



New York State Office of the State Comptroller
Thomas P. DiNapoli

Division of State Government Accountability

Reporting and Utilization of Bias Incident Data

New York City Police Department



Report 2014-N-2

September 2014

Executive Summary

Purpose

To determine whether the New York City Police Department (NYPD) is accurately collecting, recording, and reporting bias incident statistics and utilizing the data for management decisions. We also determined whether NYPD officers receive sufficient training to enable them to identify and handle all possible bias incidents.

Background

With the passage of the Hate Crimes Act of 2000 (Act), the New York State Legislature acknowledged the damaging effect of criminal acts involving violence, intimidation, and destruction of property based on bias and prejudice. The Act requires law enforcement agencies throughout the state to collect and report statistics on hate crimes to the Division of Criminal Justice Services (Division). The Division compiles hate crime data in an annual statewide report and submits summary data to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for its collection and publication.

The NYPD is responsible for capturing, recording, and reporting hate crimes occurring in New York City. The Division reported a state-wide total of 720 hate crime incidents for calendar year 2012, including 374 incidents (52 percent) that reportedly took place in New York City. The NYPD's data is drawn from Incident Reports that are prepared by its Hate Crimes Task Force.

Key Findings

- Based on existing NYPD record-keeping practices, we were unable to confirm that all reported bias incidents are properly captured, recorded, and reported. From 2010 through 2012, there were data disparities between individual incident reports and summaries of bias-related crimes reported. In 2010, for example, individual incident reports indicated that there were 371 bias-related crimes. However, the Division's annual report stated that there were 350 such crimes (a difference of 21 incidents).
- There was no formal central office analysis of, or corresponding action plan for, the bias-related crime data that was collected. Thus, such data was not used for central office management decision-making purposes.
- We also identified some improvement opportunities to enhance the NYPD's training program regarding bias incidents.

Key Recommendations

- Develop a document tracking system to properly account for all bias-related incidents. Ensure that all official summary records of hate crime-related data are reconciled and supported by the properly accounted for incident reports.
- Periodically analyze the captured hate crime-related summary data and make inquiries or take action as appropriate.
- Develop a training-related recordkeeping system that can be easily accessed by NYPD management to ensure that all officers receive required training.
- Consider requiring periodic hate crime-related training as part of the regular NYPD training curriculum.

**State of New York
Office of the State Comptroller**

Division of State Government Accountability

September 25, 2014

Mr. William Bratton
Commissioner
1 Police Plaza
New York, NY 10038

Dear Mr. Bratton:

The Office of the State Comptroller is committed to helping State agencies, public authorities and local government agencies manage government resources efficiently and effectively. By so doing, it provides accountability for tax dollars spent to support government operations. The Comptroller oversees the fiscal affairs of State agencies, public authorities, and local government agencies, as well as their compliance with relevant statutes and their observance of good business practices. This fiscal oversight is accomplished, in part, through our audits, which identify opportunities for improving operations. Audits can also identify strategies for reducing costs and strengthening controls that are intended to safeguard assets.

Following is a report of our audit, entitled *Reporting and Utilization of Bias Incident Data*. The audit was performed pursuant to the State Comptroller's authority as set forth in Article V, Section 1 of the State Constitution and Article III of the General Municipal Law.

This audit's results and recommendations are resources for you to use in effectively managing your operations and in meeting the expectations of taxpayers. If you have any questions about this report, please feel free to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

*Office of the State Comptroller
Division of State Government Accountability*

Table of Contents

Background	4
Audit Findings and Recommendations	5
Accuracy of Reported Data	5
Utilization of Collected Data	7
Bias Incident-Related Training	7
Recommendations	8
Audit Scope and Methodology	8
Authority	9
Reporting Requirements	9
Contributors to This Report	11
Exhibit A	12
Exhibit B	13
Agency Comments	16

State Government Accountability Contact Information:

