

# Available-Record Grade 1.0

## TCF department working model · Adopted October 13, 2026

This model replaces the latest Available-Record Grade proposal v0.1 for newly generated department reports. It does not change the officer or single-incident rubrics. Original department editions remain available under their original method labels.

## What the number means

The grade is an editorial assessment of the evidence actually reviewed against fixed checks. It is not an estimate of overall department quality, the share of officers acting properly, resident trust or future misconduct. The model, weights and bands are editorial choices and have not been statistically validated.

A grade may be calculated from one sufficiently documented check. There is no minimum overall or category coverage and no minimum event count for this limited claim. If no check can be assessed, show **NR — no assessable evidence**. Missing, inaccessible or unresolved evidence earns neither credit nor a penalty.

## Calculation

**Score =  $100 \times \text{earned weight} \div \text{assessed weight}$ .**

Each check weighs 5. A 0–4 rating earns  $5 \times \text{rating} \div 4$ . Average distinct eligible event ratings within an outcome check. Use one bounded current snapshot for a publication check. A zero remains assessed and stays in the denominator.

**Rubric coverage =  $\text{assessed weight} \div 100 \times 100\%$ .** All 20 checks remain in the coverage denominator.

Coverage is not the percentage of incidents or personnel reviewed. Do not average five category scores equally: partial evidence changes the effective category mix.

| Letter | Unrounded score |
|--------|-----------------|
| A      | 90 to 100       |
| B      | 80 to below 90  |
| C      | 70 to below 80  |
| D      | 60 to below 70  |
| F      | Below 60        |

Show one decimal. Add precision at a boundary so rounding never promotes the letter. Hypothetical ratings 3, 2 and 3 earn 10/15 assessed points: 66.7, D, with 15% rubric coverage. The other 17 checks remain Unknown.

# Scope, evidence & revisions

## Labels required beside every score

Show the method, evidence cutoff, assessed-check count, rubric coverage, assessed and unassessed categories, and the specific evidence scope. If any check remains Unknown, show **PROVISIONAL — LIMITED RECORD**. If only publication/access checks are assessed, show **PUBLIC INFORMATION / PROCESS ONLY — CONDUCT NOT ASSESSED**.

A published contact route, policy or process establishes what was available in the identified readable set; it does not establish successful implementation. An audience restriction, subunit-only record or single-incident assessment must be stated prominently. A current publication observation does not refresh every historical research lane.

## Selecting and coding evidence

Declare the review window and selection rule before coding. Seek routine, favorable and adverse evidence. Distinguish legal duties, department requirements and TCF editorial expectations. Use attributable, sufficiently complete evidence, with a source, date, locator, scope and rationale for every observation. Unresolved material disputes remain Unknown.

Several articles about one event count as one observation. Do not count an audit and its underlying cases twice. A source may support more than one check only through separate relevant facts. Raw crime totals, complaint counts, headcount and budget size are context, not automatic performance points. Allegations, settlements, terminations, procedural dismissals and accreditation retain their actual meaning.

## Publication checks

A1, T1, T2, T3 and P2 use four fixed components. Each documented component present earns one rating unit. A component marked absent must be confirmed absent from the named readable set; a blocked URL, search failure or inaccessible site cannot earn a zero. State the audience and scope of that set. Component results do not establish absence everywhere else.

## Critical findings and comparisons

Prominently identify substantiated grave findings and their actual decision-maker beside the grade. There are no hidden score caps. Positive records do not erase adverse findings. Do not rank departments assessed on different checks or selections. Shared-check comparisons still need comparable periods and disclosed sampling limits.

## October 13, 2026 migration

Saved evidence is reassessed against this rubric, with targeted official publication refreshes dated separately. Historical operational and incident cutoffs remain disclosed. Earlier artwork, source PDFs, logs and report pages are retained for viewing. A revised score may reflect the changed method or evidence and does not prove changed department behavior.

## Public sentiment remains separate

The comment index requires 30 eligible account-platform units, three discussions, two independent publishing sources and completed reliability review. It is not a resident-trust percentage and adds no grade points. Missing original comments are never reconstructed to reproduce an old index. Preserve earlier counts and results as historical, with the current result NR when no qualifying sample is available.

