Case: 1:15-cv-01046-SO Doc #: 314-2 Filed: 06/17/20 1 of 11. PageID #: 6764

EXHIBIT B



CLEVELAND DIVISION OF POLICE FORCE REVIEW BOARD CHECKLIST

INCIDENT INFORMATION		
Incident #:		
Date of Incident:		
Involved Officers:		
involved officers.		
Classified Level of Force:		
INVESTIGATION INFORMATION		
Investigating Supervisor:		
Investigating Unit:		
Date Investigation Complete:		
Date Follow-up [if any] Complete:		
	BOARD INFORMATION	
Date of Board:		
Board Chairman:		
	ΕΝΤΡΑΤΊΩΝΙ ΔΕ ΙΝΙΖΙΕςΤΊΩ ΑΤΊΩΝΙ ΤΩ ΕΏΡ	
PRESENTATION OF INVESTIGATION TO FRB		
Presenter:		

ALL findings by the Board must be supported by a preponderance of the	e evidence.	
A. DECISION MAKINO	G AND TACTICS	
1. Did the officer(s) decision making and tactics contribute to the ne	eed to use force? □Yes □No	Regardless of whether decisionmaking and tactics are approved or disapproved, summarize follow up action identified:
2. During the whole of the incident, did the officer(s) employ tactics making consistent with:	and decision	□ None □ Chain of command for counseling and entry
i. Policy, other than the Use of Force Policy?	□Yes □No	into tracking software.
ii. Training?	□Yes □No	section. Recommendation/referral to policy section Recommendation of non-disciplinary corrective action (specify):
REVIEW OF DECISION MAKING AND TACTICS: List By Each Involution incident, as appropriate. Administrative Approval: Based on the documentation provided, the decision division core principles and training. Administrative Disapproval : Based on the documentation provided, the decision with division core principles and training.	ion-making and tacti	cs employed appear to be consistent with

Case: 1:15-cv-01046-SO Doc #: 314-2 Filed: 06/17/20 4 of 11. PageID #: 6767

Name and Serial Number	Approved or Disapproved
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

B. USE OF FORCE	
The application of the use of force policy does not, and should not, involve inquiries into the involved officer's subject analysis must be conducted from the standpoint of an objectively reasonable officer encountering the same circumstan	<i>r</i>
3. Did the officer(s) involved use <u>de-escalation</u> techniques when safe and feasible to do so under the circumstances?	• Use of Force: General, Section V
i. Did the officer(s) involved take reasonable efforts to de-escalate <u>prior to using force</u> ?	• Use of Force: De- Escalation
□Yes □No □Not feasible	
ii. What de-escalation tactics, or additional de-escalation tactics, might have been used in the circumstances? \Box N/A	
Protective use of distance, cover, concealment, and time (separation, barriers, slowing down incident)	
☐ Hearing and listening	
□ Strategic communication or voice commands to de-escalate the situation	
Increasing officer presence/calling resources (more personnel, specialized CIT officer, supervisor)	
□ Other	
iii. <u>During and/or after using force</u> , did the officer(s) reduce the level of force applied as the nature of the threat diminished?	
□Yes □No □Not feasible	