Audit Director: Frank Patone

Phone: (212) 417-5200

Email: StateGovernmentAccountability@osc.state.ny.us

Address:

Office of the State Comptroller
 Division of State Government Accountability
 110 State Street, 11th Floor
 Albany, NY 12236

This report is also available on our website at: www.osc.state.ny.us

Background

With the passage of the Hate Crimes Act of 2000 (Act), the New York State Legislature acknowledged the damaging effect of criminal acts involving violence, intimidation, and destruction of property based on bias and prejudice. Crimes are defined as bias- or hate-based when the victims were believed to have been targeted due to their actual or perceived race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, religion, religious practice, age, disability, or sexual orientation. The Act states that such crimes do more than threaten the safety and welfare of citizens: “Crimes motivated by invidious hatred toward particular groups not only harm individual victims but send a powerful message of intolerance and discrimination to all members of the group to which the victim belongs. Hate crimes can and do intimidate and disrupt entire communities and vitiate the civility that is essential to healthy democratic processes.”

The Act specifies harsher sentences for offenders convicted of committing such crimes and requires law enforcement agencies throughout the state to collect and report statistics on hate crimes to the Division of Criminal Justice Services (Division). The Division compiles hate crime data in an annual statewide report, in accordance with the Executive Law, and submits summary data to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for its collection and publication. In its “Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Manual,” the FBI states why such data collection is important: “National statistics have resulted in greater awareness and understanding of the true dimensions of the problem nationwide. Those charged with the enforcement of the law will be better able to quantify their resource needs and direct available resources to the areas where they will have the most effectiveness. Likewise, community service organizations and groups will be better able to respond to the needs of the victims.”

Hate crime data reported to the Division include the number and type of incident(s), crime locations, date of the incident(s), bias motivation, and both victim and offender demographics. The Division’s “Hate Crime in New York State: 2012 Annual Report” reported a total of 720 hate crime incidents for that year. Of the total number of hate crimes, 374 incidents (52 percent) reportedly took place in New York City and were reported to the Division by the New York City Police Department (NYPD).

Some advocacy groups contend the actual incidence of bias-related crimes is much higher than official statistics indicate. For example, the New York City Anti-Violence Project, which tracks hate violence against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities, reported that it served 470 hate-crime survivors in 2012, more than the total number of bias incidents reported by the NYPD for the year. Thus, it is possible that not all bias incidents are reported to the NYPD, resulting in the potential underreporting of mandated statistics.

Audit Findings and Recommendations

Based on existing NYPD recordkeeping practices, we were unable to confirm that all bias incidents are properly captured, recorded by the NYPD, and reported to the Division. We also determined that there is no formal central office analysis of, or corresponding action plan for, the data that is collected. In addition, we've identified some improvement opportunities to enhance the NYPD's training program for addressing and reporting bias-related incidents.

Accuracy of Reported Data

Timely and accurate reporting of crimes is a critical step in understanding the nature and volume of crimes committed and proactively addressing increases in crime. Pursuant to Section 837 4(c) of the New York State Executive Law, law enforcement agencies should collect and analyze statistical and all other information and data with respect to the number of hate crimes reported to or investigated by the Division of State Police, and all other police or peace officers in the State. The Division shall include the statistics and other information required by this subdivision in its annual report to the governor and legislature.

Currently, bias incident data is captured as follows:

- When an NYPD officer suspects that an incident he/she has responded to might have been motivated by bias, he/she requests the patrol supervisor to come to the site of the incident.
- The patrol supervisor notifies the precinct desk officer (sergeant or lieutenant) of the incident, and requests the commanding officer (captain or duty captain) to respond.
- The commanding officer determines whether the incident is possibly bias-related and should be referred to NYPD's Hate Crime Task Force (HCTF) for further investigation. He/she prepares a report known as an Unusual Occurrence Report and categorizes the incident as either a Possible Bias Incident or a Non Bias Incident.
- Possible Bias Incidents are then referred to and investigated by the HCTF, while Non Bias Incidents are handled by the individual precincts.

