Start of Block: Default Question Block

*ISR ENTRY INSTRUMENT*

Q1 * ISR Number

* Page Number of PDF

Page Break
Q2 * Type of Stop Event [SELECT ONLY ONE]

☐ a. Terry Stop

☐ b. Probable Cause Stop (Skip to Q.6)

☐ c. Citizen Encounter (i.e. the officer responded to a call of a person in need of assistance, responded to a call for a well-being check, or engaged in a social contact or other voluntary, non-custodial interview) (skip to Q.6)

☐ d. Error (ISR Generated in Error) (Skip to Q.20)

☐ e. Other (Specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q3 *
Does the ISR establish that there was reasonable articulable suspicion for the stop in that the subject had been, was, or would soon be engaged in criminal activity? (CPD Special Order S04-13-09 IV.A)

- Yes (Go to Q4, skip Q5)
- No (Go to Q5, skip Q4)
Q4 Comments Notes/Comments (Q4 - Factors for RAS in Stop)

Q4 * What factor(s) set forth in the ISR provided RAS for the stop? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Actions indicative of engaging in a drug transaction?

☐ b. Fits description of offender as described by victim or witness?

☐ c. Fits description from Flash Message
d. Actions indicative of "casing" victim or location

☐ d. Actions indicative of "casing" victim or location

☐ e. Proximity to the reported crime location

☐ f. Met the standards of the gang or narcotics loitering ordinance

☐ g. Subject's physical behavior (e.g., manner of movement, body language)

☐ h. Circumstances of the encounter (e.g., the time of day, nature of the neighborhood, location on street, proximity to crime scene)

☐ i. Subject's words (e.g., statements, answers to questions, representations)

☐ j. Officer's prior knowledge about the subject (e.g., prior interactions, and/or knowledge of subject's criminal history or criminal modus operandi)

☐ k. Additional/Other (specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q5 Comment Notes/Comments (Q5 - Lacking Factors for RAS in Stop)

Q5 * Why doesn't the ISR establish RAS for the initial stop? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Reliance on location without other sufficient justification

☐ b. Reliance on evasion/nervousness of subject without other sufficient justification

☐ c. Reliance on innate/immutable subject characteristic(s) (e.g., race/gender) without other sufficient justification

☐ d. Reliance on uncorroborated, anonymous tip without other sufficient justification

☐ e. For a stop based on a complaint, the description of subject did not match description of alleged offender

☐ f. Reliance on conclusory statements rather than facts without other sufficient justification

☐ g. Incomplete documentation/narrative (e.g., insufficient facts articulated or incomplete data provided such that stop justification could not be readily determined one way or another)

☐ h. Failed to meet the standards of the gang/narcotics loitering ordinance and the stop is not otherwise justified by reasonable suspicion

☐ i. Additional/Other (specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q6 * Did the officer conduct a protective pat down during the stop?

○ Yes

○ No (go to Q19)
Q7 * Was the pat down based on consent

○ Yes (Go to Q 11)

○ No
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Q8 *
Does the ISR establish RAS for the protective pat down, in that a reasonable officer under the circumstances would have suspected that the stopped subject may have been armed and dangerous or presented a danger of attack to the officer or another? (CPD Special Order S04-13-09 VI.A.1)

☐ Yes (Go to Q 9, skip Q 10)

☐ No (Go to Q10, skip Q 9)
Q9 Comments Notes/Comments (Q9 - Factors for Pat Down)

Q9 * What factor(s) set forth in the ISR provided reasonable grounds for conducting the pat down? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Verbal threats of violence by suspect

☐ b. Knowledge of suspect’s prior criminal violent behavior/use of force/use of weapon

☐ c. Actions indicative of engaging in violent behavior

☐ d. Violent crime suspected

☐ e. Suspicious bulge/object

☐ f. The basis for the stop itself (e.g., factors that justified making the initial stop also/by extension justified the protective pat down)

☐ g. Observable subject behavior consistent with carrying a weapon or firearm (e.g., failing to comply with instructions, failing to keep hands in sight of officer(s))

☐ h. Additional/other (specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q10 * Why doesn't the ISR establish RAS for the protective pat down? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Missing pat down narrative/reason for protective pat down description (i.e., does not indicate presence of danger or threat of attack)

☐ b. Factors articulated fail to establish sufficient grounds for RAS

☐ c. Additional/other factors (specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q11(a) * Was a search beyond a protective pat down conducted?

〇 Yes

〇 No (Go to Q 16)

Q11(b) * Was the search related to (i.e. arising out of) the pat down?

〇 Yes (Go to Q12)

〇 No (Go to Q19)
Q12 * Was the related search based on consent?

