

WOODSTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

VOLUME NUMBER: 1		EFFECTIVE DATE: 05/14/2018		CHAPTER: 46	
SUBJECT: Early Warning Systems					
REFERENCE: Woodstown Police Department Procedures for statewide mandatory early warning systems			SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Read and Comply Revision Date:		
APPLICABILITY: All Police Department Personnel			NUMBER OF PAGES: 6		
REVISIONS					
DATE	PAGE	SECTION	DATE	PAGE	SECTION

PURPOSE: The purpose of this written directive is to establish a personnel early warning system.

POLICY: It is the policy of this agency to implement and utilize an early warning system for tracking and reviewing incidents of risk and provide timely intervention consistent with the New Jersey Attorney General's Law Enforcement Directive No. 2018-3.

PROCEDURE:

I. EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

- A. The Early Warning System is designed to detect patterns and trends before the conduct escalates into more serious problems. As such, officers must understand that the early warning system is not identical to the disciplinary process. Although it is possible that disciplinary action may be taken as the result of evidence that rules and regulations were violated, this is not the sole or even primary intent of the system. The primary intent of an early warning system is to address potential problems through the use of appropriate management and supervisory strategies before formal discipline is warranted.
- B. Many different measures of officer performance (actions or behaviors) can be regularly examined for patterns or practices that may indicate potential problems. These performance measures may include, but are not limited to, the following documented indicators:
1. Internal affairs complaints against an officer, whether initiated by another employee or by a member of the public;
 2. Civil actions filed against the officer;
 3. Criminal investigations of or criminal complaints against an officer;
 4. Any use of force by the officer that is formally determined or adjudicated (for example, by internal affairs or a grand jury) to have been excessive, unjustified, or unreasonable;
 5. Domestic violence investigations in which the officer is an alleged subject;
 6. An arrest of the officer, including on a driving under the influence charge;
 7. Sexual harassment claims against an officer;
 8. Vehicular collisions involving an officer that is formally determined to have been the fault of the officer;
 9. A positive drug test by an officer;
 10. Cases or arrests by an officer that are rejected or dismissed by a court;
 11. Cases in which evidence obtained by an officer is suppressed by a court;
 12. Insubordination by the officer;
 13. Neglect of duty by the officer;
 14. Unexcused absences by the officer;

15. Vehicular pursuits.

- C. Generally, three (3) instances of questionable conduct or performance indicators (as listed in section B, above) within a 12-month period would initiate the early warning system process.
- D. If one incident triggers multiple performance indicators, that incident shall not be double or triple counted, but instead shall count as only one performance indicator.

II. ADMINISTRATION OF EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

- A. The early warning system is primarily the responsibility of the Internal Affairs Unit; but, any supervisor may initiate the early warning process based upon their own observations. Emphasis should be placed on anticipating officer problems before it results in improper performance or conduct.
- B. The Internal Affairs Unit member shall conduct a computerized Guardian Tracking audit of its records to determine if an officer has the emergence of a pattern, practices or trend of inappropriate behavior or misconduct. In addition to the regular data audits by the Internal Affairs Unit member, the Internal Affairs Unit member shall audit an individual employee's history any time a new complaint is received.
 - 1. Using this information and their experience, Internal Affairs member may be able to identify officers who may need remedial/corrective intervention even before such is indicated by the early warning system data audit.
- C. If the audit indicates the emergence of a pattern, practices or trend of inappropriate behavior or misconduct, the Internal Affairs Unit member shall consult with the officer's supervisor and the Police Chief or Director of Public Safety.
- D. The Police Chief or Public Safety Director shall review the information provided by the Internal Affairs member along with any other relevant information from agency records for the purpose of initiating a course of intervention designed to correct/interrupt the emerging pattern, practice or trend.
 - 1. If the audit indicates that the early warning system has returned an incorrect identification or "false positive," that conclusion should be documented and no further action is needed.
 - 2. If the audit reveals that an officer has violated agency rules and regulations or written directives, the Police Chief or Director of Public Safety in consultation with the Internal member should proceed with an internal investigation and possible disciplinary action.
 - 3. If the audit reveals that the officer has engaged in conduct, which indicates a lack of understanding or inability to comply with accepted procedures, the Police Chief or Director of Public Safety shall consult with the Internal Affairs Unit to determine the appropriate course of remedial/corrective intervention.

- E. At least every six (6) months, internal affair's member shall audit the agency's Guardian Tracking system and records to assess the accuracy and efficacy of the tracking system.

