

Assessing the Impact of the Office of the Independent Monitor on Complainant and Officer Satisfaction

Conducted for the
Office of the Independent Monitor
Denver, Colorado

March 11, 2008

Joseph De Angelis, Ohio University

Introduction

This report presents the final results of a multi-year research project that uses anonymous mailed surveys to examine how the implementation of Denver's Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) affects satisfaction among complainants and police officers.¹ The first stage, called the *baseline* survey, was an anonymous mailed survey sent in fall 2005 to all Denver police officers and to community members who filed police complaints PRIOR to the implementation of the OIM. In order to gauge how the implementation of the OIM has affected levels of satisfaction, *post-implementation* surveys were administered to Denver police officers in September 2006 and again in November 2007. Community members who filed complaints after the implementation of the OIM have received surveys on a quarterly basis, as their complaints have been resolved.

In this report, we compare the levels of satisfaction between the baseline and post-implementation periods for both officers and citizen complainants. Specifically, we compare levels of officer and complainant satisfaction with the previous complaint process to officer and complainant satisfaction with the new complaint process.

The report is divided into four main sections:

- **Executive Summary:** In this section we highlight the central findings of the baseline and post-implementation surveys;
- **Methodology:** This section outlines survey methodology used in the research;
- **Research Findings:** In this section we report the findings of the research; and
- **Appendix:** This appendix contains copies of the survey instruments and respondent demographics

Questions and comments about the implications of the research for the City of Denver can be directed to the Office of the Independent Monitor at (720) 913-3306 or by email at ois@ci.denver.co.us.

Questions or comments about the research methodology or findings should be directed to Dr. Joseph De Angelis, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Ohio University at (740) 593-1371 or by email at deangeli@ohio.edu.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Survey Methods	6
Familiarity with the Complaint Process	9
Complainant Satisfaction with Internal Affairs	10
Officer Satisfaction with Internal Affairs	11
Satisfaction with the Quality of Communication	12
Complainant Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process	13
Officer Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process	14
Complainant Views on Citizen Oversight	16
Officer Views on Citizen Oversight	17
Conclusion	18
Appendices	
• Appendix A: Officer Questionnaire	22
• Appendix B: Complainant Questionnaire	26
• Appendix C: Demographic Characteristics for Complainants	30
• Appendix D: Demographic Characteristics for Officers	31
• Appendix E: About the Author	32
Endnotes	33

Executive Summary

In order to gauge officer satisfaction with the complaint process over time, all Denver Police Department (DPD) officers were surveyed in three waves. A *baseline* survey was administered in fall 2005, and follow-up surveys were administered in fall 2006 and fall 2007. The response rates for these surveys were 43%, 29%, and 30%. To measure complainant satisfaction over time, a baseline survey was administered to community members who filed complaints against Denver police officers in the three years prior to the implementation of the OIM. Satisfaction surveys were also administered to community members who filed complaints through the OIM-administered complainant process on a quarterly basis between August 2005 and September 2007. The response rate for the baseline complainant surveys was 20%, while the post-implementation response rate was 19%.

The following is a brief summary of the results of these surveys, with particular attention paid to differences between the baseline and post-implementation survey results. We strongly encourage readers to read the more detailed results. Due to the low response rates, particularly among complainants, caution should be used when drawing inferences about the overall population of officers and complainants based on this pool of survey respondents.

Familiarity with the Complaint Process

- There was a significant increase between 2005 and 2007 in the percentage of complainants who reported that they understood the complaint process either well or very well (from 35.9% to 52.1%).
- In 2007, about half of the complainants reported that it was easy or very easy to file their complaint.

Satisfaction with Internal Affairs

- Complainants who responded to the survey reported increases of roughly six percentage points in satisfaction with the objectivity, politeness, and respectfulness of internal affairs investigators between 2005 and 2007.
- Officer views toward the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) improved significantly between the baseline and post-implementation surveys, with officers reporting eight to twelve point increases in satisfaction with the efficiency, thoroughness, and objectivity of IAB investigations.

Satisfaction with Communication

- Among complainants, there were strong increases between 2005 and 2007 in satisfaction with how well they were kept informed about the status of their complaint (10.9% to 19.4%), and with the information they received about the outcome on their complaint (12.9% to 22.1%). There was also improvement in satisfaction with the explanations they received about police policy between 2005 and 2007 (9.6% to 18.8%).

Overall Satisfaction with the Complaint Process

- There was no substantive change between 2005 and 2007 on five of the six questions that measured respondent satisfaction with the overall complaint process. There was, however, some improvement in respondent satisfaction with the efficiency of the complaint process between 2005 and 2007.
- Between 2005 and 2007, officers reported substantial gains in satisfaction with the complaint process. There was a drop in the percentage of officers who reported that they believed that the complaint process was biased in favor of citizens (from 66% to 50%). There was also a ten-point increase between 2005 and 2007 in the percentage of officers who believed that the rights of officers are well protected within the complaint process. Most strikingly, there was a very strong increase in satisfaction with the overall process among officers who received complaints, from 12% in 2005 to 34% in 2007.

Satisfaction with Citizen Oversight

- In terms of the citizen attitudes toward the Denver's specific oversight agencies, there was an increase in complainant satisfaction following the implementation of the OIM. The percentage of complainants who indicated that the oversight agency was biased in favor of police officers dropped from 73% in 2005 to 50% in 2007.
- There was a strong increase between 2005 and 2007 in reported officer satisfaction with the quality of the oversight decision-making. In 2005, 78% of officers disagreed with the statement that the PSRC carefully weighed information given by officers before making decisions. In 2007, only 24% of officers disagreed with the statement that the OIM carefully weighed information given by officers before making decisions.

Survey Methods

This project was designed to measure how the implementation of the Office of the Independent Monitor has affected levels of satisfaction among Denver police officers and community members who filed complaints against police officers.

