and rank. This analysis had to be done at the allegation level rather than the sworn member case level since some members may have multiple allegations in the same case that are different Classes (e.g., in the same case an officer may be investigated for Use of Force – Class I and FTARC – Class II). Above (See [3.4. Did the Seriousness of the Allegation \(Class I Versus Class II\) Differ by Group?](#)), we assessed whether a particular group was receiving a disproportionately higher percentage of Class I or Class II allegations.

Table 27 presents sustained rates at the Allegation Class level broken down by race. In 2025, the overall sustained rates by race at the allegation level were similar to the sustained rates at the sworn member case level. At the allegation level, the sustained rate for Black members was higher than at the member case level (9%, 48 of 527 versus 7%, 21 of 303). The sustained rates for Asian and Other/Unknown members were lower at the allegation level. There were no significant differences in the sustained rates when comparing white members to non-white members⁸, when looking at all allegations, Class I allegations and Class II allegations. This was a change from 2024, when we did observe disparity between white members and non-white members.

⁸ We were unable to test white versus Other/Unknown members.

Table 27: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Race 2025

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	5%	20	366	8%	9	106	4%	11	260
Black	9%	48	527	11%	15	135	8%	33	392
Hispanic	8%	55	662	9%	17	187	8%	38	475
Asian/Filipino	3%	18	536	3%	4	158	4%	14	378
Other/Unknown	4%	5	112	0%	0	22	6%	5	90
Total	7%	146	2203	7%	45	608	6%	101	1595

Table 27: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Race 2024

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	2%	5	312	1%	1	71	2%	4	241
Black	7%	36	537	11%	15	133	5%	21	404
Hispanic	7%	46	649	9%	15	162	6%	31	487
Asian/Filipino	2%	11	494	2%	3	123	2%	8	371
Other/Unknown	1%	1	117	0%	0	31	1%	1	86
Total	5%	99	2109	7%	34	520	4%	65	1589

Table 28 presents the same breakdown by gender. In 2025, male members were sustained at a significantly higher rate than female members for all allegations (7%, 134 of 1877 versus 4%, 12 of 326). Males were also sustained at a higher rate than females for Class I and Class II allegations, but the differences were not significant.

Table 28: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Gender 2025

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	7%	134	1877	8%	42	532	7%	92	1345
Female	4%	12	326	4%	3	76	4%	9	250
Total	7%	146	2203	7%	45	608	6%	101	1595

Table 28: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Gender 2024

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	5%	85	1778	7%	32	444	4%	53	1334
Female	4%	14	331	3%	2	76	5%	12	255
Total	5%	99	2109	7%	34	520	4%	65	1589

Table 29 presents the same breakdown by rank. In 2025, sergeants and above were sustained at a significantly higher rate than officers for all allegations, Class I allegations and Class II allegations.

Table 29: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Rank 2025

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	6%	111	1942	5%	28	517	6%	83	1425
Sgt and Above	13%	35	261	19%	17	91	11%	18	170
Total	7%	146	2203	7%	45	608	6%	101	1595

Table 29: Allegations - Sustained Rate for Allegation Class by Rank 2024

	All Allegations			Class I Allegations			Class II Allegations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	4%	88	1991	6%	31	490	4%	57	1501
Sgt and Above	9%	11	118	10%	3	30	9%	8	88
Total	5%	99	2109	7%	34	520	4%	65	1589

4.6. Do Year-to-Year Fluctuations in Sustained Rates Average Out Over Time?

Again, we looked at the last five years to check for longer-term trends and found that the combined sustained rate for 2021-2025 was relatively consistent across all race groups (7-9%) except for Asian/Filipinos, who had the lowest combined sustained rate (5%). Besides Other/Unknown members, who have much lower numbers than other race groups, white members had the highest sustained rate for the combined five-year period (9%). White and Asian members had a precipitous drop in sustained rates between 2023 and 2024. In 2025, the rate for white members rose by 3% points, while the rate for Asian members only rose by 1% point. While the number of sustained cases increased between 2024 and 2025 (64 to 82), both years still remain the lowest of the last five years.

Table 2 (repeated from p. 5): Sustained Rates by Race 2021 to 2025

	2021		2022		2023		2024		2025		2021-2025
	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate	# Sust/ Total	Sust Rate
White	11%	51/457	11%	34/323	11%	37/348	2%	4/223	5%	11/222	9%
Black	9%	19/213	11%	23/212	6%	20/341	7%	23/351	7%	21/303	7%
Hispanic	9%	40/434	9%	30/317	8%	40/512	6%	25/425	8%	33/406	8%
Asian/Filip	7%	18/251	7%	16/240	7%	26/379	3%	11/342	4%	12/336	5%
Other/Unk	16%	9/57	18%	7/38	9%	6/68	1%	1/76	7%	5/69	9%
Grand Total	10%	137/1412	10%	110/1130	8%	129/1648	5%	64/1417	6%	82/1336	8%

4.7. Did “Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint” Allegations Affect Sustained Rates in 2024?

Prior to 2024, Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint (FTARC) allegations had an impact on sustained rates and discipline. This impact largely disappeared in 2024 due to the Department amending its policy allowing for internally discovered FTARC allegations to be handled outside the IA process. We analyzed the data for both 2024 and 2025 with and without FTARC allegations included in the data set to see

whether they influenced the sustained rates. In both years, FTARC allegations had little impact on the sustained rates. Tables 30 and 31 compare sustained rates with and without FTARC allegations for 2024 and 2025.

Table 30: Allegations by Investigation Type with and without FTARC Allegations (2024 Versus 2025)

	All Allegations		FTARC Allegations Excluded	
	2024	2025	2024	2025
Overall Sustained Rate	5%	7%	4%	6%
DLI Sustained Rate	4%	4%	4%	3%
IA Investigation Sustained Rate	19%	24%	18%	23%

Table 31: Allegations by Complaint Origin with and without FTARC Allegations (2024 Versus 2025)

	All Allegations		FTARC Allegations Excluded	
	2024	2025	2024	2025
Overall Sustained Rate	5%	7%	4%	6%
Externally Generated Case Sustained Rate	4%	4%	4%	3%
Internally Generated Case Sustained Rate	25%	27%	26%	28%

5. Focusing on Fully Investigated Cases

5.1. Sustained Rates for Fully Investigated Cases

A finding of “sustained” can only occur as a result of a full investigation (whether DLI or IA). In 2025, full investigations comprised 29% (384 of 1336) of all cases. This was higher than in 2024, when full investigations comprised 25% (352 of 1417) of all cases. As discussed earlier (See [3.5. Did the Type of Investigation Differ by Group?](#)), a case can be closed without a full investigation through Informal Complaint Resolution (ICR) or by Summary Finding. While we did not find compelling evidence of racial disparity in terms of the proportion of cases that were moved on to a full investigation (making them eligible for a “sustained” finding), we did note that Asian members had the lowest percentage of cases that were fully investigated, meaning they were the least likely to have a case that could result in a sustained finding.

Table 15 (repeated from p. 25): Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Race 2025

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	60%	134	3%	7	3%	7	18%	41	15%	33
Black	59%	179	4%	11	3%	10	25%	77	9%	26
Hispanic	63%	257	2%	10	3%	11	23%	94	8%	34
Asian/Filipino	76%	254	2%	6	4%	15	13%	45	5%	16
Other/Unknown	72%	50	1%	1	0%	0	22%	15	4%	3
Grand Total	65%	874	3%	35	3%	43	20%	272	8%	112

Table 15 (repeated from p. 25): Member Cases - Type of Investigation Percentages by Race 2024

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		DLI Full Invest		Internal Affairs Full Invest	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	74%	164	1%	3	1%	2	17%	39	7%	15
Black	70%	244	1%	3	2%	6	23%	82	5%	16
Hispanic	70%	299	2%	10	2%	10	21%	88	4%	18
Asian/Filipino	74%	252	1%	2	3%	11	19%	65	4%	12
Other/Unknown	75%	57	1%	1	1%	1	21%	16	1%	1
Grand Total	72%	1016	1%	19	2%	30	20%	290	4%	62

Even with the lower rate of full investigations for Asian members, we proceeded to analyze sustained rates for fully investigated cases. Table 32 shows sustained rates by race for investigation type. When looking at only fully investigated cases, white members had the lowest sustained rate for all investigations,

DLI investigations and IA investigations, but the differences were not significant. Additionally, the gap between white members and Black and Hispanic members narrowed in 2025. While this was an improvement from 2024, we continued to observe disparity between white members and non-white members in IA investigations in 2025, with white members sustained at half the rate of non-white members for IA investigations (15%, 5 of 33 versus over 30%).

Table 32: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Race 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	15%	11	74	15%	6	41	15%	5	33
Black	20%	21	103	16%	12	77	35%	9	26
Hispanic	26%	33	128	22%	21	94	35%	12	34
Asian/Filipino	20%	12	61	15%	7	45	31%	5	16
Other/Unknown	28%	5	18	27%	4	15	33%	1	3
Total	21%	82	384	18%	50	272	29%	32	112

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 32: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Race 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	7%	4	54	8%	3	39	7%	1	15
Black	23%	23	98	22%	18	82	31%	5	16
Hispanic	24%	25	106	19%	17	88	44%	8	18
Asian/Filipino	14%	11	77	15%	10	65	8%	1	12
Other/Unknown	6%	1	17	6%	1	16	0%	0	1
Total	18%	64	352	17%	49	290	24%	15	62

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 33 shows the same breakdown by gender. Sustained rates in 2025 were higher for male members than female members for all investigations, DLI investigations and IA investigations. In 2024, the sustained rates were the same for male and female members, except for IA investigations, where females had a higher rate (29% versus 24%).

Table 33: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Gender 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	23%	74	324	20%	45	226	30%	29	98
Female	13%	8	60	11%	5	46	21%	3	14
Total	21%	82	384	18%	50	272	29%	32	112

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 33: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Gender 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	18%	54	297	17%	41	242	24%	13	55
Female	18%	10	55	17%	8	48	29%	2	7
Total	18%	64	352	17%	49	290	24%	15	62

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 34 shows the same breakdown by rank. Similar to 2024, sustained rates in 2025 were higher for officers than sergeants and above for all investigations, DLI investigations and IA investigations. The gap in sustained rates widened in 2025. For DLI investigations, the sustained rates were 19% (48 of 253) for officers and 5% (1 of 19) for sergeants and above (unable to test for significance). For IA investigations, the sustained rates were 37% (18 of 49) for officers and 22% (14 of 63) for sergeants and above, but the difference was not significant.

