

# LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCREDITATION

## Frederick (MD) Police Department

### Agency

Frederick (MD) Police Department  
100 West Patrick Street  
Frederick, MD 21701

### Chief Executive Officer

Chief of Police  
Edward Hargis

### Methodology Overview

CALEA serves as the premier credentialing association for public safety agencies and provides accreditation services for law enforcement organizations, public safety communication centers, public safety training academies, and campus security agencies. The standards are promulgated by a board of 21 commissioners, representing a full spectrum of public safety leadership. The assessment process includes extensive self-assessment, annual remote web-based assessments, and quadrennial site-based assessments. Additionally candidate agencies are presented to the Commission for final consideration and credentialing.

CALEA Accreditation is a voluntary process and participating public safety agencies, by involvement, have demonstrated a commitment to professionalism. The program is intended to enhance organization service capacities and effectiveness, serve as a tool for policy decisions and management, promote transparency and community trust, and establish a platform for continuous review.

CALEA Accreditation is the Gold Standard for Public Safety Agencies and represents a commitment to excellence.



### *Law Enforcement Accreditation*

CALEA standards reflect the current thinking and experience of Law Enforcement practitioners and researchers. Major Law Enforcement associations, leading educational and training institutions, governmental agencies, as well as Law Enforcement executives internationally, acknowledge CALEA's Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies© and its Accreditation Programs as benchmarks for professional law enforcement agencies.

#### **CALEA's Founding Organizations:**

- **International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)**
- **Police Executive ResearchForum (PERF)**
- **National Sheriffs Association (NSA)**
- **National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>Executive Summary</b>
<b>Chief Executive Officer Profile</b>
<b>Community Profile</b>
<b>Agency History</b>
<b>Agency Structure and Function</b>
<b>Agency Successes</b>
<b>Future Issues for Agency</b>
<b>First Annual Compliance Service Review</b>
<b>Second Annual Compliance Service Review</b>
<b>Third Annual Compliance Service Review</b>
<b>Fourth Annual Compliance Service Review</b>
<b>Site-Based Assessment Review</b>
<b>Community Feedback and Review</b>
<b>Standards Related Data Tables</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### *Overview:*

The Frederick (MD) Police Department is currently commanded by Edward Hargis. The agency participated in a remote assessment(s), as well as site-based assessment activities as components of the accreditation process. The executive summary serves as a synopsis of key findings, with greater details found in the body of the report.

### *Compliance Service Review:*

CALEA Compliance Services Member(s) Tim Hazlette remotely reviewed 30 standards for the agency on 4/6/2017 using Law Enforcement Manual 5.23. These standards included specific time-sensitive issues, as well as all standards applicable to the agency by size and function. If standard issues are found they are listed below.

CALEA Compliance Services Member(s) Virgil Hubbard remotely reviewed 51 standards for the agency on 3/26/2018 using Law Enforcement Manual 5.23. These standards included specific time-sensitive issues, as well as all standards applicable to the agency by size and function. If standard issues are found they are listed below.

- 3.1.1 – Written Agreement for Services Provided (LE1) – ISSUE: 1) In Bullet B, the highlighted portion of the MOU says SROs are employees of FPD and rules, regulations, and policies and procedures, but does not really address financial obligations. 2) The MOU does not contain language addressing records to be maintained concerning performance of services by the provider agency. AGENCY ACTION NEEDED: 1) The MOU needs language specifically addressing financial obligations. 2) The MOU should have language addressing records as required by the standard. CSM NOTE: The agency continues resolution on this issue as the contract will have to be amended. Suggest future review.

CALEA Compliance Services Member(s) Russell McElwee remotely reviewed 74 standards for the agency on 3/15/2019 using Law Enforcement Manual 5.23. These standards included specific time-sensitive issues, as well as all standards applicable to the agency by size and function. If standard issues are found they are listed below.

CALEA Compliance Services Member(s) Brian Childress remotely reviewed 86 standards for the agency on 10/15/2019 using Law Enforcement Manual 5.23. These standards included specific time-sensitive issues, as well as all standards applicable to the agency by size and function. If standard issues are found they are listed below.