Survey Instrument Design

The survey instruments for all complainants were administered as anonymous mailed surveys, as were the instruments for Denver police officers surveyed in 2005 and 2006. The 2007 officer survey was administered as an anonymous online survey (see appendices A and B for copies of the 2007 survey instruments). Each survey respondent was provided with a survey form by mail or email (for the 2007 officer survey) that solicited no individually identifying personal information. All respondents were informed of the goals of the study, that their participation was voluntary, and that their responses would be anonymous.

The instrument for all complainants and police officers had a mix of closed and open questions that were designed to measure core issues,² such as:

- Satisfaction with the fairness, thoroughness, efficiency, and outcomes of the complaint process;
- Perceptions regarding the professionalism and objectivity of the internal affairs and police monitor staff;
- Satisfaction with the overall job the city of Denver is doing in responding to allegations of misconduct;
- Details about the survey respondents (such as the number of complaints in which they have been involved and demographic information).

In order to boost the response officer response rate, the 2007 online officer survey instrument was shortened considerably. While the 2007 online officer survey was based on the earlier instruments, it included only roughly half of the questions used in earlier surveys.

The response format for many of the questions on the survey instruments consisted of five-point Likert-type scales that were anchored by either Very Satisfied/Very Dissatisfied or Strongly Agree/Strongly Disagree. Other questions included Yes/No responses and several questions were formatted to elicit open-ended comments about the complaint process.

Distribution of Citizen Surveys

Since the goal of the baseline survey was to measure the attitudes of complainants PRIOR to the implementation of the OIM, all complainants with a valid postal address who filed a complaint against a Denver police officer and had it closed between August 1, 2003 and August 1, 2005 were surveyed.³ Complainants were identified by the OIM through the use of the Internal Affairs Bureau's (IAB) information management database. In order to measure the impact of the OIM, post-implementation surveys were administered to all complainants with a postal address who filed a complaint against Denver police officers between August

2005 and September 2007.

For the baseline survey 1,118 complainants with a complete postal address were mailed a survey. From that population, 368 surveys were returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Post Office and 148 were completed and returned. This gave us a baseline complainant response rate of 20%. For the post-implementation surveys, 1,111 complainants with a complete postal address were mailed a survey. From that population, 173 surveys were returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Post Office and 176 were completed and returned. This gave us a baseline complainant response rate of 19%. Even though this response rate is low, it is consistent with the response rates found in similar studies.⁴

The demographic characteristics of respondents were compared between the baseline and post-implementation surveys, and there were no statistically significant differences in terms of gender, race, age or education. Moreover, the respondent characteristics were not significantly different from those of the overall population of complainants with regard to gender and case outcome. See Appendix C for complainant demographic information.⁵

Distribution of Officer Surveys

The 2005 and 2006 officer surveys were administered to Denver officers directly via their precinct mailboxes. In order to boost the officer response rate to the survey, the Independent Monitor sent two emails to all DPD officers after the distribution of each of the surveys encouraging them to complete and return the surveys. Approximately 1,500 officer surveys were distributed during both the baseline and the post-implementation surveys (representing all sworn DPD police officers). Overall, 648 completed and returned the baseline survey (43% response) while 439 officers completed and returned the post-implementation survey (29% response).⁶ The 2007 survey was administered electronically to all Denver police officers via their official police department email accounts. The initial solicitation email included a link to an online survey. Of the roughly 1500 Denver officers, 446 responded to the online survey (30%).

Officer demographics were compared between the 2005, 2006, and 2007 surveys, and there were no statistically significant differences in terms of race, age, education, or gender. The post-implementation surveys may have had a higher percentage of sergeants and detectives. Officer demographic information was also compared to the overall population of DPD officers (see Appendix D). Overall, the characteristics of the respondents were similar with regard to race/ethnicity, gender, age, and rank to that of the overall population of DPD officers. There were a few small differences, however, between the respondent pool and the overall DPD population. For the baseline survey, the pool of responding officers may have contained a slightly smaller percentage of female officers, Latino/Hispanics, officers under age 35, officers who have been on the force five or fewer years, and detectives. For the post-implementation surveys, sergeants and detectives, males, and those between the age of 45-and 54 may have been slightly overrepresented. African American and Latino/Hispanic officers may have been slightly underrepresented. Unfortunately, information relating to gender, race, and age were missing for roughly 20% of the baseline respondents. Rank information was missing for 29% of the baseline respondents. As a result of this missing data, we report only unweighted data.

Response Categories were Collapsed for this Report

In order to simplify the reporting of the survey results, we chose to collapse the reported responses from a five-point scale to a three-point scale in this report. For example, on questions where officers and complainants reported being very satisfied or satisfied, responses were collapsed into the category of satisfied. On questions where the respondents reported very dissatisfied or dissatisfied, responses were collapsed into the category of dissatisfied.⁷ Blanks and responses of “Don’t Know” were excluded from the analysis.

A Word of Caution on Low Response Rates

In survey projects of this type, some caution is warranted when trying to use the survey results to draw conclusions about the overall population of police officers and complainants. It is important to note that those who did not respond may hold different views of the citizen complaint process than those who did respond. For example, respondents who are highly dissatisfied with the complaint process may have a greater incentive to respond to customer satisfaction surveys than respondents who are satisfied or neutral in relation to the complaint process. This does not mean, of course, that the results are of no use. The characteristics of complainants and officers were very similar between the reporting periods, so it is likely that the year-to-year changes we observe do tap into changes in satisfaction among that subgroup of officers and complainants. Even so, we should consider these percentages to be descriptive to the individuals who responded to the survey.

Research Findings

Familiarity with the Complaint Process

The first section of the survey included questions that were designed to measure how well complainants and officers felt they understood the complaint process.⁸

Complainant Understanding of the Process

There was a significant increase between 2005 and 2007 in the percentage of complaints who reported that they understood the complaint process either well or very well. There was little change between 2006 and 2007 in complainant familiarity with the complaint process.

In addition to being asked about their knowledge of the process, complainants were also asked several questions designed to examine their perceptions regarding the accessibility of the complaint process. Overall, almost half of the responding complainants reported that it was either easy or very easy to file a complaint.