Table 34: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Rank 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	22%	67	302	19%	49	253	37%	18	49
Sgt and Above	18%	15	82	5%	1	19	22%	14	63
Total	21%	82	384	18%	50	272	29%	32	112

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 34: Sustained Rate by Investigation Type by Rank 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			DLI Investigations			IA Investigations		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	19%	57	308	17%	46	266	26%	11	42
Sgt and Above	16%	7	44	13%	3	24	20%	4	20
Total	18%	64	352	17%	49	290	24%	15	62

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

In Table 35, we broke down fully investigated cases by case origin. In 2025, white members were sustained at less than half the rate of non-white members (15%, 5 of 33 versus 33% and higher), though the difference was not significant and the gap narrowed between 2024 and 2025. For externally generated cases, there was no significant disparity between white and non-white members and the gap also narrowed in 2025. We were unable to test for significance between white and Other/Unknown members.

Table 35: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Race 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	15%	11	74	15%	5	33	15%	6	41
Black	20%	21	103	37%	10	27	14%	11	76
Hispanic	26%	33	128	36%	12	33	22%	21	95
Asian/Filipino	20%	12	61	33%	4	12	16%	8	49
Other/Unknown	28%	5	18	0%	0	4	36%	5	14
Total	21%	82	384	28%	31	109	19%	51	275

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 35: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Race 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
White	7%	4	54	0%	0	5	8%	4	49
Black	23%	23	98	64%	7	11	18%	16	87
Hispanic	24%	25	106	36%	4	11	22%	21	95
Asian/Filipino	14%	11	77	20%	1	5	14%	10	72
Other/Unknown	6%	1	17	0%	0	0	6%	1	17
Total	18%	64	352	38%	12	32	16%	52	320

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 36 shows the same breakdown by gender. Sustained rates in 2025 were higher for male members than female members for all investigations, DLI investigations and IA investigations. This was a reversal from 2024, when female members were sustained at a far higher rate than male members for internally generated cases.

Table 36: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Gender 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	23%	74	324	29%	27	92	20%	47	232
Female	13%	8	60	24%	4	17	9%	4	43
Total	21%	82	384	28%	31	109	19%	51	275

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 36: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Gender 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Male	18%	54	297	32%	9	28	17%	45	269
Female	18%	10	55	75%	3	4	14%	7	51
Total	18%	64	352	38%	12	32	16%	52	320

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 37 shows the same breakdown by rank. Similar to 2024, sustained rates in 2025 were higher for officers than sergeants and above for all investigations and IA investigations. However, officers also had a higher sustained rate for externally generated cases in 2025, which was not the case in 2024. There were no significant disparities in sustained rates between officers and sergeants and above for internally or externally generated cases. Additionally, the gap in sustained rates between officers and sergeants and above for internally generated cases narrowed by 75% (40% gap in 2024 to 10% gap in 2025).

Table 37: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Rank 2025 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	22%	67	302	33%	19	57	20%	48	245
Sgt and Above	18%	15	82	23%	12	52	10%	3	30
Total	21%	82	384	28%	31	109	19%	51	275

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

Table 37: Sustained Rate by Case Origin by Rank 2024 (Full Investigations Only*)

	Full DLI and IA Investigations			Internal Origin			External Origin		
	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot	% Sust	# Sust	Tot
Officer	19%	57	308	50%	11	22	16%	46	286
Sgt and Above	16%	7	44	10%	1	10	18%	6	34
Total	18%	64	352	38%	12	32	16%	52	320

**This excludes summary findings and informally resolved complaints.*

5.2. Allegation-Level Analysis for Fully Investigated Cases

One of the reasons to focus on fully investigated cases is that, since they seem to be where disparity arises, it gives us a more manageable dataset to analyze, including looking more closely at the specifics of the cases, such as what types of allegations are involved. Assuming that some allegations are more likely to yield a finding of “sustained,” it could constitute an upstream factor yielding the disparity, so it is important to make sure there are no disparities in the type of allegation by group. Because cases often involve more than one (and different) allegations, we need to get down to the allegation level for this analysis.

Table 38 shows the breakdown for the allegations that could yield a finding without a full investigation. In 2025, 63% of all allegations were in summary findings cases and 2% of allegations were categorized as

informal complaint resolutions. Asian and Other/Unknown members were the most likely to have allegations resolved via summary finding, similar to what we saw at the case level.

Table 38: Allegations that did Not Result in a Full Investigation, by Race 2025 (similar to Table 15 at the Case level)

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		Total (Including Full Investigations, not shown in table)
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	
White	56%	206	2%	7	3%	10	366
Black	50%	266	3%	16	2%	11	527
Hispanic	59%	392	3%	17	2%	11	662
Asian/Filipino	74%	399	1%	7	4%	20	536
Other/Unknown	71%	80	1%	1	0%	0	112
Grand Total	61%	1343	2%	48	2%	52	2203

Table 38: Allegations that did Not Result in a Full Investigation, by Race 2024 (similar to Table 15 at the Case level)

	DLI Summary Finding		IA Summary Finding		Informal Complaint Resolution		Total (Including Full Investigations, not shown in table)
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	
White	70%	218	1%	3	1%	2	312
Black	67%	360	1%	5	2%	9	537
Hispanic	64%	418	2%	16	2%	11	649
Asian/Filipino	72%	356	1%	3	3%	14	494
Other/Unknown	69%	81	2%	2	1%	1	117
Grand Total	68%	1,433	1%	29	2%	37	2109

This leaves 760 (34%) allegations of misconduct that were fully investigated in 2025, corresponding to 384 sworn member cases. We analyzed allegations by investigative type and complaint origin and compared by race (Table 39).

There were changes in the percentage of allegations from an internally generated case by race in 2025. Overall, the percentage of allegations in internally generated, fully investigated cases increased. In 2025, 11% of DLI investigations were from internally generated cases compared to 4% in 2024. The percentage in IA investigations rose from 36% to 71%. In 2025, white members had more than double the percentage of allegations in DLI investigations from internally generated cases compared to non-white members. For IA investigations, the percentage of internally generated allegations was relatively consistent across race groups.

Table 39: Number of Allegations by Race and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
White	48	17	26%	25	53	68%
Black	131	18	12%	27	58	68%
Hispanic	130	12	8%	24	76	76%
Asian/Filipino	72	2	3%	9	27	75%
Other/Unknown	23	2	8%	3	3	50%
Grand Total	404	51	11%	88	217	71%

Table 39: Number of Allegations by Race and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
White	61	2	3%	22	4	15%
Black	123	8	6%	19	13	41%
Hispanic	140	5	3%	30	29	49%
Asian/Filipino	99	4	4%	15	3	17%
Other/Unknown	31	0	0%	2	0	0%
Grand Total	454	19	4%	88	49	36%

Table 40 shows the sustained rates by race for investigation type and complaint origin in fully investigated cases. Overall, white members had the lowest sustained rate for allegations in fully investigated cases, similar to what we saw at the case level. In 2025 the gap in sustained rates between white members and Black and Hispanic members narrowed. The overall sustained rates remained nearly the same for Black and Hispanic members (21% to 23%), while the sustained rate for white members rose from 6% (5 of 89) to 14% (20 of 143). The largest gap in sustained rates was between white and Black members for allegations from externally generated cases conducted by IA (4%, 1 of 25 versus 41%, 11 of 27).

Table 40: Sustained Rates by Race and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust
White	10%	48	12%	17	4%	25	23%	53	14%
Black	9%	131	22%	18	41%	27	36%	58	21%
Hispanic	16%	130	33%	12	13%	24	36%	76	23%
Asian/Filipino	15%	72	0%	2	11%	9	22%	27	16%
Other/Unknown	17%	23	0%	2	33%	3	0%	3	16%
Grand Total	13%	404	20%	51	19%	88	30%	217	19%

Table 40: Sustained Rates by Race and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	% Sust
White	5%	61	0%	2	9%	22	0%	4	6%
Black	17%	123	50%	8	5%	19	77%	13	22%
Hispanic	12%	140	20%	5	37%	30	59%	29	23%
Asian/Filipino	9%	99	25%	4	7%	15	0%	3	9%
Other/Unknown	3%	31	0	0	0%	2	0	0	3%
Grand Total	11%	454	32%	19	17%	88	55%	49	16%

Table 41 shows the breakdown of allegations by gender and complaint origin for fully investigated cases. In 2025, the percentage of allegations from internally generated cases was higher for females in DLI investigations and higher for males in IA investigations, but the gaps were small.

Table 41: Number of Allegations by Gender and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
Male	340	40	11%	75	190	72%
Female	64	11	15%	13	27	68%
Grand Total	404	51	11%	88	217	71%

Table 41: Number of Allegations by Gender and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
Male	381	17	4%	80	39	33%
Female	73	2	3%	8	10	56%
Grand Total	454	19	4%	88	49	36%

Table 42 shows sustained rates for gender broken down by investigation type and complaint origin for fully investigated cases. Overall, female members were sustained at a lower rate than males by a much wider margin in 2025 (11% margin in 2025 versus a 1% margin in 2024). In fact, female members had a lower sustained rate than males in all categories in 2025.

Table 42: Sustained Rates by Gender and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust
Male	14%	340	23%	40	23%	75	32%	190	21%
Female	8%	64	9%	11	0%	13	22%	27	10%
Grand Total	13%	404	20%	51	19%	88	30%	217	19%

Table 42: Sustained Rates by Gender and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	% Sust
Male	11%	381	29%	17	19%	80	59%	39	16%
Female	12%	73	50%	2	0%	8	40%	10	15%
Grand Total	11%	454	32%	19	17%	88	55%	49	16%

Table 43 shows the breakdown of allegations by rank broken down by investigation type and complaint origin for fully investigated cases. In 2025, sergeants and above had a higher percentage of allegations from internally generated cases in both DLI and IA investigations. In 2024, officers had a higher percentage in IA investigations.

Table 43: Number of Allegations by Rank and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
Officer	376	43	10%	60	98	62%
Sgt and Above	28	8	22%	28	119	81%
Grand Total	404	51	11%	88	217	71%

Table 43: Number of Allegations by Rank and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024

	Division Level Investigation			Internal Affairs Investigation		
	External	Internal	% Internal	External	Internal	% Internal
Officer	429	15	3%	62	42	40%
Sgt and Above	25	4	14%	26	7	21%
Grand Total	454	19	4%	88	49	36%

Table 44 below shows sustained rates for rank broken down by investigation type and complaint origin. Officers and sergeants and above were sustained at the same rate overall in 2025, which was similar to 2024. However, in 2025, officers were sustained at a higher rate in all categories, which was a change from 2024 when sergeants and above were sustained at a higher rate than officers for allegations in externally generated cases.