# Fixed department rubric

| Category                   | Weight | Checks |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Conduct, force and custody | 35%    | 7      |
| Accountability             | 25%    | 5      |
| Transparency               | 20%    | 4      |
| Training and supervision   | 10%    | 2      |
| Service and communication  | 10%    | 2      |

The following anchors apply consistently to every department. Outcome examples are hypothetical illustrations, not findings about a named agency. Unknown is a separate status and is never a substitute rating of 0 or 2.

## Conduct, force and custody • 35%

### C1 • Stops and searches — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented stop or search complies with its applicable authority and scope.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented stop or search complies with its applicable authority and scope. Example: The complete reviewed stop/search meets its sourced authority and scope.                                                                      |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Authority/scope are met; a minor required receipt detail is omitted.                                                                                         |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Distinct parts of the reviewed search comply and materially fail.                                                                                                |
| 1      | Evidence establishes unsupported stop/search or material scope violation; little of the benchmark is met. Example: A reviewed search substantially exceeds the established lawful scope.                                                                                                            |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving unsupported stop/search or material scope violation. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated deliberate warrantless search without a lawful exception. |

## C2 · Arrests and detention — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented arrest or detention has the required basis, duration and process.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented arrest or detention has the required basis, duration and process. Example: The reviewed detention meets its identified basis, duration and process duties.                        |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Authority and duration are met with a minor nonmaterial processing delay.                                              |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Initial custody is justified but a material later process duty is unmet.                                                   |
| 1      | Evidence establishes unlawful or unjustified detention; little of the benchmark is met. Example: A documented detention continues seriously beyond its established authority.                                                                                 |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving unlawful or unjustified detention. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated grave detention with no lawful basis. |

## C3 · Force justification and proportionality — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented use of force meets the applicable necessity and proportionality benchmark.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented use of force meets the applicable necessity and proportionality benchmark. Example: The complete reviewed force episode affirmatively meets the applicable standard.            |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: The force benchmark is met with a documented minor nonmaterial shortcoming.                                          |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Some force is justified but a distinct material use is not.                                                              |
| 1      | Evidence establishes unjustified or disproportionate force; little of the benchmark is met. Example: The reviewed force is seriously disproportionate to the established threat.                                                                            |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving unjustified or disproportionate force. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated grave use of unjustified force. |

### C4 · Restraint and de-escalation conduct — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented encounter follows applicable restraint, intervention and de-escalation requirements in its actual circumstances.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented encounter follows applicable restraint, intervention and de-escalation requirements in its actual circumstances. Example: The reviewed episode meets all applicable restraint/intervention requirements.              |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Required conduct is largely met with one minor documented omission.                                                                                        |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Some required restraint/intervention steps occur but material steps fail.                                                                                      |
| 1      | Evidence establishes avoidable escalation or prohibited restraint; little of the benchmark is met. Example: A documented serious restraint or de-escalation requirement is largely unmet.                                                                                                         |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving avoidable escalation or prohibited restraint. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated grave prohibited restraint or deliberate failure to intervene. |

### C5 · Custody and medical care — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented custody or medical-care episode meets the applicable safety and care duties.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented custody or medical-care episode meets the applicable safety and care duties. Example: The reviewed care episode or merits finding affirmatively meets the identified duty.                           |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Care duties largely met with a minor documented delay not defeating the benchmark.                                                        |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Some needed care is provided but a material identified duty remains unmet.                                                                    |
| 1      | Evidence establishes denial of required care or unsafe custody; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Documented serious delay defeats most of the applicable care requirement.                                                                                               |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving denial of required care or unsafe custody. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: An established grave denial of necessary medical aid in custody. |

## C6 · Equal treatment — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented service or enforcement decision meets the applicable nondiscrimination/equal-treatment benchmark.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented service or enforcement decision meets the applicable nondiscrimination/equal-treatment benchmark. Example: Affirmative case evidence establishes compliance with the equal-treatment benchmark.      |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: The standard is largely met with a minor documented treatment shortcoming.                                                                |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: The documented decision contains both compliant and materially unequal treatment.                                                             |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established discriminatory treatment; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Reviewed differential treatment seriously fails the applicable equal-treatment duty.                                                                                         |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established discriminatory treatment. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated grave discriminatory enforcement or service decision. |