For each potential hate crime investigated, the HCTF prepares an Incident Report, which includes the bias motivation, victim/offender information, and a general description of the incident. The HCTF maintains statistical data on the bias crimes it investigates and forwards copies of the incident reports to NYPD's Office of Management and Planning (OMAP) on a weekly basis. OMAP sorts the bias incidents by category and disseminates the data to the Mayor's Office of Operations and to the Division, which use the data to produce their own reports.

To assess the accuracy of the hate crime data reported by the Division, we counted the HCTF's individual Incident Reports for calendar years 2010 through 2013, and compared our totals to summary data maintained by OMAP and the Division for the same time periods. We identified notable differences (see Table A below).

Table A

	2010	2011	2012	2013
Incident Reports (received from HCTF)	371	255	367	315
Hate Crimes Summary Sheet (OMAP)	340	224	371	321
Hate Crimes by Precinct (OMAP)	378	255	378	315
Hate Crimes Annual Report (Division)	350	242	374	n/a

We also compared the Mayor's Agency Performance Mapping Report (APMR), which is prepared on a fiscal year basis (July to June), to HCTF Incident Reports for the same periods and found similar differences (see Table B).

Table B

Fiscal Year	2011-12	2012-13
Incident Reports	326	314
Agency Performance Mapping Report	305	306
Differences	21	8

When we asked NYPD officials about the different data totals between the HCTF and OMAP, we were told that each NYPD unit does its own physical count of the individual Incident Reports and that is what most likely accounts for the differences.

We note that the official Incident Reports identifying an occurrence as a bias incident are not sequentially numbered and, as a result, it is very difficult for NYPD officials to ensure that all of them are accounted for when preparing the summary reports. Further, by only providing each reporting area with the individual Incident Reports (instead of summarized data), the risk of inconsistent reporting between the areas increases. Moreover, because of the lack of consistency, there is considerable risk that the annual reports prepared by the Division and the Mayor's Office of Operations do not accurately present statistics regarding the number of bias incidents reported in New York City.

We shared this information with the Deputy Commissioner of OMAP, who agreed that the manual compilation process used by the NYPD to produce hate crime statistics may have contributed to the data inconsistencies we found. He added that his staff would review their present methods to identify areas in need of improvement.

Utilization of Collected Data

To determine the distribution of reported bias incidents throughout the five boroughs of New York City, we prepared a pictorial presentation (Exhibit A) illustrating reported incidents by NYPD precinct. The supporting precinct data is presented as Exhibit B. In reviewing the illustrated data, we noted that the number of reported hate crimes varied widely between precincts, as well as from year to year within many of the precincts. From our perspective, it appears that these data comparisons could be useful to NYPD's central office in terms of staff deployment, budgeting, community outreach, etc.

However, when we asked NYPD officials whether they performed any statistical analysis of the reported data for decision-making purposes, we were told that they do not. According to NYPD officials, they are confident that precinct commanders do analyze the data with respect to their individual precincts. However, we believe that an analysis by the central office would offer management the benefit of a "system-wide" perspective and approach to this very significant issue. Also, such analysis could be shared with precinct commanders for their consideration in managing operations at that level. As noted previously, the FBI indicated that the collection of this bias-related crime data would better enable law enforcement officials to quantify their resource needs and direct available resources to areas where they will have the most effectiveness.

Bias Incident-Related Training

Since law enforcement officers are the first to be called to the scene of a potential hate crime, it is imperative that they are adequately trained to handle bias incidents. If they are not, they may fail to identify indicators of hate crimes and not respond appropriately.