Table 44: Sustained Rates by Rank and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2025 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust
Officer	14%	376	23%	43	25%	60	35%	98	19%
Sgt and Above	4%	28	0%	8	7%	28	27%	119	19%
Grand Total	13%	404	20%	51	19%	88	30%	217	19%

Table 44: Sustained Rates by Rank and Complaint Origin for Fully Investigated Cases 2024 (Allegation Level)

	Division Level Investigation				Internal Affairs Investigation				
	External		Internal		External		Internal		Total
	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	n	% Sust	% Sust
Officer	11%	429	40%	15	13%	62	62%	42	16%
Sgt and Above	12%	125	0%	4	27%	26	14%	7	15%
Grand Total	11%	454	32%	19	17%	88	55%	49	16%

5.3. Analysis by Type of Sustained Violation for Fully Investigated Cases

We next looked at the type of allegations that different racial groups were being sustained for. While this analysis is only partial because it leaves out the allegations that were not sustained in each case, we hoped it would give us some insight into whether one group was being systematically saddled with a sustained finding for a specific type of allegation.

Table 45 shows the breakdown of sustained allegations by race for fully investigated cases. In both 2024 and 2025, *Performance of Duty – General, Conduct Toward Others* and *Truthfulness* were among the top four sustained allegations. The numbers are too small for clear patterns to emerge, but there was no obvious evidence of different patterns in either 2024 or 2025.

Table 45: Sustained Allegations by Race for Fully Investigated Cases 2025

Sustained Allegations	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Filipino	Other/ Unknown	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	5	9	13	8	2	37
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	1	6	6		2	15
GENERAL CONDUCT	2	2	4			8
TRUTHFULNESS	1	2	4	1		8
REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)		2	3	2		7
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1	2	2	2		7
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1	3	2			6
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST			4		1	5
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY		1	3	1		5
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD		2	1	2		5
COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections		2	1	1		4

NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	2		2			4
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	1	1	1			3
INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT		1	2			3
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION			2			2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY		1	1			2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	2					2
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	2					2
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90		2				2
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS			1	1		2
GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING	1	1				2
PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY		1				1
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Gross dereliction of duty) Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90			1			1
COMMERCIAL TESTIMONIALS		1				1
CORRESPONDENCE		1				1
TARDINESS		1				1
CONFLICT OF INTEREST		1				1
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER		1				1
ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS			1			1
REPORTS AND BOOKINGS		1				1
DEPARTMENT PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT - MISAPPROPRIATION/MISUSE		1				1
INTOXICANTS ON DEPARTMENTAL PREMISES		1				1
ENDORSEMENTS AND REFERRALS - FEE IS EXCHANGED		1				1
CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS		1				1
PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION			1			1
COURT APPEARANCES	1					1
Grand Total	20	48	55	18	5	146

Table 45: Sustained Allegations by Race for Fully Investigated Cases 2024

Sustained Allegations	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Filipino	Other/ Unknown	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	2	11	11	3		27
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	1	3	7	3	1	15
TRUTHFULNESS		3	4			7
CUSTODY OF PRISONERS - TREATMENT		3	1	1		5
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY		2	2			4
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER		3		1		4
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1	1	2			4
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD		2		1		3
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY			3			3
GENERAL CONDUCT		1	2			3
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION			3			3
USE OF FORCE	1			1		2
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS			2			2
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST			1	1		2
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS		2				2
REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)			1			1
DAMAGED, INOPERATIVE PROPERTY OR EQUIPMENT			1			1
FALSE REPORTING OF ILLNESS OR INJURY		1				1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION			1			1
IMPROPER DISSEMINATION OF COMPUTER INFORMATION			1			1
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER		1				1
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90			1			1
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS			1			1
ABSENCE FROM DUTY		1				1
PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY		1				1

USE OF PRIVILEGED INFORMATION			1			1
REFUSAL TO ACCEPT OR REFER COMPLAINT (INTENTIONAL)		1				1
COMMANDING OFFICERS AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES - COMMAND			1			1
Grand Total	5	36	46	11	1	99

While there was no significant difference in sustained rates for internally generated cases between white and non-white members, white members did have the lowest sustained rate, aside from Other/Unknown members. Therefore, we again looked at sustained allegations for internally generated cases. Allegations in internally generated cases tend to have higher sustained rates because they are often based on Department employees' observations of potential misconduct.

Table 46 shows sustained allegations by race for internally generated cases. In 2024, no white members were sustained in an internally generated case. In 2025, however, 18% of the sustained allegations in internally generated cases were for white members. Black members were sustained for 33%, Hispanic for 41% and Asian for 8%. The top sustained allegation in internally generated cases for both years was *Performance of Duty – General*. In 2025, the next top three were *Reporting Violations of Laws, Ordinances, Rules or Orders (Class I)*, *General Conduct*, and *Obstructing the Internal Affairs Process*.

Table 46: Sustained allegations by Race for Internally Generated Cases 2025

Allegation	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Filipino	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	1	4	5	1	11
REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)		2	3	2	7
GENERAL CONDUCT	2	1	4		7
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1	3	2		6
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS		2	3		5
TRUTHFULNESS	1		3		4
COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections		2	1	1	4
NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	2		1		3
INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT		1	2		3
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	1	1	1		3
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90		2			2
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	2				2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	2				2
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS			1	1	2
PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY		1			1

SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Gross dereliction of duty) Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90			1		1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)				1	1
INTOXICANTS ON DEPARTMENTAL PREMISES		1			1
ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS			1		1
GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING	1				1
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER		1			1
COURT APPEARANCES	1				1
REPORTS AND BOOKINGS		1			1
TARDINESS		1			1
CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS		1			1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD		1			1
PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION			1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION			1		1
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY			1		1
Grand Total	14	25	31	6	76

Table 46: Sustained allegations by Race for Internally Generated Cases 2024

Allegation	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Filipino	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	3	1	1	5
TRUTHFULNESS	2	3		5
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	3	1		4
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION		3		3
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS		2		2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY		2		2
GENERAL CONDUCT		2		2
FALSE REPORTING OF ILLNESS OR INJURY	1			1
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	1			1
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS		1		1
IMPROPER DISSEMINATION OF COMPUTER INFORMATION		1		1
DAMAGED, INOPERATIVE PROPERTY OR EQUIPMENT		1		1
USE OF PRIVILEGED INFORMATION		1		1
ABSENCE FROM DUTY	1			1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	1			1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1			1
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1			1
Grand Total	14	18	1	33

Table 47 shows sustained allegations by gender for internally generated cases. In 2024, female members were sustained at a much higher rate than males in internally generated cases that were fully investigated (75% versus 32%). We did not see the same disparity in 2025 (24% versus 29%).

Table 47: Sustained allegations by Gender for Internally Generated Cases 2025

Allegation	Male	Female	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	10	1	11
REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	7		7
GENERAL CONDUCT	6	1	7
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	5	1	6
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	5		5
TRUTHFULNESS	3	1	4
COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections	4		4
NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	3		3
INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT	3		3
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	3		3
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90	2		2
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	2		2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION		2	2
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	2		2
PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY	1		1
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Gross dereliction of duty) Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90	1		1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1		1
INTOXICANTS ON DEPARTMENTAL PREMISES	1		1
ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS	1		1
GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING	1		1
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER	1		1
COURT APPEARANCES	1		1
REPORTS AND BOOKINGS		1	1
TARDINESS	1		1
CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS	1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	1		1
PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION	1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION	1		1
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	1		1
Grand Total	69	7	76

Table 47: Sustained allegations by Gender for Internally Generated Cases 2024

Allegation	Male	Female	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	3	2	5
TRUTHFULNESS	5		5
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	4		4
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	2	1	3
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS	1	1	2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	2		2
GENERAL CONDUCT	1	1	2
FALSE REPORTING OF ILLNESS OR INJURY	1		1
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	1		1
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	1		1
IMPROPER DISSEMINATION OF COMPUTER INFORMATION	1		1
DAMAGED, INOPERATIVE PROPERTY OR EQUIPMENT	1		1
USE OF PRIVILEGED INFORMATION	1		1
ABSENCE FROM DUTY	1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	1		1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1		1
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1		1
Grand Total	28	5	33

Finally, we looked at sustained allegations by rank for internally generated cases (Table 48). In 2024, sergeants and above were only sustained for one allegation in an internally generated case, compared to officers who had 32 sustained allegations. In 2025, the gap narrowed with members at the rank of sergeant sustained for 32 allegations compared to officers who were sustained for 44 allegations.

Table 48: Sustained allegations by Rank for Internally Generated Cases 2025

Allegation	Officer	Sgt and Above	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	9	2	11
REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	4	3	7
GENERAL CONDUCT	5	2	7
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1	5	6
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	3	2	5
TRUTHFULNESS	3	1	4
COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections		4	4
NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	1	2	3
INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT	2	1	3

OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	2	1	3
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90		2	2
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	1	1	2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	2		2
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	2		2
PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY	1		1
SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Gross dereliction of duty) Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90		1	1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)		1	1
INTOXICANTS ON DEPARTMENTAL PREMISES	1		1
ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS	1		1
GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING		1	1
REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER	1		1
COURT APPEARANCES		1	1
REPORTS AND BOOKINGS		1	1
TARDINESS	1		1
CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS	1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	1		1
PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION		1	1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION	1		1
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	1		1
Grand Total	44	32	76

Table 48: Sustained allegations by Rank for Internally Generated Cases 2024

Allegation	Officer	Sgt and Above	Grand Total
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	4	1	5
TRUTHFULNESS	5		5
CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS	4		4
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	3		3
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS	2		2
OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	2		2
GENERAL CONDUCT	2		2
FALSE REPORTING OF ILLNESS OR INJURY	1		1
INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	1		1
INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	1		1
IMPROPER DISSEMINATION OF COMPUTER INFORMATION	1		1
DAMAGED, INOPERATIVE PROPERTY OR EQUIPMENT	1		1

USE OF PRIVILEGED INFORMATION	1		1
ABSENCE FROM DUTY	1		1
PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	1		1
FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	1		1
OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	1		1
Grand Total	32	1	33

5.4. Did Seniority Or Age Explain The Differences In Sustained Rates for Fully Investigated Allegations?

We again examined age and seniority to see if either variable explained differences in sustained rates for fully investigated cases. For seniority, we tested to see if the sustained percentage was disproportionately higher for members with less seniority (assuming rookie officers make more mistakes), since a higher percentage of Black and Hispanic members have less than 5 years of seniority compared to white members. Table 49 covers sustained rates by seniority for fully investigated allegations.

In 2025, the sustained rate was highest for the most junior officers (less than 2 years - 23%) and the most senior officers (over 10 years - 21%). Officers with 2 to 5 years seniority had a sustained rate of 16%. This indicates that seniority does not explain the differences in sustained rates, which we also found to be the case in 2024. It is important to note that the sustained rate for white members was highest for less than five years and the sustained rate for Black members was highest for over 10 years.