Officers' Understanding of the Process

There was little change between the baseline and 2006 post-implementation survey in relation to officers' understanding of the complaint process. For both surveys, more than half of officers reported that they understood the process well. In order to shorten the survey instrument, this question was not administered to officers in 2007.

Table 1: How well do you feel you understand the citizen complaint process?

	2005	2006	2007
Citizens			
<i>Well</i>	35.9%	51.0%	52.1%
<i>Neutral</i>	28.3%	29.6%	26.0%
<i>Poorly</i>	35.9%	19.4%	21.9%
<i>Number</i>	145	98	73

Table 2: How easy was it for you to file your complaint?

	2005	2006	2007
<i>Easy</i>	41.0%	45.2%	47.3%
<i>Neutral</i>	31.9%	26.9%	28.4%
<i>Hard</i>	27.1%	28.0%	24.3%
<i>Number</i>	144	93	74

Table 3: How well do you feel you understand the citizen complaint process?

	2005	2006	2007
Officers			
<i>Well</i>	54.3%	50.6%	-
<i>Neutral</i>	22.6%	27.2%	-
<i>Poorly</i>	23.2%	22.2%	-
<i>Number</i>	643	437	-

Satisfaction with Internal Affairs

In the next section of the surveys, complainants and officers were asked a series of questions that were designed to measure their opinions about the efficiency, thoroughness, and objectivity of the Internal Affairs Bureau.

Complainant Satisfaction with Internal Affairs

Satisfaction with Internal Affairs was lower among complainants than among officers, though there was some improvement in satisfaction over time. In particular, respondent satisfaction with the objectivity, politeness, and respectfulness of investigators increased between 2005 and 2007.

Table 4: Complainant Evaluations of the Objectivity, Thoroughness, and Efficiency of Internal Affairs

	2005	2006	2007
How satisfied were you:			
with the objectivity of the complaint investigator?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	20.9%	16.1%	26.5%
<i>Neutral</i>	11.9%	12.9%	13.2%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	67.2%	71.0%	60.3%
<i>Number</i>	134	93	68
that the Internal Affairs staff were polite?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	44.1%	37.6%	50.8%
<i>Neutral</i>	18.9%	21.2%	25.4%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	37.0%	41.2%	23.8%
<i>Number</i>	127	85	63
with how well the investigator listened to your description of what happened?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	38.9%	30.8%	31.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	11.5%	17.6%	25.4%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	49.6%	51.6%	42.9%
<i>Number</i>	131	91	63
with the fairness of the investigator's questions?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	31.5%	23.6%	38.3%
<i>Neutral</i>	16.9%	31.5%	20.0%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	51.5%	44.9%	41.7%
<i>Number</i>	130	89	60
that you were interviewed soon enough after filing the complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	35.6%	33.0%	33.9%
<i>Neutral</i>	16.7%	25.3%	9.7%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	47.7%	41.8%	56.5%
<i>Number</i>	132	91	62
that the investigator treated you with respect?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	42.9%	37.4%	47.6%
<i>Neutral</i>	15.8%	22.0%	15.9%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	41.4%	40.7%	36.5%
<i>Number</i>	133	91	63

Satisfaction of ALL Officers with Internal Affairs⁹

Officer views toward the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) improved significantly between the baseline and post-implementation surveys. For example, officer satisfaction with how well Internal Affairs investigators listened increased from 42% in 2005 to 51% in 2007. Similarly, 33% of the officers who responded to the survey in 2007 agreed that Internal Affairs investigates in an unbiased manner, up from 24% in 2005.

Table 5: Officer Evaluations of the Objectivity, Thoroughness, and Efficiency of Internal Affairs

	2005	2006	2007
Internal Affairs listens carefully to information given by officers.			
<i>Agree</i>	42.1%	48.8%	51.2%
<i>Neutral</i>	22.5%	28.0%	33.6%
<i>Disagree</i>	35.4%	23.2%	15.2%
<i>Number</i>	565	422	441
Internal Affairs investigates all complaints thoroughly.			
<i>Agree</i>	44.5%	47.6%	52.4%
<i>Neutral</i>	24.9%	26.6%	29.9%
<i>Disagree</i>	30.6%	25.9%	17.7%
<i>Number</i>	591	410	441
Internal Affairs investigates all complaints in an unbiased manner.			
<i>Agree</i>	24.3%	26.5%	32.5%
<i>Neutral</i>	26.5%	29.0%	36.4%
<i>Disagree</i>	49.2%	44.5%	31.1%
<i>Number</i>	593	407	440
Internal Affairs investigates complaints efficiently.			
<i>Agree</i>	20.0%	29.2%	31.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	20.5%	25.5%	33.7%
<i>Disagree</i>	59.4%	45.3%	34.6%
<i>Number</i>	594	411	439

Complainant Satisfaction with the Quality of Communication

Complainants were also asked a number of questions that were intended to examine satisfaction with the quality of communication about their complaint. In particular, we wanted to measure how satisfied complainants were that the complaint process was clearly explained to them, that they were kept adequately informed about the progress on their case, and that they were clearly informed about the outcome of the complaint. In order to shorten the length of the online survey, officers were not asked these questions in 2007.

Table 6: Complainant Satisfaction with Communication

	2005	2006	2007
How satisfied were you:			
that the complaint process was clearly explained to you?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	27.4%	26.6%	34.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	23.0%	19.1%	18.1%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	49.6%	54.3%	47.2%
<i>Number</i>	135	94	72
that Internal Affairs explained how long it would take to investigate your complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	23.4%	21.1%	25.4%
<i>Neutral</i>	14.8%	18.9%	20.9%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	61.7%	60.0%	53.7%
<i>Number</i>	128	90	67
that you were kept informed about what was happening with your complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	10.9%	16.2%	19.4%
<i>Neutral</i>	12.4%	10.1%	12.5%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	76.6%	73.7%	68.1%
<i>Number</i>	137	99	72
with the letters you received?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	14.3%	13.4%	21.4%
<i>Neutral</i>	11.4%	21.6%	18.6%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	74.3%	64.9%	60.0%
<i>Number</i>	140	97	70
that Internal Affairs gave clear explanations about how officers are supposed to act in incidents like yours?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	9.6%	8.5%	18.8%
<i>Neutral</i>	9.6%	9.6%	10.1%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	80.9%	81.9%	71.0%
<i>Number</i>	136	94	69
that you were informed about what happened as a result of your complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	12.9%	11.0%	22.1%
<i>Neutral</i>	13.7%	15.0%	13.2%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	73.4%	74.0%	64.7%
<i>Number</i>	139	100	68

Complainant satisfaction with the quality of letters increased from 14% to 21% between 2005 and 2007. Similarly, there were strong increases in complainant satisfaction with the information they received about the outcome on their complaint and with the explanations they received about police policy during the same time period. There was some improvement in satisfaction with how well they were kept informed about the status of their complaint.