Case: 1:15-cv-01046-SO Doc #: 314-2 Filed: 06/17/20 5 of 11. PageID #: 6768

4. Was the officer's use of force <u>necessary</u> to achieve a lawful objective?	□Yes □No	•	Use of Force: General, Section II
5. Was the officer's use of force <u>proportional</u> to the level of the subject's resistance?	□Yes □No	•	Use of Force: General, Section III
6. Was the officer's use of force <u>objectively reasonable</u> ?	□Yes □No	•	Use of Force: General, Section IV
7. Did the officer comply with CPD's general procedures involving force?	□Yes □No	•	Use of Force: General,
• Officer identify selves and advise of intent to detain, arrest, or search before using force, if safe	e and feasible?		Section I
• Verbal warning to submit prior to force, if safe and feasible?			
• Avoid unnecessary risks to civilians, officers, and emergency personnel?			
• Consider surroundings when un-holstering and/or before discharging firearms?			
8. Did the officer use prohibited force?	□Yes □No	•	Use of Force: General, Section III
1. Use force to subdue a subject(s) who is not suspected of any criminal conduct,	□Yes □No		
other than to protect an officer's or another person's safety?			
2. Use retailiatory force?	□Yes □No		
3. Use force against subject(s) who only verbally confront officers and are not involved in criminal conduct?	□Yes □No		
4. Use force against subject(s) who are handcuffed or otherwise restrained?	□Yes □No		
If yes, was force nonetheless objectively reasonable and necessary under circumstances to stop an assault, escape, or as necessary to fulfill other law enforcement objectives?	□Yes □No		
5. Un-holster and display or unholster and point a firearm?	□Yes □No		
If yes, did the circumstances surrounding the incident create an objectively reasonable belief that the situation may escalate to the point at which deadly force would be authorized?	□Yes □No		
6. Use force to overcome passive resistance?	□Yes □No		
If yes, was force necessary, proportional, and objectively reasonable to achieve a legitimate law enforcement objective?	□Yes □No		
7. Use force against those who are exercising their First Amendment Rights?	□Yes □No		
If yes, was it necessary and objectively reasonable for the safety of that individual or the public?	□Yes □No		
If yes, was it done with sufficient personnel?	□Yes □No		
8. Carry weapons that are not authorized or approved by the Division?	$\Box Yes \Box No$		
9. Use a firearm as an impact weapon?	$\Box Yes \Box No$		
10. Fire warning shots?	$\Box Yes \Box No$		

Case: 1:15-cv-01046-SO Doc #: 314-2 Filed: 06/17/20 6 of 11. PageID #: 6769

		11
11. Use deadly force solely to protect property or solely to effectuate an arrest?	□Yes □No	
12. Use neck holds?	□Yes □No	
13. Discharge a firearm from or at a moving vehicle?	□Yes □No	
If yes, was deadly force justified by something other than the threat of the moving	□Yes □No	
vehicle?		
14. Reach into, or place themselves in the path of a vehicle?	□Yes □No	
15. Discharge a firearm at a threat that is not verified and visible?	□Yes □No	
16. Use head strikes with hard objects?	□Yes □No	
If yes, to any of the questions (numbers 1 through 16) above:		
a. Would a reasonable officer believe that the use of deadly force was objectively reasonable		
proportional according to this policy?	□Yes □No	
b. (Only if yes to (a)): Did the subject's actions constitute an immediate and grave threat to t		
	□Yes □No	
c. (Only if yes to (b)): Were there <u>any</u> other force options, techniques, tactics, or choices with		
policy available to the officer?	□Yes □No	
If yes to (c), the "rare and exceptional circumstances" language in Use of Force: General Sect	ion III(B) may	
apply.		
9. Did the officer comply with the Division's policy on providing medical attention following	the use of ferres	• Use of Force: General,
once the scene is secured?	g the use of force □Yes □No	• Use of Force: General, Section V
once the scene is secured.		Section V
REVIEW OF FORCE APPLIED: List by Each Involved Officer		
Administrative Approval: Based on the documentation provided, the force used was objectively		y, and proportional; was
consistent with the duty to de-escalate; and consistent with all other provisions of the Use of Force	e Policy.	
Administrative Disapproval: Based on the documentation provided, the force was not objective		ary, and proportional; was
consistent with the duty to de-escalate; and/or was not consistent with all provisions of the Use of	Force Policy.	
Name and Serial Number	Approved	or Disapproved
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Case: 1:15-cv-01046-SO Doc #: 314-2 Filed: 06/17/20 7 of 11. PageID #: 6770

[INCIDENT #]

6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

C. SUPI	ERVISION	
10. Was there an on-scene supervisor(s)?	□Yes □No	
If yes, did the on-scene supervisor(s) provide appropriate tactical gu support to the field during the incident?	nidance and □Yes □No	

<u>REVIEW OF INCIDENT SUPERVISION (For Each On-Scene Supervisor)</u>

<u>Administrative Approval</u>: The review board finds that the supervision and direction of the incident appears to be consistent with policy and training.