Table 49: Sustained Rates by Seniority 2025 (Fully Investigated Allegations)

Seniority	Race Clean	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total	
		%	n	%	n	%	Total
Less than 2 yrs	White	15%	2	85%	11	100%	13
	Black	22%	13	78%	47	100%	60
	Hispanic	22%	11	78%	40	100%	51
	Asian/Filipino	38%	9	63%	15	100%	24
	Other/Unk.	14%	1	86%	6	100%	7
Less than 2 yrs Total		23%	36	77%	119	100%	155
2-5 yrs	White	23%	3	77%	10	100%	13
	Black	4%	2	96%	47	100%	49
	Hispanic	25%	16	75%	47	100%	63
	Asian/Filipino	10%	2	90%	19	100%	21
	Other/Unk.	17%	2	83%	10	100%	12
2-5 yrs Total		16%	25	84%	133	100%	158
5-10 yrs	White	14%	4	86%	25	100%	29
	Black	13%	5	88%	35	100%	40
	Hispanic	21%	14	79%	53	100%	67
	Asian/Filipino	8%	2	92%	24	100%	26

	Other/Unk.	20%	2	80%	8	100%	10
5-10 yrs Total		16%	27	84%	145	100%	172
Over 10 yrs	White	13%	11	88%	77	100%	88
	Black	33%	28	67%	57	100%	85
	Hispanic	23%	14	77%	47	100%	61
	Asian/Filipino	13%	5	87%	34	100%	39
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	2	100%	2
Over 10 yrs Total		21%	58	79%	217	100%	275
Grand Total		19%	146	81%	614	100%	760

Table 49: Sustained Rates by Seniority 2024 (Fully Investigated Allegations)

Seniority	Race Clean	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total	
		%	n	%	n	%	Total
Less than 2 yrs	White	0%	0	100%	17	100%	17
	Black	20%	15	80%	60	100%	75
	Hispanic	26%	21	74%	59	100%	80
	Asian/Filipino	11%	4	89%	31	100%	35
	Other/Unk.	13%	1	88%	7	100%	8
Less than 2 yrs Total		19%	41	81%	174	100%	215
2-5 yrs	White	0%	0	100%	6	100%	6
	Black	35%	13	65%	24	100%	37
	Hispanic	33%	16	67%	32	100%	48
	Asian/Filipino	10%	4	90%	36	100%	40
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	8	100%	8
2-5 yrs Total		24%	33	75%	106	100%	139
5-10 yrs	White	6%	2	94%	30	100%	32
	Black	15%	5	85%	28	100%	33
	Hispanic	4%	2	96%	48	100%	50
	Asian/Filipino	7%	2	93%	28	100%	30
	Other/Unk.	0%	0	100%	17	100%	17
5-10 yrs Total		7%	11	93%	151	100%	162
Over 10 yrs	White	9%	3	91%	31	100%	34
	Black	17%	3	83%	15	100%	18
	Hispanic	27%	7	73%	19	100%	26
	Asian/Filipino	6%	1	94%	15	100%	16
Over 10 yrs Total		15%	14	85%	80	100%	94
Grand Total		16%	99	84%	511	100%	610

When looking at the age of members (Table 50), there was no particular pattern. In 2025, the youngest members (20-25) did not have the highest sustained rate (19%), rather the age groups with the highest sustained rate were 30-35 (23%) and over 40 (22%).

Table 50: Sustained Rates by Age 2025 (Fully Investigated Allegations)

Age categorized	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
20-25	19%	8	81%	35	100%	43
25-30	14%	19	86%	120	100%	139
30-35	23%	38	77%	126	100%	164
35-40	12%	14	88%	100	100%	114
Over 40	22%	67	78%	233	100%	300
Grand Total	19%	146	81%	614	100%	760

Table 50: Sustained Rates by Age 2024 (Fully Investigated Allegations)

Age categorized	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
20-25	17%	8	83%	40	100%	48
25-30	12%	18	88%	130	100%	148
30-35	20%	32	80%	125	100%	157
35-40	17%	21	83%	102	100%	123
Over 40	15%	20	85%	114	100%	134
Grand Total	16%	99	84%	511	100%	610

5.5. Do Specific Investigators Stand Out in Fully Investigated Cases?

We also looked at investigators to see if there were any patterns. To do this, we focused on the investigators of fully investigated cases. We split up the investigators by IA versus DLI investigations (Tables 51 and 52). It is important to point out that investigators do not control which cases they receive and there are several layers of review after they complete their investigative findings. In some cases, an investigator's findings may be changed during the chain of review by the Chief of Police, the CPRA, or a Discipline Committee. Hence, the final finding used in this analysis may not have been the investigator's recommendation. Additionally, investigations sometimes get reassigned mid-investigation, effectively resulting in more than one investigator participating.

In 2025, there were 83 investigators who investigated the 384 fully investigated member cases. Table 51 presents findings for the 20 investigators who conducted the IA investigations (involving 112 member cases), ordered by decreasing number of cases. Investigator number 1 in the Table is not actually an individual OPD IA investigator, but rather a group of outside contractors to which OPD outsourced investigations. As stated in section [2. Methodology](#), "What Counts as Investigated by OPD," we identified 7 such investigations involving 28 sworn member cases, which were contracted out to independent third-party law firms, constituting 25% of the 112 member cases recorded as fully investigated by IA. Since we did not single out such cases in our 2023 and 2024 analyses, we included these outside investigations in our 2025 analyses to maintain consistency with prior years. To check the impact of outside investigators on sustained rates, we removed the outside investigator cases and found that the difference in sustained

rates between Black and white members for the 112 member cases investigated by IA shrank. Black members dropped from 35% (9 of 26) to 33% (6 of 18) and white members rose from 15% (5 of 33) to 22% (5 of 23).

Table 51: Fully Investigated IA Cases by Investigator 2025

Inv	Inv Race	# of Sustained Member Cases	# of Member Cases Investigated	Overall Sustained Rate	Sustained Rates				
					White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
1	N/A	6	28	21%	0/10	3/8	2/7	1/3	0/0
2	W	8	19	42%	2/6	4/7	2/4	0/2	0/0
3	W	6	14	43%	2/4	1/2	2/6	1/1	0/1
4	A	4	13	31%	0/2	0/2	3/6	1/3	0/0
5	W	0	11	0%	0/5	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/1
6	B	2	5	40%	0/2	0/0	0/1	1/1	1/1
7	W	1	4	25%	0/0	1/2	0/1	0/1	0/0
8	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
9	H	2	2	100%	1/1	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
10	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0
11	B	1	2	50%	0/0	0/1	1/1	0/0	0/0
12	A	0	2	0%	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
13	H	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
14	H	0	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
15	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
16	W	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0
17	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
18	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
19	A	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
20	W	0	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
TOTAL		32	112	29%	5/33	9/26	12/34	5/16	1/3
					15%	35%	35%	31%	33%
Outside Investigators (25% cases)				21%	0%	36%	29%	33%	N/A
Removing Outside Investigators (75% left)				31%	22%	33%	37%	31%	33%

Table 51: Fully Investigated IA Cases by Investigator 2024

Inv	Inv Race	# of Sustained Member Cases	# of Member Cases Investigated	Overall Sustained Rate	Sustained Rates				
					White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
1	W	1	15	7%	0/3	0/3	1/2	0/7	0/0
2	W	0	11	0%	0/4	0/2	0/4	0/1	0/0
3	B	3	9	33%	0/3	3/5	0/0	0/1	0/0
4	B	5	6	83%	1/1	1/2	3/3	0/0	0/0
5	A	3	6	50%	0/1	1/2	1/1	1/2	0/0
6	W	0	4	0%	0/1	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/1

7	W	0	3	0%	0/0	0/1	0/2	0/0	0/0
8*	W	1	3	33%	0/1	0/0	1/1	0/1	0/0
9	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
10	A	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
11	W	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
12	A	1	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
TOTAL		15	62	24%	1/15	5/16	8/18	1/12	0/1
					7%	31%	44%	8%	0%
Top 3 Investigators (56% cases)					0%	30%	17%	0%	0%
Removing Top 3 Investigators (44% left)					20%	33%	58%	33%	0%

*There was one investigator (#8) who conducted both DLIs and IA investigations during the time-period of review.

Table 52 presents findings for the 70 investigators who conducted the DLI investigations (involving 272 member cases), ordered by decreasing number of cases. There were 7 investigators who conducted both DLI and IA investigations (See Table 53 to see the combined sustained rates for these investigators). This can happen if an investigator transfers in or out of IAB during the year and therefore investigates some cases while working in IAB and some while working in the field. Another scenario for which this might occur is when a case starts off with a DLI investigator but is transferred to an IA investigator, or vice versa, and the complaint form is not updated to reflect the change.

In 2025, the top 4 investigators who conducted DLI investigations made up 19% of all DLI member cases. When removing the top 4 investigators, the sustained rates increased for all races, but the differences between sustained rates by race stayed nearly the same.

Table 52: Fully Investigated DLI Cases by Investigator 2025

Inv	Inv Race	# of Sustained Member Cases	# of Member Cases Investigated	Overall Sustained Rate	Sustained Rates				
					White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
21	W	2	16	13%	0/1	0/2	1/7	1/4	0/2
22	W	0	14	0%	0/3	0/2	0/4	0/3	0/2
23	H	0	12	0%	0/1	0/2	0/7	0/2	0/0
24	A	2	10	20%	0/5	0/3	2/2	0/0	0/0
25	W	0	9	0%	0/1	0/0	0/4	0/3	0/1
26	B	3	9	33%	0/0	1/3	1/3	0/2	1/1
2*	W	3	9	33%	0/1	1/3	1/2	1/3	0/0
27	B	5	9	56%	0/0	0/0	1/5	2/2	2/2
28	A	0	9	0%	0/1	0/2	0/4	0/2	0/0
29	A	3	8	38%	0/0	0/3	2/3	0/1	1/1
30	W	0	7	0%	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1
31	W	0	7	0%	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/2	0/1
32	H	0	7	0%	0/2	0/4	0/1	0/0	0/0
33	H	1	6	17%	1/3	0/0	0/2	0/1	0/0
34	H	0	6	0%	0/0	0/4	0/1	0/1	0/0

35	H	2	6	33%	0/0	0/2	1/2	1/2	0/0
36	W	1	6	17%	0/1	0/2	1/3	0/0	0/0
37	B	6	6	100%	1/1	3/3	1/1	1/1	0/0
38	B	0	6	0%	0/1	0/1	0/3	0/1	0/0
39	W	0	5	0%	0/0	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/1
40	W	2	5	40%	0/0	1/3	0/1	1/1	0/0
41	A	0	4	0%	0/0	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/0
42	B	1	4	25%	0/0	0/0	1/4	0/0	0/0
43	W	1	4	25%	1/2	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
44	A	0	4	0%	0/0	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/0
45	H	0	4	0%	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/0	0/0
10*	W	0	4	0%	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/0	0/0
46	W	1	4	25%	1/2	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
47	H	0	3	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/0
3*	W	0	3	0%	0/1	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0
48	H	2	3	67%	0/0	0/0	2/3	0/0	0/0
49	B	0	3	0%	0/2	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
50	B	1	3	33%	0/0	0/1	1/1	0/1	0/0
51	W	0	3	0%	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
52	W	0	3	0%	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
53	A	1	3	33%	0/0	0/1	1/2	0/0	0/0
54	W	0	3	0%	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
55	W	1	2	50%	1/1	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
56	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0
57	H	1	2	50%	0/1	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
58	A	0	2	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
6*	B	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
59	H	0	2	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0
60	H	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
61	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/0
18*	H	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
62	B	2	2	100%	0/0	1/1	1/1	0/0	0/0
63	W	2	2	100%	1/1	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
64	H	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
65	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
16*	W	1	1	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
66	A	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
67	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
68	B	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
69	W	0	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
70	B	1	1	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
71	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
72	H	1	1	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0

73	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
74	W	1	1	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
75	A	0	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
76	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
77	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
78	A	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
79	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
19*	A	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
80	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
81	A	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
82	W	1	1	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
83	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
TOTAL		50	272	18%	6/41	12/77	21/94	7/45	4/15
					15%	16%	22%	16%	27%
Only Top 4 Investigators (19% cases)				8%	0%	0%	15%	11%	0%
Removing Top 4 Investigators (81% left)				21%	19%	18%	24%	17%	36%

*Denotes an investigator who conducted both DLI and IA investigations during 2025.

