*Presented to the PCOB Policy and Procedure Subcommittee on 9/5/24 for Discussion*

**Triage Goal:**

Ensure consistent prioritization of complaints utilizing a point system which represents the hierarchy of complaint metrics through a simple base 10 calculation, remaining flexible for future expansions and specifications but also predictable and easily calculable.

**Results of a Complaint:**

1) Referral to OIM Investigation Complaint Queue

2) Referral to other Department for rapid resolution

3) Dismissal

- Grounds

- Communication

- Appeal

4) Pending/Incomplete (Needs additional information or is unactionable at present)

- Information recorded and tagged

- Determine conditions or required information to re-open

5) Mediation

- Goals and expectations

- Feasibility

**Triage Scoring rubric**

*Safeguard Code:* Scores will be assigned an alphabetical code to precede their score. These codes will be updated and provide an at-a-glance view of the age of a complaint.

Example: At time of entry of Complaint 1, which receives a score of 5,304, the code will be “D.” Upon the entry of Complaint 2, which scores higher than 5,304 and is thus ranked above Complaint 1, the code of Complaint 1 will change from “D” to “C” and so on. No complaint with a code of “A” may be skipped. A complaint with a Selection Score of A-5,304 will be ranked above a complaint with a Selection Score of B-6,204.

**I. Category Code**

1) 010 – Use of Force (9000)

2) 020 – Racial Profiling (8000)

3) 030 - Discrimination (7000)

4) 040 – Ethical/Procedural Misconduct (6000)

5) 050 – Discourtesy (5000)

6) 060 – Policy Failure (4000)

7) 070 - Policy Success (3000)

8) 080 – MPD Staff Praise (2000)

9) 090 – General Public Input (1000)

**II. Degradation risk:**

1) Immediate (exigent circumstances concerning material evidence) (1000)

2) Urgent (Evidence limited to statements, physical evidence not in custody, interviews needed) (800)

3) High (Evidence includes physical evidence which is secured, but interviews are needed to establish statements) (600)

4) Moderate (Evidence does not include physical evidence but sufficient statements have been taken and secured) (400)

5) Low (Physical evidence secure, sufficient statements taken and secured) (200)

**III. Age of incident**

(less than)

1) 30 Days (100)

2) 60 Days (90)

3) 90 Days (80)

4) 6 months (70)

5) 1 year (60)

6) 1 year 6 months (50)

7) 2 years (40)

8) 2 years 6 months (30)

9) 3 years (20)

10) over 3 years (10)

**IV. Actionability of Evidence**

1) Video, Audio, 2 or more Witnesses (10)

2) Either Video or Audio, 2 or more Witnesses (8)

3) Either Video or Audio, 2 Witnesses (6)

4) 2 witnesses (4)

5) 1 witness (2)

Potential other metrics?

**V. Resolution Sought**

1) Referral to PFC (policy or individual)

2) Chief recommendation (policy or individual)

3) Mediation

4) Record of Incident

5) ?

**Conclusion:**

This system aims to use category codes as the primary selection rubric, and the degradation of evidence as the secondary selection rubric. Effectively then, items such as age of the incident and actionability of the evidence, which are linked in several unavoidable ways, have a near equal role to each other and serve to break ties.