III. SUPERVISORS

- A. An officer's first line supervisor is usually the first member of the agency to encounter and document specific incidents that affect an employee. It is essential for the supervisor to speak with the officer, document these incidents and report findings to their supervisor and if warranted, the internal affairs member. The success of this program relies heavily on the first line supervisor's participation and involvement.
- B. If a supervisor has initiated remedial/corrective intervention, the Internal Affairs member shall be formally notified of such efforts. This information shall be documented and appropriate copies forwarded to the Internal Affairs member for filing within the Guardian Tracking System.
- C. If the remedial/corrective intervention was training, documentation shall be filed in the Guardian Tracking system (remedial training).
- D. Supervisors shall forward all documentation as required by agency written directives established to assist in a comprehensive audit. This data shall minimally include: use of force reports, vehicle pursuit reports, and attendance records.

IV. Police Chief or Director of Police

- A. In addition to the regular data audits conducted by internal affairs member, the Police Chief or Director of Public Safety shall periodically audit an individual officer's history. Using this information and experience, the Police Chief or Director of Public Safety may be able to identify officers who may need remedial/corrective intervention even before such is indicated by the early warning system data audit.
- B. When under early warning system monitoring, the officer's Police Chief or Police Director and supervisor shall meet with the officer to discuss the situation in depth to:
 - 1. Identify problems or potential problems;
 - 2. Determine short and long-term goals for improvement;
 - 3. Come to a consensus commitment on a plan for long-term improved performance;
 - 4. Advise of the monitoring process and the repercussions of future sustained transgressions.
- C. Generally, officers should expect to remain under intensive monitoring and supervision for at least three (3) months when an early warning flag is triggered or until the supervisor concludes that the officer's behavior has been remediated (whichever is longer).
- D. Supervisor/Officer Meeting

1. All supervisor/officer meetings shall be thoroughly documented within the Guardian Tracking system. The affected officer and supervisor shall meet on a regular basis, minimally monthly, to discuss progress towards the agreed upon goals and objectives.
 3. Additional monitoring may be required following removal from the early warning system.
- E. Any statement made by the officer in connection with the early warning system review process may not be used against them in any disciplinary or other proceeding.

V. REMEDIAL/CORRECTIVE INTERVENTION

- A. Supervisory or command personnel may initiate remedial/corrective intervention to correct behavior. Remedial/corrective intervention may include, but is not limited to:
1. Training;
 2. Remedial Training;
 3. Counseling;
 4. Intensive supervision;
 5. Fitness for duty examination;
 6. Employee Assistance Program, when warranted, if available;
 7. Peer counseling.
- B. Internal disciplinary action, remedial/corrective intervention, and fitness for duty examinations are not mutually exclusive and should be jointly pursued if and when appropriate.
- C. When remedial/corrective intervention has been undertaken, the Police Chief or Police Director shall ensure that such actions are documented within the Guardian Tracking System. If the remedial/corrective intervention is a training program, attendance and successful completion of that program should be noted in the employee's training record within the Guardian Tracking System.
- D. These reports have the same confidential status as Internal Affairs documents and are subject to the same disclosure and retention regulations and guidelines.

VI. NOTIFICATION TO SUBSEQUENT LAW ENFORCEMENT EMPLOYER

- A. If any officer who is or has been subject to an Early Warning System review process applies to or accepts employment at a different law enforcement agency than the one where he or she underwent the Early Warning System review process, it is the responsibility of the prior or current employing law enforcement agency to notify the subsequent employing law enforcement agency of the detective's Early Warning System review process history and outcomes. Upon request, the prior or current employing agency shall share the officer's Early

Warning System review process files with the subsequent employing agency.

VII. NOTIFICATION TO COUNTY PROSECUTOR AND ATTORNEY GENERAL

- A. Upon initiation of the Early Warning System review process, the Police Chief or Police Director shall make notification to the Salem County Prosecutor. Notice shall include all Guardian Tracking system reports.
- B. Prosecutor or a designee shall make a confidential written notification to the Attorney General's Office. The notice shall identify the subject officer, the nature of the triggering performance indicators, and the planned remedial program. Upon completion of the Early Warning System review process, the Prosecutor shall make a confidential written notification to the Attorney General or his/her designee of the outcome of the Early Warning System review, including any remedial measures taken on behalf of the subject officer.
- C. On January 5th of the calendar year, the Prosecutor or a designee shall report, in writing, to the Attorney General the total number of Early Warning reviews that were undertaken for the previous year.

VIII. PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

- A. The Early Warning System policy shall be made available to the public upon request and shall be posted on the agency website. However, all written reports created or submitted that identify specific officers are confidential and are not subject to public disclosure.