Table 52: Fully Investigated DLI Cases by Investigator 2024

Inv	Inv Race	# of Sustained Member Cases	# of Member Cases Investigated	Overall Sustained Rate	Sustained Rates				
					White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
13	A	2	17	12%	1/6	0/1	0/6	1/3	0/1
14	W	1	17	6%	0/2	1/4	0/7	0/2	0/2
15	W	0	13	0%	0/1	0/5	0/4	0/3	0/0
16	H	0	13	0%	0/3	0/2	0/4	0/3	0/1
17	H	5	12	42%	0/1	3/4	1/3	1/4	0/0
18	A	1	10	10%	1/3	0/5	0/1	0/1	0/0
19	A	2	8	25%	0/0	0/2	2/5	0/1	0/0
20	A	0	8	0%	0/0	0/3	0/4	0/1	0/0
21	W	0	8	0%	0/1	0/4	0/1	0/1	0/1
22	H	1	8	13%	0/2	0/1	1/3	0/2	0/0
23	A	3	7	43%	0/0	2/2	1/4	0/1	0/0
24	B	3	7	43%	1/1	0/2	2/2	0/1	0/1
25	W	0	7	0%	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/3	0/0
26	W	1	6	17%	0/0	0/2	0/1	1/2	0/1
27	W	0	6	0%	0/3	0/0	0/0	0/3	0/0
28	H	3	6	50%	0/0	2/4	1/1	0/1	0/0
29	B	0	5	0%	0/0	0/1	0/4	0/0	0/0
30	W	0	5	0%	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/0
31	W	2	5	40%	0/0	1/3	0/0	1/2	0/0
32	A	2	5	40%	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/3	0/1
33	H	0	5	0%	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/1	0/0

34	W	0	5	0%	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/0
35	B	0	5	0%	0/0	0/2	0/1	0/1	0/1
36	W	0	4	0%	0/0	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/0
37	B	1	4	25%	0/1	0/0	1/2	0/1	0/0
38	B	0	4	0%	0/0	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/0
39	H	0	4	0%	0/0	0/1	0/2	0/0	0/1
40	W	3	4	75%	0/0	2/2	0/1	1/1	0/0
41	W	1	4	25%	0/1	1/1	0/1	0/0	0/1
42	H	0	4	0%	0/2	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
43	A	0	3	0%	0/0	0/2	0/1	0/0	0/0
44	H	0	3	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/2	0/1
45	H	0	3	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/1
46	H	1	3	33%	0/1	0/0	1/2	0/0	0/0
8*	W	2	3	67%	0/0	1/1	1/2	0/0	0/0
47	H	0	3	0%	0/0	0/0	0/3	0/0	0/0
48	B	1	3	33%	0/1	0/0	0/1	1/1	0/0
49	B	0	3	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/2	0/0
50	W	2	3	67%	0/0	1/1	0/1	0/0	1/1
51	A	2	2	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1	0/0
52	H	2	2	100%	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1	0/0
53	W	2	2	100%	0/0	1/1	1/1	0/0	0/0
54	B	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
55	H	0	2	0%	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
56	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0
57	B	2	2	100%	0/0	1/1	1/1	0/0	0/0
58	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
59	A	0	2	0%	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0
60	B	0	2	0%	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0
61	B	0	2	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/2	0/0
62	H	0	2	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	0/0
63	B	1	2	50%	0/0	0/0	1/2	0/0	0/0
64	W	1	2	50%	0/1	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
65	W	0	2	0%	0/1	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
66	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0
67	W	0	2	0%	0/0	0/2	0/0	0/0	0/0
68	W	1	2	50%	0/1	0/0	0/0	1/1	0/0
69	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
70	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
71	A	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
72	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
73	B	0	1	0%	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
74	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
75	W	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0

76	W	1	1	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
77	H	0	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0
78	B	0	1	0%	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
79	H	2	1	0%	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
TOTAL		49	290	17%	3/39	18/82	17/88	10/65	1/16
Only Top 5 Investigators (25% cases)				11%	8%	22%	19%	15%	6%
Removing Top 5 Investigators (75% left)				19%	8%	21%	25%	16%	8%

**There was one investigator (#8) who conducted both DLIs and IA investigations during the time period of review.*

Since there were 7 investigators in 2025 who conducted both DLI and IA investigations, compared to only one in 2024, we also present the findings for all investigations for these investigators in Table 53. Investigator number 2 completed the most investigations of all OPD investigators in 2025. However, we were unable to test for disparity in sustained rates by race due to low numbers.

Table 53: Fully Investigated Cases by Investigators who Conducted both IA and DLI Investigations in 2025

Inv	Inv Race	# of Sustained Member Cases	# of Member Cases Investigated	Overall Sustained Rate	Sustained Rates				
					White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
2	W	11	28	39%	2/7	5/10	3/6	1/5	0/0
3	W	6	17	35%	2/5	1/4	2/6	1/1	0/1
6	B	2	7	29%	0/2	0/1	0/2	1/1	1/1
10	W	0	6	0%	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/0
18	H	0	3	0%	0/0	0/1	0/2	0/0	0/0
19	A	1	2	50%	0/0	0/0	1/2	0/0	0/0
16	W	2	2	100%	0/0	1/1	0/0	1/1	0/0

6. Discipline Analyses

This next section includes analyses of the discipline imposed for sustained cases. Discipline is determined based on the severity and number of sustained allegations, whether the member has been sustained for that allegation in the past, and the number of aggravating and mitigating factors. Commanders of each employee produce a Pre-Discipline Report⁹ which includes the above information and a recommendation for discipline. The Department's Discipline Matrix¹⁰ is the reference for determining a range for discipline. Discipline determinations are made during a pre-discipline conference, which is attended by members of the Executive Team, and in some cases members of the CPRA. Final discipline is determined by the Chief of Police or their designee, or in some cases the Oakland Police Commission Discipline Committee. Appendix 8 contains discipline for each sustained case and includes race, gender, rank, violation, aggravating/mitigating factors, offense number, and the discipline matrix range.

Discipline by Class

Following the *Department's Working Methodology for Internal Affairs Disparity Analyses*, cases were separated by Class before analyzing discipline. Class I allegations are typically more severe and generally result in more severe discipline. If at least one of the sustained allegations against a member was a Class I allegation, the case was coded as "Class I." If the case had only Class II sustained allegations, it was coded as "Class II."

The number of cases per category for Class I and Class II cases were too small to conduct a chi-square test, so we relied on numbers and percentages to identify differences of concern. In 2025, there were 82 member cases where discipline was imposed. This was a 32% increase from 2024 (62 cases).

We first looked at the percentage of discipline cases that were Class I versus Class II. Tables 54-56 show the percentage of Class I versus Class II discipline cases by race, gender and rank for 2024 and 2025. In 2025, Black members again had the highest percentage of Class I discipline cases (48%, 10 of 21). This means that Black members were more often being disciplined for more serious misconduct, which often results in more severe penalties. This was a decrease from 2024 when 52% (12 of 23) of Black member discipline cases were Class I. White members, on the other hand, experienced an increase in percentage of Class I discipline cases (25%, 1 of 4 to 36%, 4 of 11), and had the second highest percentage in 2025. The gap in percentages between Black and white members narrowed considerably between 2024 and 2025.

Males had a higher percentage of Class I discipline cases in both 2024 and 2025 compared to females. Sergeants and above had a higher percentage of Class I discipline cases in both 2024 and 2025 compared to officers, but the gap between the two groups was much larger in 2025 (67% for sergeants and above and 28% for officers).

⁹ TF 3340 Pre-Discipline Report. Revised: May 2015.

¹⁰ Training Bulletin V-T Discipline Policy Appendix (Discipline Matrix). Effective Date: March 14, 2014.

Table 54: Discipline by Class and Race 2024 Versus 2025 (All Sustained Cases)

	Class I Discipline Cases 2024		Class II Discipline Cases 2024		Class I Discipline Cases 2025		Class II Discipline Cases 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
White	25%	1	75%	3	36%	4	64%	7
Black	52%	12	48%	11	48%	10	52%	11
Hispanic	29%	7	71%	17	33%	11	67%	22
Asian/Filipino	20%	2	80%	8	33%	4	67%	8
Other/Unknown	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	100%	5
Grand Total	35%	22	65%	40	35%	29	65%	53

Table 55: Discipline by Class and Gender 2024 Versus 2025 (All Sustained Cases)

	Class I Discipline Cases 2024		Class II Discipline Cases 2024		Class I Discipline Cases 2025		Class II Discipline Cases 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Male	38%	20	62%	33	36%	27	64%	47
Female	22%	2	78%	7	25%	2	75%	6
Grand Total	35%	22	65%	40	35%	29	65%	53

Table 56: Discipline by Class and Rank 2024 Versus 2025 (All Sustained Cases)

	Class I Discipline Cases 2024		Class II Discipline Cases 2024		Class I Discipline Cases 2025		Class II Discipline Cases 2025	
	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n	% Total	n
Officer	35%	19	65%	36	28%	19	72%	48
Sgt and Above	43%	3	57%	4	67%	10	33%	5
Grand Total	35%	22	65%	40	35%	29	65%	53

When looking at the severity of discipline by race, we did not observe disparity between white members and non-white members for Class I cases in 2025. Table 57 shows Class I discipline by race. All but one Class I sustained cases resulted in suspension or termination in both 2024 and 2025. In 2024, one white sergeant received counseling for a use of force allegation. In 2025, one Hispanic officer received a written reprimand for *Performance of Duty – Miranda Violation*, which was lower than the discipline matrix range of 2-day suspension to Termination.