### *Site-Based Assessment Review:*

From 11/18/2019 to 11/20/2019, Michael Webb and David Wolf visited the agency following a consultation with the chief executive officer regarding critical issues impacting the organization since the last assessment. These issues were identified as:

- Community Partnership - With an understanding of the importance of maintaining and increasing community partnership and engagement, the agency has created a comprehensive strategy to determine the effectiveness of agency programs and the effect those programs have on Community Partnership and Engagement. The analysis has provided insight on the proper allocation of resources to ensure the agency has the tools needed to continue to provide programs that encourage, enhance and support community partnership. It is clear the agency places a great importance in the community and the commitment of every member is evident in the organizational culture.
- Training And Personnel Development - The agency Command Staff clearly understands the need to increase retention of experienced employees. They have developed a clear path to address the issues identified. Understanding the future needs of the agency, and ensuring there is a comprehensive plan in place to address both the current and future needs of the agency, is a key element for success. The Frederick Police Department has been able to identify these needs and put into place a plan to ensure the continued success and growth of the agency.
- Crime Fighting And Public Safety - The agency demonstrates the importance of maintaining community safety

and quality of life. The agency has implemented an ongoing review of their Crime Fighting and Public Safety Operations. This review and planning provides the opportunity for all agency functions to update their operational processes to ensure alignment with the mission. This mission is clearly focused on maintaining a safe environment and all agency members are provided with the needed resources to ensure mission fulfillment.

- Facilities, Research And Technology - The agency has completed a comprehensive evaluation of the facilities, research and technology currently available. As assessors were shown, the agency has identified areas for growth and have developed a comprehensive plan to address and improve those areas. The agency is forward thinking in its realization that, in order to provide the best protections and quality of life standards, law enforcement must remain current with changes in equipment and technology. The Frederick Police Department is well on its way to accomplishing this critical task.

During the Site-Based Assessment Review, the assessment team conducted 96 interviews regarding the topical areas previously defined. The interviews were with agency members and members of the community. The approach not only further confirmed standards adherence, but also considered effectiveness measures, process management and intended outcomes.

---

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER PROFILE

---

### *Edward Hargis*

---

Chief Ed Hargis began his law enforcement career in 1982 as a civilian Police Dispatcher in Cherry Hill, New Jersey. In 1986, Chief Hargis began working as a Police Officer with the Camden City Police Department in Camden, New Jersey. During his tenure in Camden, his assignments included Patrol Operations, Special Operations, Tactical Force Unit, Emergency Services Unit, and led the Operations and Criminal Investigations Commands. He rose through the ranks and was appointed as Chief of Police in January 2008. He also served concurrently as the Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator for the City of Camden for seven years.

Chief Hargis was appointed Chief of Police of the Portsmouth Police Department in January 2009. During his tenure, he's focused on making Portsmouth a safer city through the implementation of several initiatives to reduce crime and improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods and commercial corridors. He has worked progressively with staff to develop a five year Strategic Plan for the agency specifically targeted at improved Public Safety Services, Enhancing Community Partnerships, Developing Personnel and Improving Technology within the agency.

On July 30, 2015, Chief Hargis was appointed Chief of Police of the Frederick Police Department.

Chief Hargis holds a Bachelor's Degree in Public Administration and a Master's Degree in Administrative Science from Fairleigh Dickinson University. He is a graduate of the FBI National Academy 207th Session and the FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development – (LEEDS) Program.

Chief Hargis previously served as Chairman of the Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Training Academy (HRCJTA) Board of Directors and Executive Committee, and previously served as the 2014 President of the Hampton Roads Association of Chiefs of Police. He has served as an Adjunct Professor at Tidewater Community College and is a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

---

## COMMUNITY PROFILE

---

Frederick is located less than 1 hour from Washington DC and Baltimore, MD and has the second largest population in the State of Maryland. According to the US Census Bureau, the city has a total area of 23.13 square miles. In 2010 the population was 65,239, in 2014 it was estimated that the population had increased to 67,403.

2014 ERSI Forecasts - Demographics: White Alone = 41,855 (62.1%);  
Black Alone = 12,439 (18.5%); American Indian Alone = 296 (0.4%); Asian Alone = 3,971  
(5.9%); Pacific Islander Alone = 76 (0.1%); Some Other Race Alone = 5,738 (8.5%);  
Two or More Races = 3,028 (4.5%); Hispanic Origin – Any Race = 11,506 (17.1%)

2014 ERSI Forecasts - Average Household Income = \$81,314

2014 ERSI Forecasts - Average Education Level - High School  
Graduate = 9,242 (20.5%); Some College = 9,648 (21.4%); Associate Degree =  
3,652 (8.1%); Bachelor Degree = 9,828 (21.8%)

Top Ten Employers (as of 2015 provided by City of Frederick, Economic Development) (1) Ft. Detrick Campus –  
(Military, Civilian, NCI) 6,400; (2) Frederick County Public Schools 5,650; (3) Frederick Memorial Healthcare 2,232;  
(4) Frederick County Government 1,937; (5) Leidos BioMedical Research 1,836; (6) Wells Fargo Home Mortgage  
1,742; (7) Frederick Community College 992; (8) City of Frederick Government 842; (9) State Farm Insurance 832;  
(10) United Health Care 635.