We determined that the NYPD does provide its officers training on potential bias incidents. For example, officers are required to complete an appropriate basic training course within one year of employment. That training, which takes place at the Police Academy, includes a course on "policing impartially" that addresses the appropriate officer actions regarding identifying and reporting bias incidents. We also note that the NYPD requires that officers who are promoted to various supervisory ranks (e.g. sergeant, lieutenant, and captain) receive rank-appropriate training for their new job responsibilities, including a course on bias-crime incidents.

According to NYPD officials, other training opportunities include in-service training (non-mandatory courses offered at the Police Academy) and roll-call training, which may be provided at local precincts as part of each day's roll call. Further, some training issues are handled through updates to the "Patrol Guide," the procedural rule book issued to every police officer.

We tried to confirm the periodic hate crime-related training that may take place at the precinct level or the voluntary training officers may sign up for at the Academy. (Note: Such training could be particularly relevant for officers who have not been promoted for many years and might not have received updated training in this area.) We selected a sample of 25 officers ranging in rank from police officer to lieutenant to determine whether those who were long-term employees

without frequent promotion received any hate-crime training after their initial hiring or promotion.

However, we were not able to accurately assess the extent of such training based on the available records. According to NYPD officials, training records are not maintained by topic, nor are they kept electronically or in a central location. We were told the training offered to individual officers should be retained at the precinct level. We therefore visited 10 precincts to determine what roll-call training had been offered to their officers. However, only two of the ten precincts we visited showed us such records for hate-crimes roll-call training. Further, at the other eight precincts we visited, officials told us it would be too time consuming to look through all of their roll-call training records to identify the dates when hate crime-related training was offered. Thus, we could not assess the extent of hate crime-related roll-call or voluntary training received by officers. Without sufficient training, officers could be less certain in terms of what constitutes a reportable bias-related crime.

Recommendations

1. Develop a document tracking system to properly account for all bias-related incidents. Ensure that all official summary records of hate crime-related data are reconciled and supported by the properly accounted for incident reports.
2. Periodically analyze the captured hate crime-related summary data and make inquiries or take action as appropriate.
3. Develop a training-related recordkeeping system that can be easily accessed by NYPD management to ensure that all officers receive required training.
4. Consider requiring periodic hate crime-related training as part of the regular NYPD training curriculum.

Audit Scope and Methodology

Our audit determined whether the New York City Police Department is accurately collecting, recording, and reporting bias incident statistics and utilizing the data for management decisions. We also determined whether police officers receive sufficient training to enable them to identify and handle all possible bias incidents. Our audit covered the period January 2010 through June 2014.

To accomplish our audit objectives we reviewed relevant statutes pertaining to the reporting and collection of bias-crime statistics and required training of NYPD officers. We interviewed NYPD central office and Division officials to determine their respective data collection and incident reporting procedures. We also obtained available hate-crime reports and source data and compared them for inconsistencies. In addition, we visited 10 NYPD precincts to determine what procedures are applied at the precinct level regarding the recording and reporting of hate crime data and the associated officer training.

We conducted our performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

As is our practice, we notified NYPD officials at the outset of the audit that we would be requesting a representation letter in which agency management provides assurances, to the best of their knowledge, concerning the relevance, accuracy, and competence of the evidence provided to the auditors during the course of the audit. The representation letter is intended to confirm oral representations made to the auditors and to reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings. Agency officials normally use the representation letter to assert that, to the best of their knowledge, all relevant financial and programmatic records and related data have been provided to the auditors. They affirm either that the agency has complied with all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to its operations that would have a significant effect on the operating practices being audited, or that any exceptions have been disclosed to the auditors. However, officials at the NYPD advised us that the New York City Mayor’s Office of Operations has informed them that, as a matter of policy, mayoral agency officials do not provide representation letters in connection with our audits. As a result, we lack assurance from NYPD officials that all relevant information was provided to us during the audit.