Even though there was improvement between 2005 and 2007, a majority of complainants who responded to this survey reported that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the quality of communication on their complaints. Roughly 22% of the respondents in 2007 reported that they were satisfied with the information they received about the outcome on their complaint.

Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process

Officers and complainants were also asked a series of questions that were meant to measure their views regarding the overall complaint process.

Complainant Satisfaction with the Overall Process

Like satisfaction with communication, a majority of the community members who responded to the survey indicated that they were dissatisfied with the complaint process. Roughly three-quarters of the respondents reported that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the complaint process in general. Moreover, there was no significant change between 2005 and 2007 on five of the six questions that measured respondent satisfaction with the overall complaint process.

There was, however, some improvement in satisfaction with the efficiency of the process. Altogether there was a thirteen-point drop in the percentage of complainants who reported that they were dissatisfied that their complaint was handled quickly.

Table 7: Complainant Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process

	2005	2006	2007
How satisfied were you:			
that your complaint was handled quickly?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	18.3%	23.5%	22.2%
<i>Neutral</i>	16.2%	21.4%	25.0%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	65.5%	55.1%	52.8%
<i>Number</i>	142	98	72
that the Denver Police Department considered your views before making a decision on the complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	9.0%	8.5%	11.9%
<i>Neutral</i>	11.2%	11.7%	10.4%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	79.9%	79.8%	77.6%
<i>Number</i>	134	94	67
that enough information was gathered before a decision was made on your complaint?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	13.0%	7.3%	15.5%
<i>Neutral</i>	13.0%	13.5%	12.7%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	74.0%	79.2%	71.8%
<i>Number</i>	131	96	71
that you were treated fairly?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	15.0%	7.2%	17.3%
<i>Neutral</i>	12.1%	15.5%	12.0%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	72.9%	77.3%	70.7%
<i>Number</i>	140	97	75
with the outcome you received?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	8.0%	4.3%	10.0%
<i>Neutral</i>	5.8%	6.4%	2.9%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	86.2%	89.4%	87.1%
<i>Number</i>	138	94	70
with the complaint process in general?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	11.7%	10.2%	14.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	13.8%	12.2%	11.8%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	74.5%	77.6%	73.5%
<i>Number</i>	145	98	68

Officer Satisfaction with the Overall Process

There were a number of significant changes to the reported satisfaction of officers with the overall complaint process. Between 2005 and 2007, there was a substantial drop in the percentage of officers who reported that they believed that the process was biased in favor of citizens (from 66% to 50%). There was a twenty-point drop in the percentage of officers who disagreed with the statement that officers' rights are well protected within the complaint process.

There was also an increase in satisfaction with the neutrality of police command staff. For example, the percentage of officers who indicated that command staff makes fair decisions increased by almost ten percentage points. In a similar fashion, there was a six-point increase in the percentage of officers who agreed that command staff carefully consider information given by officers.

Table 8: Officer Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process

	2005	2006	2007
The complaint process is biased in favor of citizens.			
<i>Agree</i>	66.4%	54.3%	49.6%
<i>Neutral</i>	19.8%	25.3%	37.4%
<i>Disagree</i>	13.8%	20.4%	13.0%
<i>Number</i>	616	427	423
Officers' basic rights are well protected within the complaint process.			
<i>Agree</i>	24.5%	27.9%	34.8%
<i>Neutral</i>	17.9%	26.9%	28.1%
<i>Disagree</i>	57.6%	45.2%	37.1%
<i>Number</i>	625	420	420
Police command staff usually make fair disciplinary decisions.			
<i>Agree</i>	17.9%	21.3%	26.9%
<i>Neutral</i>	16.2%	18.2%	26.2%
<i>Disagree</i>	65.9%	60.5%	46.9%
<i>Number</i>	613	428	424
Police command staff carefully consider information given by officers before making a decision on a complaint.			
<i>Agree</i>	21.2%	21.0%	27.1%
<i>Neutral</i>	18.2%	23.4%	28.1%
<i>Disagree</i>	60.6%	55.6%	44.8%
<i>Number</i>	599	414	424

Satisfaction with the Overall Process for Officers Who Received Complaints

When we looked specifically at officers who had been the subject of citizen complaints (and thus had first-hand contact with the complaint system), we found that there were a number of areas where substantial improvements were made in terms of officer satisfaction. Satisfaction with the efficiency of the complaint process increased from 20% in 2005 to 34% in 2007. There was also a moderate increase between 2005 and 2007 in officer satisfaction with the outcome on their complaint (from 49% to 56%).

The most significant change was in overall satisfaction with the complaint process. Between 2005 and 2007, officer satisfaction increased from 12% to 36%, while dissatisfaction decreased from 64% to 42%.