- a. Yes (Go to Q16)
- b. No (Go to Q13)
Q13 * Did the protective pat down provide probable cause for the related search?

○ a. Yes (Go to Q14)

○ b. No (Go to Q15)
Q14 * What factors, as set forth in the ISR, provided the basis for the related search beyond a pat down? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Plain touch (e.g., officer felt what he or she believed to be a weapon or contraband) (CPD Special Order S04-13-09 VI.B)

☐ b. Search of personal possessions based on RAS that there was a concealed weapon within reach

☐ c. Search of personal possessions based on plain view (e.g., officer viewed contraband in personal possessions)

☐ d. Other (Specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q15 * Why doesn't the ISR establish probable cause for the related search beyond a pat down? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ a. Missing search narrative/reason for search description

☐ b. Factors articulated fail to establish sufficient grounds (Please specify in box directly underneath; consider factors listed in Q 14)

☐ c. Additional/Other factors (Specify in Notes/Comments above)
Q16 * Did the officer discover contraband, drugs, weapons, or firearms during the PPD and/or search pursuant to the PPD? (Regardless of justification for the action)

☐ Yes

☐ No (Go to Q 19, skip Q 17 and Q 18)
Q17 * Indicate what was found during the *protective pat down* [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ Contraband (other than drug substances)
☐ Drugs
☐ Weapons
☐ Firearms
☐ Nothing
Q18 * Indicate what was found during the search pursuant to the PPD [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

☐ Contraband (other than drug substances)
☐ Drugs
☐ Weapons
☐ Firearms
☐ Nothing
Q19 * Does the ISR show an inconsistency between the narrative field and the check boxes?
(Specify in Notes/Comments)

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q19 Comments Notes/Comments
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Q20 * Did the ISR involve a Terry Stop?
   ○ Yes (Go to Q21)
   ○ No (Go to Q24)

Q21 * Does the identified error in the multiple version ISR concern the legal narratives RAS determination?
   ○ Yes (Go to Q22)
   ○ No (Skip Q22-23)

Q22 * Did the submitting officer correctly articulate RAS?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No (Go to Q23)

Q23 * Did the first reviewer correctly identify the RAS error?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No (Go to Q 24)

*The “RAS error” can refer to the Terry Stop, protective pat down or the search. The objective here is simply to determine if the reviewing supervisors are correctly identifying the legal errors being made by some officers; the objective at this time is NOT to identify the types of errors being made by the submitting officers in the ISR versions prior to the final version.
Q24 * Did the reviewer send the ISR back to the submitting officer?

☐ Yes (Go to Q25)

☐ No (Go to Q26)

*If the first reviewer sent the ISR to the IU for a determination before resubmission to the officer, note only whether the officer ever had an opportunity to correct the ISR – it doesn't matter who sent the ISR back to the officer, only that the officer revised the initial submission.

Q25 * Did the officer fix the identified error?

☐ Yes

☐ No

*It does not matter how many "versions" it took to reach the correct determination. The # of versions can be determined apart from coding an answer.
Q26 * What was the finalized status code of the ISR? (RESPONSE IS CASE SENSITIVE)

---

Report Status Codes:

- PRE (preliminary/not submitted yet)
- SCN (submitted for cancellation)
- SUB (submitted by police officer)
- APR (approved by Source Unit Supervisor (SUS) or 1st Reviewer/Sergeant)
- REJ (administrative rejection by SUS)
- CLD/ARC (copy of submitted ISR before revisions made is "closed" after it is "archived")
- DEF (ISR substantively rejected by SUS or hard copy d/n match electronic version)
- REV (= Deficiency Rejection Review Occurred)

Possible Outcomes:

a) FIN ("Deficiency Rejection Review Final") = Integrity Unit concluded that SUS's final determination of No-RAS or ISR created in error was correct;
b) APR (Approved and finalized because the IU disagrees with SUS and finds consistent with CPD policy);
c) DEF (IU determines ISR is substantively deficient but can be corrected by officer; removes the "REV" code and returns to officer for correction and resubmission to SUS)

Q27 * In cases where a supervisor sent the ISR back to the submitting officer, did the officer supplement or change the facts supporting RAS with information that did not appear elsewhere on the ISR as originally submitted?

- ☐ Yes (Go to Q28)
- ☐ No (Go to Q29 – end of survey)
- ☐ Does not apply (Go to Q29 – end of survey)
Q28 * If the answer to Q. 27 is YES (i.e., the narrative facts changed in the final ISR), please describe what changed?


Q29 * ISR Number (RE ENTER)


Prepared By:


Date Completed:


* This report is now completed: (Check 'YES' and then the red progression arrow to COMPLETE AND END SURVEY)

☐ Yes

End of Block: Default Question Block