---

## AGENCY HISTORY

---

In 1745, Daniel Dulaney founded Fredericktown on a feeder creek of the Monocacy River. In 1817, with a population of 3,640, Frederick became an incorporated municipality. On March 21 of that year, the city's administration appointed four town constables, one each to supervise streets, markets, enforcement, and animals.

The Police Department was officially organized in 1858 with an authorized strength of a captain and two constables. The following year the city force increased to four -- and by 1870 the organization had evolved into a police force following the established models of New York City and Metropolitan Police of London. Constables became policemen, and the force consisted of a police chief, a day squad consisting of three officers, and a night squad of three officers. From 1817 until 1941, constables and policeman served for one year and had to be rehired each year, being appointed or reappointed by the mayor and Board of Common Council and Board of Alderman. In 1941, the city reorganized the department with officers no longer being required to be rehired each year – in effect recognizing the force as a professional organization of career law enforcement officers.

Currently, the Frederick Police Department is a full-service municipal law enforcement agency, comprised of 148 sworn and 46 full-time non-sworn personnel. The Department deeply integrated with the community it serves through our policing strategies that emphasize intelligence-led deployment strategies, problem-solving, and community policing.

---

## AGENCY STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

---

The Frederick Police Department is commanded by a Chief of Police who reports to a Mayor and Board of Aldermen. Two police Captains serve as Deputy Chiefs of Police. One Deputy Chief commands the Operational Services Bureau and the other commands the Special Services Bureau. The Operational Services Bureau is comprised of two Patrol Divisions and the Special Operations Division all commanded by Lieutenants. The Special Services Bureau is comprised of three Divisions each commanded by a Lieutenant – The Criminal Investigation Division, The Technology Services Division, The Support Services Division. The Professional Services Division, commanded by a Lieutenant, reports directly to the Chief of Police. There are 146 authorized sworn positions. In 2017 FPD was authorized 53 civilian employees.



---

## AGENCY SUCCESSES

---

The Frederick Police Department implemented the new three-year strategic plan incorporating the tenets of public safety, community partnerships and engagement, personnel development, and enhancement of facilities, resources, and technology. The prevailing tenet of this plan is placing accountability throughout all levels of the Department commensurate with specific units' particular responsibilities.

The Frederick Police Department continues effective recruiting efforts with a total of 1,333 combined applicants for our two most recent entry level academies with 42% of the applicants reporting from minority demographics and ethnicities.

The City of Frederick experienced a 42% reduction of violent crime with an overall 0.5% reduction of all reported Uniform Crime Report Part I crimes. Department members initiated 48% of the 104,811 calls for service through proactive patrol techniques, community talks, and other liaison opportunities. The Department initiated and successfully completed several long-term investigations with the purpose of dismantling drug trade organizations trafficking illegal substances within the City of Frederick. In addition, the Department continues to foster formalized partnerships with federal law enforcement and actively participate in several federal task forces formed to address criminal/gang enterprises, human trafficking, and crimes against children. The Department maximized use of grant funding provided by the Governor's Office on Crime, Control, and Prevention to assist with analytical deployments

---

## FUTURE ISSUES FOR AGENCY

---

Attrition due to anticipated retirements concerns the Department; however, as stated above, the Department has exceeded recruiting expectations when compared to other jurisdictions. The Department continues to collaborate with external stakeholders and participate at community events to foster a strong community relationship and maximize recruiting opportunities throughout the community. In addition, the Department actively participates in the City of Frederick's Diversity and Inclusion initiatives to increase minority hiring and promotional opportunities.

Although the Department experienced success in combating criminal drug trade organizations, much work lies ahead with opioids, spice (synthetic marijuana), and fentanyl continuing to affect jurisdictions across the country. In addition, the Department faces numerous challenges associated with an apparent increase of homelessness negatively affecting quality of life for numerous residents and businesses in the historic district. The Department diligently continues to work with service providers, partners in the criminal justice system, and not for profit organizations for a multi-faceted approach to service, enforcement, and education while balancing reported quality of life complaints and upholding civil liberties for those involved.