In 2025, of the four white member Class I discipline cases, three involved the same member. A white sergeant received discipline of termination in three separate cases in 2025. There was only one other officer who had more than one Class I discipline case. A Hispanic officer was sustained for the same violation in two separate cases, the first of which he received a written reprimand and in the second he received a five-day suspension.

Table 57: Class I Discipline by Race 2025

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Resigned/Retired*	Suspension	Termination	Total
White	0	0	0	1	3	4
Black	0	0	2	6	2	10
Hispanic	0	1	1	6	3	11
Asian	0	0	0	2	2	4
Total	0	1	3	15	10	29

**All officers who resigned or retired were facing suspension to termination at the time they separated from the Department, so are grouped with suspension and termination for the analysis.*

Table 57: Class I Discipline by Race 2024

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Termination	Total
White	1	0	0	0	1
Black	0	0	9	3	12
Hispanic	0	0	4	3	7
Asian	0	0	2	0	2
Other/Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	15	6	22

Table 58 shows Class II discipline by race. Overall, in 2025, 40% (21 of 53) of members received a suspension or higher (which includes those who resigned or retired while facing a suspension or termination). This was a higher percentage than 28% (11 of 40) in 2024. Black and Asian members were least likely to receive more severe discipline (a suspension or higher) for a Class II case in 2025 (27%, 3 of 11 and 13%, 1 of 8 respectively). White members received a suspension in 43% (3 of 7) of Class II cases and Hispanic members received more severe discipline in 50% (11 of 22) of Class II cases.

There were three Hispanic officers who had two Class II discipline cases each. One officer was sustained for *Performance of Duty – General* and *Performance of Duty – Care of Property* and received counseling in each case. Another officer was sustained for *Performance of Duty – General* and *Conduct Toward Others* and retired. Finally, a third officer was also sustained for *Conduct Toward Others* and *Performance of Duty – General* and received counseling for one case and a 4-day suspension for the other case.

Table 58: Class II Discipline by Race 2025

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Retired/Resigned*		Suspension		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
White	57%	4	0%	0	0%	0	43%	3	100%	7
Black	55%	6	18%	2	0%	0	27%	3	100%	11
Hispanic	32%	7	18%	4	9%	2	41%	9	100%	22
Asian	75%	6	13%	1	0%	0	13%	1	100%	8
Other/Unknown	40%	2	0%	0	0%	0	60%	3	100%	5
Total	47%	25	13%	7	4%	2	36%	19	100%	53

**All officers who resigned or retired were facing suspension to termination at the time they separated from the Department, so are grouped with suspension and termination for the analysis.*

Table 58: Class II Discipline by Race 2024

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
White*	0%	0	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	100%	3
Black	36%	4	27%	3	36%	4	0%	0	100%	11
Hispanic	65%	11	18%	3	18%	3	0%	0	100%	17
Asian	63%	5	13%	1	25%	2	0%	0	100%	8
Other/Unknown	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1
Total	50%	20	23%	9	28%	11	0%	0	100%	40

Table 59 shows Class I and II discipline by gender. Female members only had two Class I discipline cases and both resulted in termination. For Class II cases, male members had a higher rate of suspension (which includes those who resigned or retired while facing a suspension or termination) than females in 2025 (42%, 20 of 47 versus 17%, 1 of 6). This was similar to 2024, although the gap between the two was higher in 2025.

Table 59: Discipline by Gender 2025

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Resigned/Retired	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Male		1	3	15	8	27
Female					2	2
Total	0	1	3	15	10	29

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Resigned/ Retired		Suspension		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Male	47%	22	11%	5	4%	2	38%	18	100%	47
Female	50%	3	33%	2	0%	0	17%	1	100%	6
Total	47%	25	13%	7	4%	2	36%	19	100%	53

Table 59: Discipline by Gender 2024

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Male	1	0	13	6	20
Female		0	2		2
Total	1	0	15	6	22

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Male	45%	15	24%	8	30%	10	0%	0	100%	33
Female	71%	5	14%	1	14%	1	0%	0	100%	7
Total	50%	20	23%	9	28%	11	0%	0	100%	40

Table 60 shows Class I and II discipline by rank. In 2025, all sergeants and above received a suspension or higher for Class I cases. One officer received a written reprimand for a Class I case. In both 2024 and 2025, sergeants and above had a higher suspension rate than officers in Class II cases by a considerable margin (75%, 3 of 4 versus 22%, 8 of 36 in 2024 and 80%, 4 of 5 versus 35%, 17 of 48 in 2025).

Table 60: Discipline by Rank 2025

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Resigned/Retired	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Officer		1	3	9	6	19
Sgt and Above				6	4	10
Total	0	1	3	15	10	29

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Resigned/ Retired		Suspension		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Officer	50%	24	15%	7	4%	2	31%	15	100%	48
Sgt and Above	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	80%	4	100%	5
Total	47%	25	13%	7	4%	2	36%	19	100%	53

Table 60: Discipline by Rank 2024

Class I Cases	Counseling	Written	Suspension	Demotion/ Termination	Total
Officer	0	0	13	6	19
Sgt and Above	1	0	2		3
Total	1	0	15	6	22

Class II Cases	Counseling		Written		Suspension		Demotion/ Termination		Total	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Officer	56%	20	22%	8	22%	8	0%	0	100%	36
Sgt and Above	0%	0	25%	1	75%	3	0%	0	100%	4
Total	50%	20	23%	9	28%	11	0%	0	100%	40

7. Department Efforts

After several years of observing white members having among the highest sustained rate, we saw a substantial drop in their sustained rate in 2024, leading to white members having a significantly lower sustained rate than Black and Hispanic members. While a comprehensive analysis was unable to explain what caused the disparity, we did find the disparity in internally generated cases to be the greatest. The Department responded by committing to several measures, including:

- Keeping a better record of internally discovered allegations
- Monitoring case outcomes quarterly

- Conducting a qualitative study on employee feelings and perceptions of the IA process
- Implementing implicit bias training, with a focus on the IA investigation and discipline process

These measures are in addition to other efforts the Department has made to mitigate disparity, particularly since it began conducting these studies several years ago. Over the past four years, the Department has updated policy on *Failure to Accept or Refer a Complaint* allegations, improved documentation of allegations and recommended findings, and improved data collection on complaint and discipline data.

The annual IA Outcomes and Discipline Study is one component of the Department's broader efforts to identify and address disparities. The Department has committed to conducting biennial surveys to assess employee perceptions of the IA process and has, at present, already conducted two. The Department has a Race and Equity team that is focused on reducing race-based disparities by reviewing and updating policies, procedures, systems and trainings.

8. Recommendations

1. **More closely monitor data entry and sustained rates for internally generated cases:** In some cases, it was difficult to determine how a case originated because information recorded in the complaint form was inconsistent across data fields. To improve data reliability, the Department should ensure consistent and accurate entry of complainant information and provide additional training to IAB personnel on properly classifying and documenting case origination. Additionally, the Department should continue to closely monitor sustained rates for internally generated cases to identify trends and potential areas of concern.
2. **Provide training on how to enter Internally Discovered Violations into the complaint form:** While "internally generated cases" are classified based on the origin of the case, "internally discovered violations" are classified at the allegation level. For example, an investigator may identify potential misconduct during a review of video evidence and add a new allegation to an existing case. In such instances, the allegation should be categorized as an "internally discovered violation," even if the case itself originated from an external complaint. The Department recently updated the complaint form to expand data collection related to "internally discovered violations." To ensure that internally discovered violations are consistently and accurately recorded, the Department should provide training to IAB staff on the definition of an "internally discovered violation," explain updates to the complaint form in Vision, and emphasize the importance of complete and accurate data entry.
3. **More closely monitor data entry for investigation type:** During the review of 2025 data, we identified cases that were reassigned between DLI and IA investigators, but the complaint form was not updated to reflect the change in investigation type. We also identified cases that were conducted by outside investigators; however, these cases were identified only through manual review because the complaint form does not include a field to indicate whether an investigation was outsourced. To improve the accuracy and reliability of data analysis, the Department should ensure that investigation type is updated whenever case assignments change and should add a data field to track whether an investigation was conducted by an outside investigator.

Appendix 1: Chi-Square Tests for Sustained Rates 2025

Sustained Rates by Race, Gender and Rank – see Table 1

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (11)	14	95% (211)	208	0.56	0.453
Black	7% (21)	18	93% (282)	285		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (11)	16	95% (211)	206	1.76	0.185
Hispanic	8% (33)	28	92% (373)	378		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (11)	9	95% (211)	213	0.34	0.557
Asian/Filipino	4% (12)	14	96% (324)	322		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (11)	12	95% (211)	210	0.18	0.669
Other/Unk	7% (5)	4	93% (64)	65		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	7% (74)	70	93% (1061)	1065	1.50	0.221
Female	4% (8)	12	96% (193)	189		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	6% (67)	74	94% (1134)	1127	5.52	0.019
Sgt and Above	11% (15)	8	89% (120)	127		

Sustained Rates by Race 2021-2025 – see Table 2

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	9% (137)	128	91% (1436)	1445	1.39	0.239
Black	7% (106)	115	93% (1314)	1305		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	9% (137)	131	91% (1436)	1442	0.47	0.494
Hispanic	8% (168)	174	92% (1926)	1920		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	9% (137)	111	91% (1436)	1462	12.84	0.000
Asian/Filipino	5% (83)	109	95% (1465)	1439		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	9% (137)	138	91% (1436)	1435	0.01	0.915
Other/Unk	9% (28)	27	91% (280)	281		

Appendix 2: Chi-Square Tests Cases Per Member and Allegations Per Case 2025

Cases per Member – see Table 5

Chi-Square Test by More Than One Case for White v Black

	More Than One Case		Only One Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	54% (51)	55	46% (44)	40	1.25	0.264
Black	63% (65)	61	38% (39)	43		

Chi-Square Test by More Than One Case for White v Hispanic

	More Than One Case		Only One Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	54% (51)	58	46% (44)	37	3.47	0.062
Hispanic	67% (92)	85	33% (46)	53		

Chi-Square Test by More Than One Case for White v Asian/Filipino

	More Than One Case		Only One Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	54% (51)	61	46% (44)	34	7.24	0.007
Asian/Filipino	73% (78)	68	27% (29)	39		

Chi-Square Test by More Than One Case for White v Other/Unk

	More Than One Case		Only One Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	54% (51)	56	46% (44)	39	4.74	0.029
Other/Unk	82% (18)	13	18% (4)	9		

Allegations per Case – see Tables 6-8

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Black

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	60% (133)	129	40% (89)	93	0.40	0.528
Black	57% (172)	176	43% (131)	127		

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Hispanic

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	60% (133)	139	40% (89)	83	1.00	0.318
Hispanic	64% (261)	255	36% (145)	151		

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Asian/Filipino

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	60% (133)	138	40% (89)	84	0.55	0.459
Asian/Filipino	63% (213)	208	37% (123)	128		