In addition to being the State Auditor, the Comptroller performs certain other constitutionally and statutorily mandated duties as the chief fiscal officer of New York State. These include operating the State’s accounting system; preparing the State’s financial statements; and approving State contracts, refunds, and other payments. In addition, the Comptroller appoints members to certain boards, commissions, and public authorities, some of whom have minority voting rights. These duties may be considered management functions for purposes of evaluating organizational independence under generally accepted government auditing standards. In our opinion, these functions do not affect our ability to conduct independent audits of program performance.

Authority

The audit was performed pursuant to the State Comptroller’s authority as set forth in Article V, Section 1 of the State Constitution and Article III of the General Municipal Law.

Reporting Requirements

We provided a draft copy of this report to NYPD officials for their review and comment. Their comments were considered in preparing this report and are included in their entirety at the end of the report.

In summary, NYPD officials agree with our report recommendations and have begun to implement them as appropriate.

Within 90 days after final release of this report, we request the Commissioner of the New York City Police Department report to the State Comptroller advising what steps were taken to implement the recommendations contained herein, and where the recommendations were not implemented, the reasons why.

Contributors to This Report

Frank Patone, CPA, Audit Director
Michael Solomon, Audit Manager
Stephen Lynch, Audit Supervisor
Tania Zino, Examiner-in-Charge
David DiNatale, Staff Examiner
Ira Lipper, Staff Examiner
Noreen Perrotta, Senior Editor
Hilary Papineau, Research Analyst
Scott Zucker, Student Assistant

Division of State Government Accountability

Andrew A. SanFilippo, Executive Deputy Comptroller
518-474-4593, asanfilippo@osc.state.ny.us

Tina Kim, Deputy Comptroller
518-473-3596, tkim@osc.state.ny.us

Brian Mason, Assistant Comptroller
518-473-0334, bmason@osc.state.ny.us

Vision


A team of accountability experts respected for providing information that decision makers value.

Mission

To improve government operations by conducting independent audits, reviews and evaluations of New York State and New York City taxpayer financed programs.

Exhibit A

Number of Hate Crimes per New York City Precinct 2010 - 2013



The 121st precinct became operational in 2013 and separate hate crime data is not yet available. The data for this area is reported under precincts 120 and 122.

Exhibit B

Reported Hate Crimes by Precinct, 2010-2013

Borough	Precinct	Neighborhood	Number of Reported Bias Crimes				
			2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Manhattan	1	North of Tribeca and West of Little Italy	13	4	6	4	27
Manhattan	5	Chinatown	6	5	4	5	20
Manhattan	6	Greenwich and West Village	13	7	2	10	32
Manhattan	7	Lower East Side	10	3	1	4	18
Manhattan	9	East Houston Street to East 14 th Street	5	1	5	4	15
Manhattan	10	Chelsea and Clinton South	2	4	3	4	13
Manhattan	13	Lower Midtown Manhattan	2	7	6	6	21
Manhattan	14	Garment District	8	5	12	14	39
Manhattan	17	Sutton Area, Beekman Place, Kips Bay	3	1	0	1	5
Manhattan	18	Midtown Manhattan	6	4	7	7	24
Manhattan	19	Upper East Side	4	3	5	1	13
Manhattan	20	Upper West Side	6	2	6	5	19
Manhattan	22	Central Park	0	1	0	0	1
Manhattan	23	East Harlem	1	2	1	4	8
Manhattan	24	North Upper West Side	2	2	13	5	22
Manhattan	25	North East Harlem	1	1	3	6	11
Manhattan	26	Upper Manhattan	6	2	3	5	16
Manhattan	28	Harlem	1	4	4	2	11
Manhattan	30	Hamilton Heights, Sugar Hill, West Harlem	2	1	2	0	5
Manhattan	32	Central Harlem	4	2	4	1	11
Manhattan	33	Washington Heights	2	1	3	3	9
Manhattan	34	Hudson Heights	3	4	4	4	15
Bronx	40	Port Morris	2	3	1	2	8
Bronx	41	Longwood	4	1	0	3	8
Bronx	42	Morrisania	6	0	1	0	7
Bronx	43	Clason Point	1	3	2	1	7
Bronx	44	Highbridge, Mount Eden	4	2	1	4	11
Bronx	45	Northeast Bronx	1	3	2	5	11
Bronx	46	Fordham, University Heights, Morris Heights	4	1	1	0	6