## YEAR 1 REMOTE WEB-BASED ASSESSMENT

Compliance Services Member: Tim Hazlette

On 4/6/2017, the Year 1 Remote Web-based Assessment of Frederick (MD) Police Department was conducted. The review was conducted remotely and included 30 standards from the CALEA® Standards for Law Enforcement Manual. The following standards were reviewed and the findings are denoted:

Standards	Findings
1 Law Enforcement Role and Authority	
1.1.2 Code of Ethics* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.2.9 Bias Based Profiling* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.1 Use of Reasonable Force (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.6 Reporting Uses of Force* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.11 Annual/Biennial Proficiency Training* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.13 Analyze Reports from 1.3.6* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
15 Planning and Research Goals and Objectives and Crime Analysis	
15.2.1 Annual Updating/Goals and Objectives* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
17 Fiscal Management and Agency Property	
17.4.2 Cash Fund/Accounts Maintenance* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
31 Recruitment	
31.2.2 Annual Analysis* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
32 Selection	
32.1.1 Selection Process Described (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33 Training and Career Development	
33.5.1 Annual Retraining Program* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35 Performance Evaluation	
35.1.2 Annual Evaluation* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35.1.9 Personnel Early Warning System* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41 Patrol	
41.2.2 Pursuit of Motor Vehicles* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.3 Roadblocks and Forcible Stopping* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.7 Mental Illness* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
42 Criminal Investigation	
42.1.6 Criminal Intelligence* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

Standards	Findings
46 Critical Incidents Special Operations and Homeland Security	
46.1.3 Command Function* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.9 Annual Training* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.10 Active Threats* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
52 Internal Affairs	
52.1.1 Complaint Investigation (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70 Detainee Transportation	
70.1.1 Pre-Transport Prisoner Searches (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70.1.7 Procedures Escape* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71 Processing and Temporary Detention	
71.2.1 Training of Personnel* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71.4.3 Inspections* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
72 Holding Facility	
72.1.1 Training User Personnel* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
73 Court Security	
73.1.1 Role Authority Policies (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81 Communications	
81.3.2 Alternate Power Source* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82 Central Records	
82.1.6 Computer File Backup and Storage* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84 Property and Evidence Control	
84.1.6 Inspections and Reports* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

***Response from Agency Regarding Findings:***

CEO Feedback not provided.

## YEAR 2 REMOTE WEB-BASED ASSESSMENT

Compliance Services Member: Virgil Hubbard

On 3/26/2018, the Year 2 Remote Web-based Assessment of Frederick (MD) Police Department was conducted. The review was conducted remotely and included 51 standards from the CALEA® Standards for Law Enforcement Manual. The following standards were reviewed and the findings are denoted:

Standards	Findings
1 Law Enforcement Role and Authority	
1.1.1 Oath of Office (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.1.2 Code of Ethics* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.2.4 Search and Seizure (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.2.9 Bias Based Profiling* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.2 Use of Deadly Force (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.7 Reviewing Reports of 1.3.6* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.13 Analyze Reports from 1.3.6* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
3 Contractual Agreements for Law Enforcement Services	
3.1.1 Written Agreement for Services Provided (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
<p><b>Notes:</b> ISSUE: 1) In Bullet B, the highlighted portion of the MOU says SROs are employees of FPD and rules, regulations, and policies and procedures, but does not really address financial obligations. 2) The MOU does not contain language addressing records to be maintained concerning performance of services by the provider agency. AGENCY ACTION NEEDED: 1) The MOU needs language specifically addressing financial obligations. 2) The MOU should have language addressing records as required by the standard. CSM NOTE: The agency continues resolution on this issue as the contract will have to be amended. Suggest future review.</p>	
11 Organization and Administration	
11.4.5 Notify CEO of Incident with Liability (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
12 Direction	
12.1.3 Obey Lawful Orders (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
15 Planning and Research Goals and Objectives and Crime Analysis	
15.2.1 Annual Updating/Goals and Objectives* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
21 Classification and Delineation of Duties and Responsibilities	
21.2.2 Job Description Maintenance and Availability (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22 Compensation Benefits and Conditions of Work	
22.2.4 Victim Witness Services/Line of Duty Death (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
26 Disciplinary Procedures	
26.1.3 Sexual Harassment (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
26.1.6 Appeal Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
31 Recruitment	
31.2.2 Annual Analysis* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
32 Selection	
32.2.1 Background Investigations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33 Training and Career Development	
33.1.5 Remedial Training (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.4.1 Entry Level Training Required (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.5.1 Annual Retraining Program* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
34 Promotion	
34.1.3 Promotional Process Described (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35 Performance Evaluation	
35.1.2 Annual Evaluation* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35.1.9 Personnel Early Warning System* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41 Patrol	
41.1.4 Agency Animals (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.2 Pursuit of Motor Vehicles* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.3.2 Equipment Specification/Replenishment (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.3.5 Protective Vests (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
42 Criminal Investigation	
42.1.3 Case File Management (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
42.2.10 Interview Rooms (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
43 Vice Drugs and Organized Crime	
43.1.1 Complaint Management (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
44 Juvenile Operations	
44.1.1 Juvenile Operations Policy (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46 Critical Incidents Special Operations and Homeland Security	
46.1.4 Operations Function (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.9 Annual Training* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.3.4 Hazmat Awareness (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
52 Internal Affairs	
52.1.2 Records Maintenance and Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
52.2.1 Complaint Types (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
55 Victim/Witness Assistance	
55.2.6 Next-of-Kin Notification (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61 Traffic	
61.1.3 Violator Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.1.11 DUI Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70 Detainee Transportation	
70.1.2 Searching Transport Vehicles (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70.1.7 Procedures Escape* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71 Processing and Temporary Detention	
71.1.1 Designate Rooms or Areas (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71.4.3 Inspections* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81 Communications	
81.2.12 Misdirected Emergency Calls (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.3.2 Alternate Power Source* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82 Central Records	
82.1.2 Juvenile Records (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82.2.1 Field Reporting System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
83 Collection and Preservation of Evidence	
83.1.1 24 Hour Availability (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84 Property and Evidence Control	
84.1.2 Storage and Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84.1.3 Temporary Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84.1.6 Inspections and Reports* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

***Response from Agency Regarding Findings:***

CEO Feedback not provided.

## YEAR 3 REMOTE WEB-BASED ASSESSMENT

Compliance Services Member: Russell McElwee

On 3/15/2019, the Year 3 Remote Web-based Assessment of Frederick (MD) Police Department was conducted. The review was conducted remotely and included 74 standards from the CALEA® Standards for Law Enforcement Manual. The following standards were reviewed and the findings are denoted:

Standards	Findings
1 Law Enforcement Role and Authority	
1.2.1 Legal Authority Defined (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.2.5 Arrest with/without Warrant (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.2.8 Strip/Body Cavity Search (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.3 Warning Shots (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.5 Rendering Aid After Use of Weapons (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.10 Demonstrating Proficiency with Weapons (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
3 Contractual Agreements for Law Enforcement Services	
3.1.1 Written Agreement for Services Provided (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
11 Organization and Administration	
11.1.1 Description of Organization (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
12 Direction	
12.1.2 Command Protocol (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
12.2.2 Dissemination and Storage (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
16 Allocation and Distribution of Personnel and Personnel Alternatives	
16.3.1 Program Description (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.2 Selection Criteria (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.3 Entry Level Training (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.5 In-Service Training (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.6 Use of Force Training & Firearms Proficiency (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.4.2 Training (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22 Compensation Benefits and Conditions of Work	
22.2.2 Benefits Program (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22.2.8 Military Deployment and Reintegration (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22.3.5 Extra-Duty Employment (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
25 Grievance Procedures	