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for White v Other/Unk

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	60% (133)	132	40% (89)	90	0.02	0.884
Other/Unk	58% (40)	41	42% (29)	28		

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for Male v Female

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	61% (691)	696	39% (444)	439	0.45	0.501
Female	64% (128)	123	36% (73)	78		

Chi-Square Test by Allegations per Case for Officer v Sgt and above

	One allegation per case		More than one Allegation per Case		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	62% (749)	736	38% (452)	465	5.22	0.022
Sgt and Above	52% (70)	83	48% (65)	52		

Appendix 3: Chi-Square Tests Allegations by Class 2025

Allegation by Class – See Tables 12-14

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for White v Black

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	29% (106)	99	71% (260)	267	1.06	0.303
Black	26% (135)	142	74% (392)	385		

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for White v Hispanic

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	29% (106)	104	71% (260)	262	0.03	0.864
Hispanic	28% (187)	189	72% (475)	473		

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for White v Asian/Filipino

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	29% (106)	107	71% (260)	259	0.01	0.926
Asian/Filipino	29% (158)	157	71% (378)	379		

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for White v Other/Unk

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	29% (106)	98	71% (260)	268	3.34	0.068
Other/Unk	20% (22)	30	80% (90)	82		

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for Male v Female

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	28% (532)	518	72% (1345)	1359	3.27	0.071
Female	23% (76)	90	77% (250)	236		

Chi-Square Test by Allegation Class for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Class I		Class II		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	27% (517)	536	73% (1425)	1406	7.42	0.006
Sgt and Above	35% (91)	72	65% (170)	189		

Appendix 4: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Investigation Type and Origin 2025

Division Level Investigations (DLI) – See Tables 20-22

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	7	97% (169)	168	0.16	0.692
Black	5% (12)	11	95% (244)	245		

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	9	97% (169)	166	1.08	0.298
Hispanic	6% (21)	18	94% (330)	333		

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	5	97% (169)	170	0.17	0.683
Asian/Filipino	2% (7)	8	98% (292)	291		

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to Test

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	5% (45)	42	95% (923)	926	0.82	0.366
Female	3% (5)	8	97% (173)	170		

Chi-Square Test by DLI Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above – Unable to Test

Internal Affairs Investigation (IA) – See Tables 20-22

Chi-Square Test by IA Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	13% (5)	7	88% (35)	33	1.10	0.294
Black	24% (9)	7	76% (28)	30		

Chi-Square Test by IA Investigation Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	13% (5)	8	88% (35)	32	1.99	0.158
Hispanic	27% (12)	9	73% (32)	35		

Chi-Square Test by IA Investigation Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by IA Investigation Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by IA Investigation Sustained for Male v Female – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by IA Investigation Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	24% (18)	17	76% (58)	59	0.15	0.702
Sgt and Above	20% (14)	15	80% (57)	56		

Externally Generated Cases – See Tables 23-25

Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	7	97% (181)	180	0.05	0.819
Black	4% (11)	10	96% (259)	260		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	9	97% (181)	178	1.12	0.290
Hispanic	6% (21)	18	94% (351)	354		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	3% (6)	5	97% (181)	182	0.04	0.837
Asian/Filipino	2% (8)	9	98% (315)	314		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test**Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for Male v Female**

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	5% (47)	43	95% (986)	990	1.64	0.200
Female	2% (4)	8	98% (180)	176		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Generated Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above – Unable to test**Internally Generated Cases – See Tables 23-25****Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for White v Black**

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	14% (5)	8	86% (30)	27	1.69	0.194
Black	30% (10)	7	70% (23)	26		

Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	14% (5)	9	86% (30)	26	3.05	0.081
Hispanic	35% (12)	8	65% (22)	26		

Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino – Unable to test**Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test****Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for Male v Female – Unable to test**

Chi-Square Test by Internally Generated Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	29% (19)	17	71% (46)	48	0.43	0.511
Sgt and Above	22% (12)	14	78% (42)	40		

Appendix 5: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Race Internally Discovered Allegations 2025

Internally Discovered Allegations – See Table 26

Chi-Square Test by Internally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	17% (15)	23	83% (72)	64	6.29	0.012
Black	34% (37)	29	66% (71)	79		

Chi-Square Test by Internally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	17% (15)	23	83% (72)	64	5.96	0.015
Hispanic	34% (38)	30	66% (75)	83		

Chi-Square Test by Internally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	17% (15)	17	83% (72)	70	0.51	0.476
Asian/Filipino	24% (10)	8	76% (31)	33		

Chi-Square Test by Internally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Externally Discovered Allegations – See Table 26

Chi-Square Test by Externally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	2% (5)	6	98% (274)	273	0.21	0.644
Black	3% (11)	10	97% (408)	409		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	2% (5)	7	98% (274)	272	0.76	0.382
Hispanic	3% (17)	15	97% (532)	534		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	2% (5)	5	98% (274)	274	0.01	0.914
Asian/Filipino	2% (8)	8	98% (487)	487		

Chi-Square Test by Externally Discovered Allegations Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Appendix 6: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Allegation Class 2025

All Allegations – See Tables 27-29

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (20)	28	95% (346)	338	3.57	0.059
Black	9% (48)	40	91% (479)	487		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (20)	27	95% (346)	339	2.41	0.120
Hispanic	8% (55)	48	92% (607)	614		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (20)	15	95% (346)	351	1.90	0.168
Asian/Filipino	3% (18)	23	97% (518)	513		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for White v Other/Unk

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	5% (20)	19	95% (346)	347	0.03	0.862
Other/Unk	4% (5)	6	96% (107)	106		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	7% (134)	124	93% (1743)	1753	4.82	0.028
Female	4% (12)	22	96% (314)	304		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained Allegations for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	6% (111)	129	94% (1831)	1813	20.79	0.000
Sgt and Above	13% (35)	17	87% (226)	244		

Appendix 7: Chi-Square Tests Sustained Rates by Fully Investigated Cases 2025

All Full Investigations – See Tables 32-34

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (11)	13	85% (63)	61	0.55	0.457
Black	20% (21)	19	80% (82)	84		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (11)	16	85% (63)	58	2.67	0.102
Hispanic	26% (33)	28	74% (95)	100		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (11)	13	85% (63)	61	0.26	0.610
Asian/Filipino	20% (12)	10	80% (49)	51		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v unknown – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	23% (74)	69	77% (250)	255	2.19	0.139
Female	13% (8)	13	87% (52)	47		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	22% (67)	64	78% (235)	238	0.37	0.541
Sgt and Above	18% (15)	18	82% (67)	64		

Division Level Investigations (DLI) – See Tables 32-34

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	6	85% (35)	35	0.02	0.895
Black	16% (12)	12	84% (65)	65		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	8	85% (35)	33	0.63	0.426
Hispanic	22% (21)	19	78% (73)	75		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	6	85% (35)	35	0.03	0.855
Asian/Filipino	16% (7)	7	84% (38)	38		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	20% (45)	42	80% (181)	184	1.52	0.217
Female	11% (5)	8	89% (41)	38		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above – Unable to test

Internal Affairs Investigations (IA) – See Tables 32-34

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (5)	8	85% (28)	25	2.06	0.151
Black	35% (9)	6	65% (17)	20		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (5)	8	85% (28)	25	2.60	0.107
Hispanic	35% (12)	9	65% (22)	25		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	37% (18)	14	63% (31)	35	2.18	0.140
Sgt and Above	22% (14)	18	78% (49)	45		

Externally Generated Cases – See Tables 35-37

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	8	85% (35)	33	0.50	0.481
Black	22% (14)	12	78% (49)	51		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	8	85% (35)	33	0.59	0.442
Hispanic	22% (21)	19	78% (74)	76		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (6)	6	85% (35)	35	0.01	0.943
Asian/Filipino	16% (8)	8	84% (41)	41		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	20% (47)	43	80% (185)	189	2.20	0.138
Female	9% (4)	8	91% (39)	35		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	20% (48)	45	80% (197)	200	1.05	0.304
Sgt and Above	10% (3)	6	90% (27)	24		

Internally Generated Cases – See Tables 35-37

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Black

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (5)	8	85% (28)	25	2.72	0.099
Black	37% (10)	7	63% (17)	20		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Hispanic

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
White	15% (5)	9	85% (28)	25	2.85	0.091
Hispanic	36% (12)	9	64% (21)	25		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Asian/Filipino– Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for White v Other/Unk – Unable to test

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Male v Female

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Male	29% (27)	26	71% (65)	66	0.04	0.845
Female	24% (4)	5	76% (13)	12		

Chi-Square Test by Sustained for Officer v Sgt and Above

	Sustained		Other than Sustained		Chi-Square Value	<i>p</i>
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected		
Officer	33% (19)	16	67% (38)	41	0.95	0.331
Sgt and Above	23% (12)	15	77% (40)	37		

Appendix 8: 2025 Sustained Allegations with Discipline

Case #	Rank at Time of Complaint	Race Code	Gender	Violation	Violation Description	Violation Class	Offense (1st, 2nd, etc.)	Agg Fact	Mit Fact	Disc Matrix	Discipline	Susp Days
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S2	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.69-1b	GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING	Class I	1st	10	0	C-T	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S3	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	398.80-1b	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	10	0	T	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.42-1e	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	Class I	1st	10	0	S2-T	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	342.00-2q	DEPARTMENT PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT - MISAPPROPRIATION/MISUSE	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S3	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.74-2a	CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S3	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	356.20-2b	CORRESPONDENCE	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S2	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	370.90-1b	ENDORSEMENTS AND REFERRALS - FEE IS EXCHANGED	Class I	1st	10	0	T	Termination	
1	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	384.28-2b	COMMERCIAL TESTIMONIALS	Class II	1st	10	0	C-S2	Termination	
2	Sgt/ Commander 1	HISPANIC	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	6	1	C-S5	Suspension	3
2	Sgt/ Commander 2	WHITE	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	6	1	C-S5	Suspension	5
2	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	2nd	5	1	S2-S5	Suspension	4
2	Police Officer 2	BLACK	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	5	1	C-S5	Suspension	3
3	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	7	0	C-S3	Resigned	