Table 9: Satisfaction with the Overall Complaint Process for Officers who Received Complaints

	2005	2006	2007
How satisfied were you:			
That the decision on the complaint was made in a reasonable amount of time?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	20.0%	32.1%	33.9%
<i>Neutral</i>	13.6%	23.9%	23.1%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	64.0%	44.0%	43.0%
<i>Number</i>	360	134	121
That you received the outcome you deserved?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	49.0%	53.3%	55.9%
<i>Neutral</i>	16.2%	25.2%	19.5%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	34.7%	21.5%	24.6%
<i>Number</i>	357	135	118
With the complaint process in general?			
<i>Satisfied</i>	11.8%	34.8%	36.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	24.2%	34.8%	20.8%
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	64.0%	30.5%	42.5%
<i>Number</i>	364	141	120

Views on Citizen Oversight

In addition to asking questions about Internal Affairs, complainants and officers were asked a series of questions that were designed to determine their views on citizen participation within Denver’s police complaint process. In particular, we were interested in measuring two specific attitudes. First, we wanted to determine the extent to which officers believe that citizen involvement in the complaint process is necessary or beneficial. Second, we wanted to compare attitudes toward the Public Safety Review Commission (PSRC) to attitudes toward the OIM.

Complainant Views on Citizen Oversight

It is clear that a firm majority of the respondents believed that it is beneficial to have independent citizen monitoring the complaint process and that citizen oversight improves the complaint process.

In terms of the citizen attitudes toward the Denver’s specific oversight agencies, there was a significant increase in complainant satisfaction following the implementation of the OIM. The percentage of complainants who indicated that the oversight agency was biased in favor of police officers dropped from 73% in 2005 to 50% in 2007.

Between 2006 and 2007 there was a fourteen-point drop in the percentage of complaints who indicated that they were dissatisfied with the performance of the OIM. Slightly more than 50% of the 2007 respondents indicated that they were satisfied or neutral in relation to the OIM’s performance, up from 40% in 2006. Unfortunately, this question was not included in the 2005 baseline survey, so these results cannot be compared to overall complainant satisfaction with the PSRC.

Table 10: Complainant Views on Citizen Oversight

	PSRC 2005	OIM 2006	OIM 2007
It is important to have independent citizens monitor the complaint process			
<i>Agree</i>	94.3%	86.5%	87.8%
<i>Neutral</i>	4.3%	6.3%	2.7%
<i>Disagree</i>	1.4%	7.3%	9.5%
<i>Number</i>	140	96	74
Citizen oversight of the police improves Internal Affairs investigations			
<i>Agree</i>	87.1%	78.0%	74.6%
<i>Neutral</i>	5.3%	8.8%	90.0%
<i>Disagree</i>	7.6%	13.2%	16.4%
<i>Number</i>	132	91	67
The [Oversight Body] is biased in favor of officers			
<i>Agree</i>	73.3%	58.2%	50.0%
<i>Neutral</i>	21.9%	24.1%	37.5%
<i>Disagree</i>	4.8%	17.7%	12.5%
<i>Number</i>	105	79	64
The [Oversight Body] does a good job of monitoring police investigations			
<i>Agree</i>	5.3%	19.4%	12.5%
<i>Neutral</i>	26.3%	26.9%	29.2%
<i>Disagree</i>	68.4%	53.7%	58.3%
<i>Number</i>	95	67	48
Overall, I'm satisfied with the performance of the Independent Monitor			
<i>Agree</i>	-	19.6%	14.5%
<i>Neutral</i>	-	19.6%	38.7%
<i>Disagree</i>	-	60.8%	46.8%
<i>Number</i>	-	51	62

Officer Views on Citizen Oversight

There were several important changes in the reported attitudes of Denver police officers in relation to citizen oversight. There was a strong increase in reported officer satisfaction with the quality of the OIM decision-making. In 2005, 78% of officers disagreed with the statement that the PSRC carefully weighed information given by officers before making decisions. In 2007, only 24% of officers disagreed with the statement that the OIM carefully weighed information given by officers before making decisions.

In 2005, 44% of officers reported that they believed that the OIM would improve the complaint process. In 2007, 39% of officers reported that the OIM had improved the process. Even so, only 22% of officers in 2007 indicated that the OIM had not improved the complaint process. A similarly small percentage (22%) disagreed with the statement that the OIM does a good job of monitoring Internal Affairs investigations.

When it comes to overall satisfaction with the OIM, there was little change between 2006 and 2007. In both years, more than 75% of the responding officers were either satisfied or neutral in relation to the performance of the OIM. Since this question was not included in the 2005 baseline survey, it is not possible to compare these results to the officer attitudes toward the PSRC.

Table 11: Officer Views on Citizen Oversight

	PSRC 2005	OIM 2006	OIM 2007
The [Oversight Body] carefully weighed information given by officers before making decisions.			
<i>Agree</i>	7.6%	23.5%	21.3%
<i>Neutral</i>	14.4%	49.2%	54.3%
<i>Disagree</i>	78.1%	27.2%	24.4%
<i>Number</i>	556	327	427
The Office of the Independent Monitor [will improve/has improved] the complaint process.			
<i>Agree</i>	43.5%	40.5%	39.3%
<i>Neutral</i>	40.5%	33.5%	38.3%
<i>Disagree</i>	15.9%	25.9%	22.4%
<i>Number</i>	464	370	428
The Office of the Independent Monitor [will/does] a good job of monitoring Internal Affairs investigations.			
<i>Agree</i>	34.3%	23.2%	22.0%
<i>Neutral</i>	53.1%	51.2%	55.7%
<i>Disagree</i>	12.6%	25.6%	22.2%
<i>Number</i>	437	297	427
Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the Independent Monitor.			
<i>Agree</i>	-	32.0%	33.7%
<i>Neutral</i>	-	46.9%	45.2%
<i>Disagree</i>	-	21.2%	24.1%
<i>Number</i>	-	397	427

Conclusions

Our focus in this report has been to report on the differences between the 2005 baseline survey results – which gauge officers’ and complaints’ views about the complaint process prior to implementation of the OIM – and the 2006 and 2007 post-implementation survey results – which gauge views about the OIM. Thus the differences between survey results may help us to understand what effects, if any, Denver’s changes in handling citizen complaints may have had on complainant and officer perceptions of the complaint process.