## C7 · Report and evidence integrity — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented reporting/evidence episode meets accuracy, preservation and disclosure duties.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented reporting/evidence episode meets accuracy, preservation and disclosure duties. Example: The reviewed reporting/preservation episode meets its sourced integrity duties.                                                               |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Evidence preserved accurately with a minor documented nonmaterial logging defect.                                                                                          |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Material records are accurate/preserved in part but an identified part fails.                                                                                                  |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established falsification, evidence loss or deliberate concealment; little of the benchmark is met. Example: A serious documented integrity failure defeats most required safeguards.                                                                                                        |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established falsification, evidence loss or deliberate concealment. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Substantiated deliberate material falsification or evidence concealment. |

## Accountability • 25%

### A1 • Complaint intake access — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** Published complaint intake is usable for its explicitly identified audience.

1. Express route for identified audience
2. Recipient and alternate around accused supervisor
3. No-identification or third-party handling
4. Review stages and result-notification target

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | All four fixed publication components are affirmatively present and usable in the identified readable set.                                                            |
| 3      | 3 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 2      | 2 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 1      | 1 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 0      | 0 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |

### A2 • Investigation quality — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A completed documented investigation addresses the material evidence, competing accounts and relevant issues.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A completed documented investigation addresses the material evidence, competing accounts and relevant issues. Example: Complete reviewed investigation examines material evidence and competing accounts.                       |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: All main issues investigated with a documented minor gap.                                                                                               |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Significant evidence is reviewed but a material line of inquiry is omitted.                                                                                 |
| 1      | Evidence establishes seriously inadequate or biased investigation; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Most material evidence or contrary accounts are not investigated.                                                                                                                  |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving seriously inadequate or biased investigation. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: A substantiated sham investigation completely disregards decisive evidence. |

### A3 · Supported findings and explanations — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A completed finding gives a reasoned conclusion supported by the reviewed evidence.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A completed finding gives a reasoned conclusion supported by the reviewed evidence. Example: Reasoned final findings trace each material conclusion to reviewed evidence.                                              |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Main findings supported with a minor explanation gap.                                                                                          |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Some conclusions have support but a material conclusion lacks explanation.                                                                         |
| 1      | Evidence establishes unsupported or materially misleading final finding; little of the benchmark is met. Example: The final explanation disregards decisive contradictory evidence.                                                                                                   |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving unsupported or materially misleading final finding. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Established fabricated or wholly unsupported final findings. |

### A4 · Corrective action and follow-through — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** Documented corrective action appropriate to an established issue is completed and followed up.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: Documented corrective action appropriate to an established issue is completed and followed up. Example: Appropriate corrective action and its required follow-through are documented complete.                                     |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Correction substantially completed with a minor documented follow-up gap.                                                                                  |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Corrective steps partly completed; material follow-through remains deficient.                                                                                  |
| 1      | Evidence establishes failure to carry out warranted corrective action; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Most warranted corrective action remains undone without adequate justification.                                                                                                   |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving failure to carry out warranted corrective action. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Established complete failure to implement required grave-issue correction. |

## A5 · Cooperation with external oversight — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented oversight episode shows compliance with the applicable oversight requests and requirements.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented oversight episode shows compliance with the applicable oversight requests and requirements. Example: Complete relevant records show compliance with the applicable oversight requirements.                            |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Oversight cooperation largely complete with a minor documented deficiency.                                                                                 |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Material requirements are partly fulfilled and partly breached.                                                                                                |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established obstruction or noncompliance with oversight; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Serious unjustified failure to comply with most oversight requirements.                                                                                                    |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established obstruction or noncompliance with oversight. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Substantiated deliberate grave obstruction of applicable oversight. |

## Transparency • 20%

### T1 • Policy publication — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A bounded reviewed public operational-policy set meets the publication components.

1. Readable operational policy text
2. Identified issuer and effective/revision date
3. Navigable index or clear policy coverage
4. Revision/supersession information sufficient to identify the applicable version

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | All four fixed publication components are affirmatively present and usable in the identified readable set.                                                            |
| 3      | 3 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 2      | 2 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 1      | 1 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 0      | 0 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |

### T2 • Complaint and force outcome disclosure — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A bounded reviewed public outcome-reporting set meets the disclosure components.