- 2 -

Bronx	47	Woodlawn, Wakefield, Williamsbridge, Baychester, Edenwald	1	0	0	0	1
Bronx	48	Tremont, Claremont	0	0	3	1	4
Bronx	49	Allerton, Morris Park, Van Nest, Pelham Parkway, Eastchester Gardens, Pelham Gardens	1	2	7	3	13
Bronx	50	Riverdale, Fieldston, Kingsbridge, Marble Hill	4	2	8	5	19
Bronx	52	Bedford Park, Fordham, Kingsbridge, Norwood	0	2	2	3	7
Brooklyn	60	Coney Island, Brighton Beach	4	8	14	6	32
Brooklyn	61	Sheepshead Bay, Gravesend, Kings Highway	12	5	16	12	45
Brooklyn	62	Bensonhurst	6	1	7	2	16
Brooklyn	63	Flatlands	7	4	7	3	21
Brooklyn	66	Borough Park	7	10	37	10	64
Brooklyn	67	Prospect Lefferts	5	5	0	6	16
Brooklyn	68	Bay Ridge, Dyker Heights, Fort Hamilton	6	1	7	5	19
Brooklyn	69	Canarsie	0	0	2	6	8
Brooklyn	70	Borough Park	14	13	7	8	42
Brooklyn	71	South Crown Heights	12	8	19	15	54
Brooklyn	72	Sunset Park	7	2	2	3	14
Brooklyn	73	Ocean Hill - Brownsville	1	0	2	2	5
Brooklyn	75	Cypress Hills, Starrett City	8	3	2	4	17
Brooklyn	76	Cobble Hill	2	0	0	3	5
Brooklyn	77	North Crown Heights	9	6	7	6	28
Brooklyn	78	Park Slope	3	5	1	3	12
Brooklyn	79	Bedford Stuyvesant	12	3	2	2	19
Brooklyn	81	Bedford Stuyvesant	1	0	1	1	3
Brooklyn	83	Bushwick	9	5	2	1	17
Brooklyn	84	Brooklyn Heights, Boerum Hill, Vinegar Hill	4	3	3	2	12
Brooklyn	88	Clinton Hill/Fort Greene	1	1	3	1	6
Brooklyn	90	Williamsburg	18	21	14	17	70
Brooklyn	94	Greenpoint	2	6	4	5	17
Queens	100	Rockaway Peninsula	2	1	2	0	5

- 3 -

Queens	101	East end of Rockaway Peninsula	4	10	2	2	18
Queens	102	Kew Gardens, Richmond Hill East, Richmond Hill	1	1	10	3	15
Queens	103	Downtown Jamaica Business District, Hollis Park Gardens, Hollis, Jamaica	1	2	6	3	12
Queens	104	Ridgewood, Glendale, Middle Village, Maspeth	2	0	3	2	7
Queens	105	Queens Village, Cambria Heights, Laurelton, Rosedale	2	2	1	6	11
Queens	106	Ozone Park	1	6	2	3	12
Queens	107	Fresh Meadows, Cunningham Heights, Hilltop Village	12	5	13	3	33
Queens	108	Long Island City, Sunnyside, Woodside	2	2	5	4	13
Queens	109	Downtown Flushing, East Flushing, Queensboro Hill	7	4	3	1	15
Queens	110	Corona, Elmhurst	2	1	2	4	9
Queens	111	Bayside, Douglaston, Little Neck, Auburndale, Fresh Meadows	2	1	3	4	10
Queens	112	Forest Hills, Rego Park	6	0	13	5	24
Queens	113	St. Albans, Hollis, Springfield Gardens, South Ozone	1	1	2	0	4
Queens	114	Astoria, Long Island City, Woodside, Jackson Heights	4	2	2	5	13
Queens	115	East Elmhurst, North Corona, Jackson Heights	3	12	2	3	20
Staten Island	120	St. George, New Brighton, Stapleton	37	4	6	4	51
Staten Island	121	Graniteville, Willowbrook, Westerleigh	0	0	0	0	0
Staten Island	122	New Dorp, Oakwood, Midland Beach, Dongan Hills	10	6	15	11	42
Staten Island	123	Tottenville	1	0	5	7	13
Totals			378	255	378	315	1,326