Complainant Conclusions

Even though there was some improvement in satisfaction with discrete parts of the process, there was no substantial change in overall complainant satisfaction with the process or its outcomes. Moreover, complainant satisfaction with the overall process remained low across the entire study period, with nearly 75% of all of the complainants who responded to the 2005, 2006, and 2007 surveys indicating that they were dissatisfied with the overall process. While this figure may be shocking at first, it is important that it be contextualized within the larger body of research on the attitudes of police complainants. By this we mean that the overall satisfaction rate found in Denver is nearly identical to the rates of satisfaction found in other jurisdictions that have conducted complainant satisfaction surveys. For example, in a recent complainant survey conducted by the RAND Corporation, 73% of the respondents indicated that they unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with the complaint process.¹⁰ A pair of criminologists working for the Vera Institute of Justice in New York City interviewed a large sample of police complainants in the late 1980s, and found that 64% reported general dissatisfaction with the process.¹¹ This pattern of low complainant satisfaction also exists in jurisdictions outside of the U.S. In 2000, a pair of British criminologists surveyed a sample of English complainants and reported that 71% were dissatisfied with the overall complaint process and outcomes.¹² Similarly, a Canadian criminologist conducted a survey of individuals who filed complaints against Toronto Metropolitan Police officers and reported that less than one-third of complainants were satisfied with the complaint process.¹³ Thus, even though the complainant satisfaction was low in Denver, it is consistent with what researchers have found in other geographic areas.

Even though *overall* satisfaction was low in Denver, it is important not to overlook that there were some increases in complainant satisfaction with certain parts of the process. Particularly between 2005 and 2007, there were increases in how satisfied complainants were with their understanding of the process, with how easy it was to file complaints, and with the objectivity, politeness, and respectfulness of the IAB staff. There was also some improvement in how satisfied complainants were with the quality of the communication on their complaints. For example, satisfaction increased with the quality of explanations about the process, with the quality of the letters on their case, and with how well they were kept informed about the status of their complaint. So even though overall complainant satisfaction may have been low, these results indicate that Denver has been successful in bringing about improvements in complainant satisfaction with certain discrete elements of the process.

Officer Satisfaction

In comparison to the results on complainant satisfaction, there were fairly profound changes in officer satisfaction between the baseline and post-implementation periods. We observed noticeable improvements in officers' satisfaction with a number of important areas of the citizen complaint process, including: increased satisfaction with the IAB's objectivity, thoroughness, and efficiency; increased satisfaction with communication about the complaint process; a declining perception that the process is biased in favor of citizens; and increased satisfaction with Denver's police oversight body. Taken together, these results seem to indicate that recent changes to the complaint process have had a positive, sustained impact on officer satisfaction.

With that said, even though the OIM has been in operation for more than two years, officers still seem to be somewhat undecided about the impact that the OIM has had on the complaint investigation process. While 40% of the officers responding to the 2007 survey agreed that the OIM had improved the process, another 38% indicated that they were neutral on the same question. Similarly, 34% of the officers were satisfied with the performance of the independent monitor, while another 45% were neutral. The most striking finding, though, is less than 25% of the responding officers indicated that they were dissatisfied with the OIM on those same questions. This is an unexpected finding, given the patterns observed in other jurisdictions. For example, in a recent survey in Seattle, Washington, more than half of the responding officers indicated that they believed that the Office of Professional Accountability (one of Seattle's police oversight mechanisms) did not work well.¹⁴ Another officer survey conducted as part of an evaluation of Albuquerque, New Mexico's system of police oversight found that only 27% of the responding officers felt that the Independent Council's office made a "...positive contribution to the professionalism of policing."¹⁵ So when compared to other jurisdictions, the officers in Denver seem to be reasonably sanguine about the role the OIM plays within the complaint investigations process.

Cautionary Note on the Findings

Though the trends in satisfaction appear to be positive, we would like to end on a cautionary note. Since the response rates for both the complainant and officer surveys were below 50%, some caution is warranted when trying to draw strong conclusions about how well the post-implementation represents the views of all Denver complainants and police officers. Yet even though the response rates were low, the characteristics of complainants and officers respondents were very similar between the baseline and the post-implementation surveys. Consequently, we feel reasonably confident in the comparability of the results. As we noted in the previous report, it seems to us that any bias in the post-implementation survey brought about by the declining response rate would likely trend toward over-emphasizing dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. By this we mean that complainants and officers who are dissatisfied with the process (or with any other part of the Denver Police Department for that matter) are arguably more likely to respond to the survey than complainants and officers who are satisfied with the process. Thus, it is entirely possible that the post-implementation survey data *understates* the increases in complainant and officer satisfaction. The fact that we

observed an increase in satisfaction between the baseline and post-implementation surveys in the face of low response rates indicates to us that the changes we observed do reflect an underlying change in complainant and officer attitudes, though we cannot be sure of the magnitude of those changes.

Appendices

Appendix A

2007 Online Officer Survey Instrument

1. 2007 Officer Satisfaction Survey

In this survey we would like to hear about what officers think about Denver's citizen complaint process. Your participation in this survey will be completely ANONYMOUS. For each question, please check the box that best fits your opinion. Questions or comments should be directed to Dr. Joseph De Angelis, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Ohio University at (740) 593-1371 or by email at deangeli@ohio.edu. Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey.

2. Satisfaction with Internal Affairs

In this section we would like to ask you how you feel about Internal Affairs.

1. Please mark your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Internal Affairs listens carefully to the information given by officers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Internal Affairs investigates all complaints thoroughly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Internal Affairs investigates complaints efficiently.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Internal Affairs investigates all complaints in an unbiased manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Satisfaction with the OIM

In this section, we would like to ask you how you feel about Denver's police oversight mechanisms.

1. Please mark your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance of the Office of the Independent Monitor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The OIM carefully weighs information given by officers before making decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The Office of the Independent Monitor has improved the complaint process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The Office of the Independent Monitor does a good job of monitoring Internal Affairs investigations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Overall Satisfaction with the Complaint Process

In this section, we would like to ask you how you feel about the complaint process in general.

1. Please mark your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Officers' basic rights are well protected within the complaint process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Police command staff carefully considers information given by officers before making a decision on a complaint.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Police command staff usually makes fair disciplinary decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The complaint process is biased in favor of citizens.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Complaint Information

In this section, we would like to ask you about your experience with citizen complaints.