1. Defined reporting period and unit
2. Complaint counts with final disposition distinctions
3. Force incidents with review/outcome distinctions
4. Scope, denominator and explanatory limitations

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | All four fixed publication components are affirmatively present and usable in the identified readable set.                                                            |
| 3      | 3 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 2      | 2 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 1      | 1 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 0      | 0 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |

### T3 · Budget and staffing disclosure — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A bounded reviewed budget/personnel publication set meets the disclosure components.

1. Current fiscal-year police appropriation
2. Separated operating/capital detail, current or latest completed year
3. Sworn/civilian/reserve distinctions
4. Dated filled/authorized positions and reconciled service scope

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | All four fixed publication components are affirmatively present and usable in the identified readable set.                                                            |
| 3      | 3 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 2      | 2 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 1      | 1 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 0      | 0 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |

### T4 · Handling documented records requests — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** An actual documented request is handled accurately under the applicable scope, deadlines and disclosure/exemption duties.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: An actual documented request is handled accurately under the applicable scope, deadlines and disclosure/exemption duties. Example: The actual request meets applicable timing, release and explanation duties.                          |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: A request is largely handled correctly with a minor documented deficiency.                                                                                      |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: A request is partly fulfilled but a material valid obligation is not met.                                                                                           |
| 1      | Evidence establishes unjustified withholding or serious failure to respond; little of the benchmark is met. Example: An actual request suffers serious unjustified withholding or deadline failure.                                                                                                    |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving unjustified withholding or serious failure to respond. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Established complete unlawful withholding or deliberate grave obstruction. |

## Training and supervision • 10%

### S1 • Required-training completion — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** Dated completion records establish that the identified required training was completed for the reviewed personnel and period.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: Dated completion records establish that the identified required training was completed for the reviewed personnel and period. Example: Dated personnel-linked records verify the identified required completion.          |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Required completion largely established with a minor documented shortfall.                                                                        |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: The identified completion requirement is materially partly met.                                                                                       |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established failure of mandatory training; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Most required training for the defined group remains uncompleted.                                                                                                               |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established failure of mandatory training. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Verified total failure of the identified mandatory training requirement. |

### S2 • Supervisory review and correction — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** Documented supervisory review identifies relevant issues and completes required corrective follow-through.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: Documented supervisory review identifies relevant issues and completes required corrective follow-through. Example: Relevant review and required corrective follow-through are documented complete.                     |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Review and correction substantially complete with a minor documented gap.                                                                       |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Meaningful review occurs but a material correction duty is unmet.                                                                                   |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established material supervisory failure; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Most material supervisory review/correction duties are unfulfilled.                                                                                                            |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established material supervisory failure. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Substantiated grave supervisory failure and no required follow-through. |

## Service and communication • 10%

### P1 • Assistance and victim/crisis response — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A documented assistance/victim/crisis episode meets the applicable response and follow-through benchmark.

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | The reviewed episode affirmatively meets the stated benchmark: A documented assistance/victim/crisis episode meets the applicable response and follow-through benchmark. Example: Complete reviewed evidence establishes the applicable assistance and follow-through.                               |
| 3      | The benchmark is largely met; a documented minor shortcoming does not materially defeat it. Identify the precise shortcoming. Example: Response largely meets the benchmark with a minor documented shortcoming.                                                                                     |
| 2      | Evidence establishes materially mixed/partial fulfillment of this benchmark. Identify both fulfilled and failed elements. Example: Assistance partly provided with a material identified unmet response duty.                                                                                        |
| 1      | Evidence establishes established failure to provide required assistance; little of the benchmark is met. Example: Serious documented response shortcoming defeats most required assistance.                                                                                                          |
| 0      | Evidence establishes complete benchmark failure or a substantiated grave breach involving established failure to provide required assistance. Identify the decision-maker and critical-finding flag when grave. Example: Substantiated grave refusal of assistance required by the stated benchmark. |

### P2 • Public access and communication — 5 weight points

**Benchmark:** A bounded reviewed police-service publication set supplies usable contact and routing information.

1. Published police contact phone and physical/mail location, with route purpose identified
2. Emergency/after-hours routing
3. Published written police or public-record route
4. Police-service assistance or escalation/response timetable

| Rating | Fixed anchor / hypothetical example                                                                                                                                   |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | All four fixed publication components are affirmatively present and usable in the identified readable set.                                                            |
| 3      | 3 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 2      | 2 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 1      | 1 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |
| 0      | 0 of the four fixed publication components are affirmatively present in the identified readable set; remaining components are confirmed absent from that bounded set. |