3	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.42-1h	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	Class I	1st	7	0	S10-T	Resigned	
3	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	328.63-1b	CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS	Class I	1st	7	0	S2-T	Resigned	
3	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	328.70-2b	INTOXICANTS ON DEPARTMENTAL PREMISES	Class II	1st	7	0	C-S3	Resigned	
4	Police Officer 1	UNK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	6	1	C-S3	Suspension	2
4	Police Officer 2	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	5	2	C-S2	Counseling	
5	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	2	3	C-S3	Written Reprimand	
6	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.42-1h	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	Class I	2nd	9	0	T	Termination	
6	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.69-1b	GIFTS, GRATUITIES - SOLICITING OR ACCEPTING	Class I	1st	9	0	C-T	Termination	
7	Police Officer	WHITE	FEMALE	314.42-2g	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	Class II	1st	7	3	C-S2	Suspension	2
7	Police Officer	WHITE	FEMALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	7	3	C-S3	Suspension	2
7	Police Officer	WHITE	FEMALE	314.42-2g	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - MISDEMEANOR/INFRACTION	Class II	1st	7	3	C-S2	Suspension	2
8	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.42-1h	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	Class I	1st	9	1	S10-T	Suspension	20
8	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	9	1	T	Suspension	20
8	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.28-1b	NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	Class I	1st	9	1	S2-T	Suspension	20
8	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	9	1	C-S3	Suspension	20
9	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-1c	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - INTENTIONAL SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
9	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2i	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	Class II	1st	9	0	WR-S5	Termination	
9	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
9	Police Officer 2	BLACK	MALE	314.39-1c	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - INTENTIONAL SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Resigned	

9	Police Officer 2	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2i	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	Class II	1st	9	0	WR-S5	Resigned	
9	Police Officer 2	BLACK	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Resigned	
9	Police Officer 3	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-1c	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - INTENTIONAL SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
9	Police Officer 3	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2i	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	Class II	1st	9	0	WR-S5	Termination	
9	Police Officer 3	ASIAN	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
10	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.28-1b	NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	Class I	1st	11	0	S2-T	Termination	
10	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	11	0	T	Termination	
10	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	11	0	C-S3	Termination	
11	Police Officer	HISPANIC	FEMALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	7	0	T	Termination	
12	Sgt/ Commander	HISPANIC	MALE	234.00-2b	COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections	Class II	2nd	6	3	S2-D	Suspension	5
12	Sgt/ Commander	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	2nd	6	3	WR-S5	Suspension	5
13	Police Officer 1	UNK	MALE	314.39-2e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class II	1st	4	3	C-S3	Suspension	2
13	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class II	1st	4	3	C-S3	Suspension	1
13	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class II	1st	4	3	C-S3	Suspension	1
13	Police Officer 3	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class II	1st	4	3	C-S3	Suspension	2

14	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	2nd	5	1	WR-S5	Suspension	5
15	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.28-1b	NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	Class I	1st	5	5	S2-T	Resigned	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	398.70-1b	INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.42-1e	OBEDIENCE TO LAWS - FELONY	Class I	1st	9	0	S2-T	Termination	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	328.91-2b	ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS	Class II	1st	9	0	C-S2	Termination	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	398.80-1a	TRUTHFULNESS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	9	0	C-S3	Termination	
16	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.38-1	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	1st	9	0	C-T	Termination	
17	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	7	3	C-S2	Suspension	21
17	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.04-1c	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - Harassment, Discrimination, or Profiling by Race or Ethnicity	Class I	1st	7	3	S30-T	Suspension	21
17	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2i	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	Class II	1st	7	3	WR-S5	Suspension	21
17	Sgt/ Commander 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	6	4	C-T	Suspension	5
17	Sgt/ Commander 1	ASIAN	MALE	234.00-2b	COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections	Class II	1st	6	4	C-S5	Suspension	5
17	Sgt/ Commander 2	HISPANIC	MALE	285.00-1b	SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Gross dereliction of duty) Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90	Class I	1st	6	3	S5-T	Suspension	12
17	Sgt/ Commander 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	6	3	C-T	Suspension	12
17	Sgt/ Commander 2	HISPANIC	MALE	285.90-2	PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION	Class II	1st	6	3	C-T	Suspension	12

18	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	6	0	C-S3	Suspension	2
19	Police Officer	ASIAN	MALE	398.70-1b	INTERFERING WITH INVESTIGATIONS	Class I	1st	9	0	T	Termination	
20	Sgt/ Commander	BLACK	FEMALE	314.38-1c	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	2nd	9	1	S3-T	Termination	
20	Sgt/ Commander	BLACK	FEMALE	370.45-1e	REPORTS AND BOOKINGS	Class I	1st	9	1	T	Termination	
21	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	314.38-1	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	1st	8	1	C-T	Suspension	3
21	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	234.00-2b	COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections	Class II	1st	8	1	C-S5	Suspension	3
21	Sgt/ Commander 2	BLACK	MALE	314.38-1	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	1st	7	2	C-T	Suspension	7
21	Sgt/ Commander 2	BLACK	MALE	234.00-2b	COMMANDING OFFICERS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 234.00 subsections	Class II	1st	7	2	C-S5	Suspension	7
22	Sgt/ Commander	ASIAN	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	4	2	C-S5	Counseling	
23	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	2nd	5	6	WR-S5	Written Reprimand	
23	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	5	6	C-S2	Written Reprimand	
24	Sgt/ Commander	HISPANIC	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	8	1	C-S3	Suspension	15
24	Sgt/ Commander	HISPANIC	MALE	314.03-2c	GENERAL CONDUCT	Class II	1st	8	1	C-S3	Suspension	15
24	Sgt/ Commander	HISPANIC	MALE	314.38-1c	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	1st	8	1	C-T	Suspension	15
25	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	6	3	C-S3	Written Reprimand	
26	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2g	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY	Class II	1st	2	3	C-S2	Counseling	

26	Police Officer 2	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2g	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY	Class II	1st	3	6	C-S2	Written Reprimand	
27	Police Officer	WHITE	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	4	4	C-S2	Counseling	
28	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-1e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION	Class I	1st	1	5	S2-T	Written Reprimand	
29	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	7	2	C-S2	Suspension	5
29	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	7	2	C-T	Suspension	5
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	12	1	C-S2	Suspension	30
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	285.00-2b	SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90	Class II	1st	12	1	C-T	Suspension	30
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	285.00-2b	SUPERVISORS - AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES Includes all of the 285.00 subsections except 285.90	Class II	1st	12	1	C-T	Suspension	30
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	314.32-2b	INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT	Class II	1st	12	1	C-S5	Suspension	30
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	314.04-2a	CONDUCT TOWARDS OTHERS - Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of AI 71	Class II	1st	12	1	C-S3	Suspension	30
29	Sgt/ Commander 1	BLACK	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	12	1	C-T	Suspension	30
29	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	10	2	C-S2	Suspension	14
29	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.04-2a	CONDUCT TOWARDS OTHERS - Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of AI 71	Class II	1st	10	2	C-S30	Suspension	14
29	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	10	2	C-T	Suspension	14

29	Police Officer 2	HISPANIC	MALE	314.32-2b	INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT	Class II	1st	10	2	C-S5	Suspension	14
29	Police Officer 3	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	6	2	C-S2	Suspension	5
29	Police Officer 3	BLACK	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	6	2	C-T	Suspension	5
29	Police Officer 4	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	8	1	C-S2	Suspension	10
29	Police Officer 4	HISPANIC	MALE	314.48-1b	REPORTING VIOLATIONS OF LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES OR ORDERS (CLASS I)	Class I	1st	8	1	C-T	Suspension	10
29	Police Officer 4	HISPANIC	MALE	314.32-2b	INSUBORDINATION - DISRESPECT	Class II	1st	8	1	C-S5	Suspension	10
30	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	328.28-2c	TARDINESS	Class II	1st	7	0	C-S2	Suspension	10
30	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	328.07-2c	PROHIBITED ACTIVITY ON DUTY	Class II	1st	7	0	C-S2	Suspension	10
31	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	2nd	5	3	WR-S5	Resigned	
32	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2i	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - PDRD	Class II	2nd	2	4	S2- S10	Suspension	2
32	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S5	Suspension	2
32	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Suspension	2
32	Police Officer 2	BLACK	FEMALE	398.76-2a	FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR REFER A COMPLAINT (UNINTENTIONAL)	Class II	1st	1	5	C-S5	Written Reprimand	
32	Police Officer 2	BLACK	FEMALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	1	5	C-S2	Written Reprimand	
33	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	2	5	C-S3	Counseling	
34	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	4	0	C-S3	Retired	
35	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	FEMALE	314.39-2g	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY	Class II	1st	1	5	C-S2	Counseling	
35	Police Officer 2	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2g	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY	Class II	1st	1	5	C-S2	Counseling	

36	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	398.77-1a	REFUSAL TO PROVIDE NAME OR SERIAL NUMBER	Class I	1st	3	6	S3-T	Suspension	1
37	Police Officer	BLACK	FEMALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	3	2	C-S2	Written Reprimand	0
38	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	5	4	C-S3	Suspension	5
39	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	1	3	C-S3	Counseling	
40	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	398.16-1c	COURT APPEARANCES	Class I	1st	10	0	C-S30	Termination	
40	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.30-1c	INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	Class I	1st	10	0	S3-T	Termination	
40	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.28-1b	NOTIFICATION - CRIMINAL	Class I	2nd	10	0	T	Termination	
40	Sgt/ Commander	WHITE	MALE	314.38-1	OBSTRUCTING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS PROCESS	Class I	1st	10	0	C-T	Termination	
41	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - UNINTENTIONAL/IMPROPER SEARCH, SEIZURE, OR ARREST	Class II	1st	2	3	C-S2	Suspension	1
41	Police Officer 2	UNK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	3	4	C-S3	Suspension	2
42	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	3	3	C-S3	Counseling	
43	Police Officer	WHITE	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	8	4	C-S2	Suspension	10
43	Police Officer	WHITE	MALE	314.30-1c	INSUBORDINATION - FAILURE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER	Class I	1st	8	4	S3-T	Suspension	10
44	Police Officer 1	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	3	2	C-S3	Suspension	1
44	Police Officer 2	FILIPINO	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	3	2	C-S3	Counseling	
45	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	3	3	C-S2	Counseling	
46	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	2nd	3	3	WR-S5	Suspension	4
46	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	2nd	3	3	WR-S5	Suspension	4

47	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2g	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CARE OF PROPERTY	Class II	1st	1	4	C-S2	Counseling	
48	Police Officer	WHITE	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	1	3	C-S2	Counseling	
49	Police Officer 1	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
49	Police Officer 2	UNK	FEMALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	4	4	C-S2	Counseling	
49	Police Officer 3	AMIND	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
49	Police Officer 4	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
50	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	1	3	C-S-3	Counseling	
51	Police Officer 1	BLACK	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
51	Police Officer 2	WHITE	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	1	4	C-S2	Counseling	
51	Police Officer 3	ASIAN	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
51	Police Officer 4	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	2	4	C-S2	Counseling	
52	Police Officer	BLACK	MALE	314.07-2b	CONDUCT TOWARD OTHERS - DEMEANOR	Class II	1st	3	5	C-S3	Counseling	
53	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	4	3	C-S3	Counseling	
54	Police Officer	WHITE	FEMALE	314.39-2f	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - GENERAL	Class II	1st	1	3	C-S2	Counseling	
55	Police Officer	HISPANIC	MALE	314.39-1e	PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - MIRANDA VIOLATION	Class I	2nd	5	6	S5-T	Suspension	5