1. Have you been the subject of a citizen complaint within the last year?

- Yes
 No

6. Complaint Information

1. If yes, how many complaints have been filed against you in the last year?

- 1
 2
 3
 4
 More than 5

2. What was the outcome of that complaint? (check all that apply)

- Sustained
 Not Sustained
 Exonerated/Unfounded
 Dismissed
 Informal/Service Complaint
 Mediated
 Pending

Other (please specify)

7. Overall Satisfaction

In this section we would like to ask you about your overall satisfaction with the citizen complaint process.

1. How satisfied were you:

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Sat. Nor Dissat.	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. That the decision on the complaint was made in a reasonable amount of time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. That you received the outcome you deserved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. With the complaint process in general?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Background Information

Since this survey is anonymous, we would like to ask you some background questions.

1. What is your age?

- 21-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or Over

2. What is your race/ethnicity (check all that apply)?

- African American/Black
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- White/Caucasian
- Other

3. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

4. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- Some High School
- High School Graduate/GED
- Some College
- College Graduate
- Advanced Degree (MA, Ph.D.)
- Other

5. How long have you worked for the Denver Police Department?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- 10-15 years
- More than 15 years

6. What is your rank?

- Academy Recruit
- Officer
- Corporal/Technician
- Sergeant
- Detective
- Lieutenant
- Captain or Higher
- Reserve Officer

Other (please specify)

9. General Questions

In this final section, we would like to give you the opportunity to comment on the complaint process in greater detail.

1. Overall, what were the strengths of the complaint process?

2. Overall, what were the weaknesses of the complaint process?

3. Do you have any specific recommendations for improving the complaint process?

End of Survey
Thank you very much!

Section C (continued)

How satisfied were you:	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Sat. Nor Dissat.	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know/ NA
Q3. that you were kept informed about what was happening with your complaint?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4. with the letters you received?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q5. that Internal Affairs gave clear explanations about how officers are supposed to act in incidents like yours?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q6. that you were informed about what happened as a result of your complaint?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section D. In this section, we would like to ask about your satisfaction with what happened with your complaint.

How satisfied were you:	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Sat. Nor Dissat.	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know/ NA
Q1. that your complaint was handled quickly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q2. that the right decision was made on your complaint?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3. that the Denver Police Department considered your views before making a decision on the complaint?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4. that enough information was gathered before a decision was made on your complaint?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q5. that you were treated fairly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q6. that the police dept. does a good job of investigating complaints?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q7. with the outcome you received?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q8. that Denver is serious about investigating police misconduct?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q9. with the complaint process in general?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section E. In this section, we would like to ask you about the details of your complaint.

Q1. How many other complaints have you filed against Denver Police Officers?	None <input type="checkbox"/>	One <input type="checkbox"/>	Two <input type="checkbox"/>	Three or more <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>	
Q2. What was your complaint about?	Excessive Force <input type="checkbox"/>	Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/>	Rude Behavior <input type="checkbox"/>	Police Procedure <input type="checkbox"/>	Law Violation <input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____ _____
Q3. In considering the final outcome of your complaint, was your complaint:	Sustained <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Sustained <input type="checkbox"/>	Mediated <input type="checkbox"/>	Dismissed <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
Q4. Did you receive written notification explaining what happened as a result of your complaint?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>			

- Q5. What do you think should have happened as a result of your complaint?
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> --Officer Sent to Jail | <input type="checkbox"/> --Officer Counseled |
| <input type="checkbox"/> --Officer Fired | <input type="checkbox"/> --Had a Supervisor Talk With Me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> --Officer Suspended | <input type="checkbox"/> --Explain my Complaint to the Officer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> --Officer Reprimanded | <input type="checkbox"/> --Change Police Policy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> --Receive an Apology | |

Q6. If you would have liked a different outcome on your complaint, please explain: _____

Section G. (continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know/ NA
Q13. The neighbors in my neighborhood know each other well.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q14. Police officers are usually friendly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q15. The City of Denver tries to hold officers accountable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section H. Since this survey is anonymous, we would like to ask you some background questions.

Q1. What is your age?	18-24 <input type="checkbox"/>	25-34 <input type="checkbox"/>	35-44 <input type="checkbox"/>	45-54 <input type="checkbox"/>	55-64 <input type="checkbox"/>	65 or Over <input type="checkbox"/>
Q2. What is your race/ethnicity (check all that apply)?	African American <input type="checkbox"/>	Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/>	White/Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/>	Native American <input type="checkbox"/>	Pacific Islander <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Q3. What is your gender?	Male <input type="checkbox"/>	Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
Q4. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?	Some High School <input type="checkbox"/>	High School Graduate <input type="checkbox"/>	Some College <input type="checkbox"/>	College Graduate <input type="checkbox"/>	Advanced Degree <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>

Section I. In this final section, we would like you to explain some of your feelings in more detail.

Q1. Overall, what were the strengths of the complaint process?

Q2. Overall, what were the weaknesses of the complaint process?

End of Survey
 Please place the survey form in the return envelope and place it in the mail. The postage is already paid.
 Thank you very much!

Appendix C

Demographic Characteristics for Complainants

	2005 Baseline Survey	2006-2007 Post Survey	2006-2007 Population*
Respondent N	148	176	1111
Gender			
Female	47.2%	43.4%	40.9%
Male	52.8%	56.6%	59.1%
	2.7%	1.7%	7.7%
Number	144	173	1111
Race/ethnicity:			
African American	12.6%	18.0%	28.3%
Hispanic/Latino	14.7%	12.8%	25.8%
White	67.1%	58.7%	43.8%
Other race/ethnicity	1.4%	6.4%	2.1%
Multiple Races	4.2%	4.1%	-
Unknown	3.4%	2.3%	35.8%
Number	143	172	1111
Age			
18-24	5.6%	6.3%	14.3%
25-34	17.4%	19.0%	21.8%
35-44	20.8%	24.1%	18.5%
45-54	41.0%	32.2%	12.9%
55-64	10.4%	14.4%	5.9%
65 and over	4.9%	4.0%	2.6%
Unknown	2.7%	1.1%	24.1%
Number	148	176	1111

* Note: This is the population of complainants who were mailed a survey and does not include complainants with incomplete postal information.