Data source: NYPD's Office of Management and Planning

Agency Comments



POLICE DEPARTMENT

Deputy Commissioner, Management Analysis and Planning
One Police Plaza, Room 1408
New York, New York 10038

August 13, 2014

Frank Patone
Audit Director
New York State Comptroller's Office
110 State Street, 11th Floor
Albany, NY 12236

**Re: NYS Comptroller Draft
Audit Report on the Reporting
and Utilization of Bias Incident
Data**

Dear Director Patone:

I am responding to the Draft Report of an audit on the Reporting and Utilization of Bias Incident Data conducted by the New York State Office of the State Comptroller, Division of State Government Accountability. In our previous letter dated August 11, 2014, we responded to two of the four recommendations and indicated that a final comprehensive response would be forwarded to you. Accordingly, this letter will serve as our final response to the recommendations indicated in the report.

As indicated in my previous correspondence, the Police Department is committed to enforcing the *Year 2000 New York State Hate Crimes Act* and to collect and report statistics on hate crimes for the Division of Criminal Justice Services. By collecting and reporting bias related data the Police Department is able to channel available resources to areas where they will be used most effectively. The Draft report acknowledges that the Police Department provides formalized training on bias related crime incidents to officers with less than one year on the job as well as to officers who are promoted to the rank of Sergeant, Lieutenant or Captain. It is also noted that additional training is conducted periodically at the Police Academy, at precincts during roll call, and at various Police facilities when updates have been made to the Patrol Guide regarding bias-related incidents.

COURTESY • PROFESSIONALISM • RESPECT
Website: <http://nyc.gov/nypd>

PD 10-11 (Rev. 4-09-14)

The recommendation that the Police Department develop a document tracking system to properly account for all bias-related incidents, and that records of hate crime-related data be reconciled and supported by properly accounted for incident reports, has been reviewed. It should be noted that "possible bias" incidents, as defined in the Patrol Guide, are entered into the Hate Crimes Task Force Database, a system which assists us in tracking possible bias related incidents. We are currently requesting that an enhancement/augmentation be made to the current system which will allow us to better retrieve, conduct searches, and account for all bias related incidents.


The recommendation that the Police Department periodically analyze the captured hate crime-related data to make inquiries or take action as appropriate, has been reviewed. The Hate Crimes Task Force is currently analyzing data and documenting "possible bias" related incidents. The data is being used to assist in investigative functions as well as to establish "pattern crime" by linking separate "possible bias" incidents together to enhance investigative efficiency. Additionally, weekly statistical reports are produced which show increases or decreases for all categories of possible bias incidents.

The report also recommends the development and creation of a training related record-keeping system to ensure that all officers receive required training. We have reviewed this recommendation and concur that a Department database similar to the one currently used for the Automated External Defibrillator (AED) training be created. The database would be updated periodically by precinct training coordinators and would track hate crime-related training given to officers.

The final recommendation is that periodic hate crime-related training be made part of the regular NYPD training curriculum. We agree that a course dedicated to hate crimes be established.

We appreciate the time and effort the auditors used to complete this audit. If you have any questions concerning this response please contact Kenneth Wesley, Audit Management Unit at 646-610-8366.

Sincerely,



Terrence Riley
Inspector
Commanding Officer