<u>Administrative Disapproval</u>: The review board finds that the supervision and direction of the incident does not appear to be consistent with policy or training for the following reasons:

Name and Serial Number	Approved or Disapproved
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

E. ADDITIONAL INVOLVED PERSONN	EL ISSUES
11. Were there any issues identified with respect to information sharing or communication? Were all CDP communications protocols followed? □Yes □No	

D. ANALYSIS OF UNDERLYING INVESTIGATION		
12. Was the investigation conducted and reported to FRB in a timely	y manner?	□ No action. Explanation sufficient.
		□ Refer to chain of command for counsel.
	□Yes □No	□ Refer to Chief's office.
13. Was the investigation objective and complete?		If no, how resolve?
		□ Refer to unit.
	□Yes □No	□ Refer toChief's Office.
14. Were the investigation's findings supported by a preponderance	e of the evidence?	If no, document reasons for determination, including
		specific evidence or analysis support Board's
	□Yes □No	conclusions in the comment section, for the Chief of
		Police.
15. Does there appear to be additional relevant evidence that may as	8	If yes, how resolve?
inconsistencies or improve the reliability or credibility of the investi-	gation?	Refer to District/Bureau/Unit for further
		investigation.
	□Yes □No	□ Refer toChief's office.
16. For Level II investigations, did the Chain of Command properly	address and	□ Refer back to chain
refer the issues identified?		□ Refer to Other
Sergeant	□Yes □No	
Lieutenant	□Yes □No	
Captain	□Yes □No	
REVIEW OF INCIDENT REPORTING AND INVESTIGATION:		

<u>Administrative Approval</u>: The review board finds that the investigation is thorough and complete. The review board finds that preponderance of the evidence supports the reviewer's determinations.

Administrative Disapproval:

• The review board finds that the investigation is not thorough and complete, for the following reasons:

Name and Serial Number	Approved or Disapproved
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
ō.	
õ.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

F. BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS					
17. Were there any policy issues raised by this incident?	□Yes □No	□ None.			
		□ Refer issue to Policy.			
		□ Refer issue to Other			
18. Were there any training issues raised by this incident?	□Yes □No	□ None.			
		□ Refer issue to Training.			
		□ Refer issue to Other			
19. Were there any equipment issues raised by this incident?	□Yes □No	□ None.			
		□ Refer issue to			
20. Were there any issues raised by this incident related to CPD's medical response?		□ None.			
	□Yes □No	□ Refer issue to			
21. Are there any other issues or lessons learned from this incident that	□ None.				
communicated? To whom?	□Yes □No	□ Involved Officers.			
		🗆 Platoon.			
		□ District.			
		□ Division-Wide.			
		□ Training.			
		□ Policy.			
		Public.			

	□ Other
22. Were there any actions by involved personnel that warrant commendation?	□ None.
□Yes □No	□ Referred for formal commendation.
	\Box Referred for informal commendation to
	·•

FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

Specific Recommendations and Assignments for Follow-Up

1. IA/Chain of Command referrals

- a. Officer name and serial number:
- b. General reason for referral (for each officer above):
- c. BOC to initiate referral via tracking software:

2. Individual officer training recommendations/Individual referrals

- a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
- b. What follow-up is requested:
- c. When a response is due:

3. Department training recommendations

- a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
- b. What follow-up is requested:
- c. When a response is due:

4. Policy change or clarification recommendations

- a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
- b. What follow-up is requested:
- c. When a response is due:

5. **Procedure change or clarification recommendations**

- a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
- b. What follow-up is requested:
- c. When a response is due:

6. Equipment recommendations

- a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
- b. What follow-up is requested:
- c. When a response is due:

COMMENTS:				
UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Serial	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Serial	Unit #