Appendix D

Demographic Characteristics for Officers

		2005 Baseline Sample	2006 Post Sample	2007 Post Sample	2006 Officer Population
Race/Ethnicity					
	African American	4%	5%	8%	9%
	Hispanic/Latino	16%	14%	18%	22%
	White	73%	74%	65%	66%
	Other	3%	5%	5%	3%
	Multiple Races	4%	3%	3%	-
	Number	523	427	397	1503
Age					
	Under 25	2%	1%	1%	3%
	25-34	21%	17%	18%	26%
	35-44	41%	41%	45%	38%
	45-54	30%	33%	31%	26%
	55 and over	7%	8%	5%	8%
	Number	532	431	407	1503
Sex					
	Male	89%	87%	88%	79%
	Female	11%	13%	13%	21%
	Number	532	427	392	1503
Rank					
	Officer	36%	31%	33%	42%
	Corporal/Technician	14%	17%	12%	16%
	Sergeant	14%	20%	18%	14%
	Detective	2%	19%	16%	16%
	Lieutenant	4%	5%	6%	4%
	Captain or Higher	2%	3%	3%	2%
	Other	0%	0%	0%	7%
	Unknown	29%	5%	12%	0%
	Number	459	439	446	1503

About the Author

Joseph De Angelis, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Ohio University, and conducts research in the areas of citizen oversight of police, criminal justice performance measurement, and the role that police and courts play in urban redevelopment initiatives.

Endnotes:

¹ I would like to thank Aaron Kupchik, Chris Campbell, Meredith Basak, Chris Kast, Tyler Wall, and Sheruni Ratnabalasuriar for their research assistance on this project. We would also like to thank Richard Rosenthal, Dr. Jon Proctor, and Gerylann Castellano of the Office of the Independent Monitor for their help in completing the both the baseline and post-implementation surveys.

² A number of the questions used on the complainant and officer surveys were tested and employed in previous academic and public policy research projects. Several questions on the complainant surveys were adapted from a survey instrument employed by social psychologists studying community attitudes toward “procedural justice.” See Tom Tyler and Cheryl Wakslak, (2004), “Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority,” *Criminology* 42, 253-281. Also Tom Tyler, (1990), *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Several questions were used by the Independent Police Review Division in Portland, Oregon. See for example *Independent Police Review Division Annual Report 2004*. Office of the City Auditor, City of Portland, Oregon, pgs. 97-107. In addition, several of the questions on the officer survey were adapted from a survey instrument used during an evaluation of the Albuquerque Police Department and from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. See Betsey Kreisel (1998) *An Analysis of Police Officer’s Perceptions of Internal and External Systems of Citizen Complaint Procedures of Police Misconduct*, unpublished dissertation. University of Nebraska, Omaha.

³ For citizens with multiple complaints, we arranged the data so that we included only the most serious allegation on the most recent complaint for each complainant. This left us with a data file with 1,118 unique individuals.

⁴ Police complainants are traditionally a difficult population to survey. For example, Waters and Brown (2000, 623) in a mailed survey of police complainants achieved a 26% response rate and reported the results of another survey that had a 14% response rate. See Ian Waters and Katie Brown, (2000) “Police complaints and the Complainants’ Experience.” *Brit. J. Criminology*. 40: 617-638. The Independent Police Review Division in Portland, Oregon has reported complainant survey response rates of 24-35% (*ibid*: 114).

⁵ The IAB data file for the baseline and post-implementation surveys contained high levels of missing data on the race (~35%) and age (~25%) for the overall population of complainants. No population data were available on the education levels of complainants. Thus, it was not possible to determine how well the respondents matched the population in relation to race, age, and education. However, the IAB database did have reliable measures of gender and case outcome, so the respondents were compared to the population on the basis of those two measures.

⁶ Given that the distribution methods for both waves was very similar, it is unlikely that the drop in response rate from wave 1 to wave 2 is due to survey distribution methods. Rather, a possible reason for the drop in response rate is that some officers may have viewed the post-implementation survey as redundant with the baseline survey, and refused to participate a second time.

⁷ The same pattern was followed on questions that asked respondents to strongly agree/strongly disagree with a statement.

⁸ During the baseline survey, officers were asked several questions that were designed to measure their actual knowledge of the complaint process. A large proportion of both officers and complainants checked “Don’t Know” on these questions. As a result, these questions were dropped from the post-implementation survey.

⁹ The wording to the first question in Table Five was changed between the baseline and post-implementation surveys. The baseline wording to this question was: “Internal Affairs carefully weighs

the information given by officers before issuing a finding on a complaint." Since the DPD Internal Affairs Bureau does not issue findings, the post -implementation survey wording was changed to: "Internal Affairs listens carefully to the information given by officers."

¹⁰ Jack Riley, et al. (2005). *Police-Community Relations in Cincinnati*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

¹¹ Michelle Sviridoff and James McElroy. (1989). *Processing Complaints against the Police in New York City: The Complainant's Perspective*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice, pp. 47.

¹² Ian Waters and Katie Brown. (2000). "Police Complaints and the Complainants' Experience." *British Journal of Criminology* 40: 617-638.

¹³ Tammy Landau. (1996). "When Police Investigate Police: A View From Complainants." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 38 (3): 291-315.

¹⁴ The survey of Seattle police officers was conducted by David Brody and Nicholas Lovrich of the Washington State University. The results were reported on by Seattle Councilmember Nick Licata (2007), in "Seattle's First Survey of Police Officers," *Urban Politics*, #233, found at <http://www.seattle.gov/council/licata/up/233.htm>. Retrieved December 12, 2007.

¹⁵ See Becky Kreisel, (1998), *An Evaluation of Police Officers' Perceptions of Internal and External Systems of Citizen Complaint Procedures of Police Misconduct*, Unpublished Dissertation, University of Nebraska, pp. 113.