<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
25.1.1 Grievance Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
26 Disciplinary Procedures	
26.1.1 Code of Conduct and Appearance (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
32 Selection	
32.2.8 Emotional Stability/Psychological Fitness Examinations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33 Training and Career Development	
33.1.6 Employee Training Record Maintenance (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.4.3 Field Training Program (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35 Performance Evaluation	
35.1.1 Performance Evaluation System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41 Patrol	
41.2.6 Missing Children (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.3.8 In-Car Audio/Video (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
42 Criminal Investigation	
42.2.1 Preliminary Investigations Steps (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
44 Juvenile Operations	
44.2.3 Custodial Interrogation (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46 Critical Incidents Special Operations and Homeland Security	
46.1.1 Planning Responsibility (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.2 All Hazard Plan (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.5 Planning Function (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.2.7 Special Events Plan (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
52 Internal Affairs	
52.2.3 Investigation Time Limits (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61 Traffic	
61.1.2 Uniform Enforcement Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.1.4 Informing The Violator (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.1.5 Uniform Enforcement Policies (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.4.1 Assistance Highway Users (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.4.2 Hazardous Highway Conditions (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70 Detainee Transportation	
70.2.1 Prisoner Restraint Requirement (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
70.4.2 Rear Compartment Modifications (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71 Processing and Temporary Detention	
71.3.3 Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71.4.2 Fire Prevention/Suppression (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71.5.1 Security Concerns in Designated Processing or Testing Rooms/Areas (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
72 Holding Facility	
72.1.1 Training User Personnel* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
72.4.1 Securing Firearms (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
72.5.3 Sight and Sound Separation (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73 Court Security	
73.1.1 Role Authority Policies (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.3.1 Weapon Lockboxes (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.4.2 External Communications (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.5.12 Securing Firearms (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.5.18 Designated Control Point (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
81 Communications	
81.2.1 24 Hour Toll-Free Service (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.2.14 First Aid Over Phone (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82 Central Records	
82.1.1 Privacy and Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82.2.3 Case Numbering System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
83 Collection and Preservation of Evidence	
83.2.4 Equipment and Supplies (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
83.3.2 Evidence Laboratory Submission (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84 Property and Evidence Control	
84.1.1 Evidence/Property Control System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84.1.4 Security of Controlled Substances Weapons for Training (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
91 Campus Law Enforcement	
91.1.1 Risk Assessment and Analysis* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.2 Out of Agency Budget Coordination	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.3 Campus Background Investigation (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.4 Campus Security Escort Service (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>

Standards	Findings
91.1.5 Emergency Notification System (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.7 Behavioral Threat Assessment (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.8 Security Camera Responsibilities* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.9 Emergency Only Phones and Devices* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.10 Administrative Investigation Procedures (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.2.1 Agency Role and Responsibilities (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.2.2 Personnel Assigned to Medical Centers	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.2.3 First Responses Responsibilities	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.3.1 Agency Role and Responsibilities (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.4.1 Position Responsible for Clery Act* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>

***Response from Agency Regarding Findings:***

CEO Feedback not provided.

## YEAR 4 REMOTE WEB-BASED ASSESSMENT

Compliance Services Member: Brian Childress

On 10/15/2019, the Year 4 Remote Web-based Assessment of Frederick (MD) Police Department was conducted. The review was conducted remotely and included 86 standards from the CALEA® Standards for Law Enforcement Manual. The following standards were reviewed and the findings are denoted:

Standards	Findings
1 Law Enforcement Role and Authority	
1.2.3 Compliance with Constitutional Requirements (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.2 Use of Deadly Force (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.4 Use of Authorized Less Lethal Weapons (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.6 Reporting Uses of Force* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.7 Reviewing Reports of 1.3.6* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.8 Removal from Line of Duty Assignment Use of Force (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.9 Authorization: Weapons and Ammunition (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.10 Demonstrating Proficiency with Weapons (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.12 Issuing Written Directives (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
1.3.13 Analyze Reports from 1.3.6* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
11 Organization and Administration	
11.3.1 Responsibility/Authority (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
12 Direction	
12.2.1 The Written Directive System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
16 Allocation and Distribution of Personnel and Personnel Alternatives	
16.3.1 Program Description (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.2 Selection Criteria (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.3 Entry Level Training (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.5 In-Service Training (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
16.3.6 Use of Force Training & Firearms Proficiency (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
17 Fiscal Management and Agency Property	
17.5.3 Operational Readiness (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22 Compensation Benefits and Conditions of Work	
22.2.7 Employee Identification (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
22.3.2 General Health and Physical Fitness (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
26 Disciplinary Procedures	
26.1.4 Disciplinary System (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
31 Recruitment	
31.2.1 Recruitment Plan (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
32 Selection	
32.2.7 Medical Examinations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33 Training and Career Development	
33.1.4 Lesson Plan Requirements (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.1.7 Training Class Records Maintenance (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.5.1 Annual Retraining Program* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.5.3 Accreditation Training (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.6.2 Tactical Team Training Program (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
33.8.2 Skill Development Training Upon Promotion (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
34 Promotion	
34.1.7 Promotional Probation (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
35 Performance Evaluation	
35.1.7 Employee Counseling (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41 Patrol	
41.2.1 Responding Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.2 Pursuit of Motor Vehicles* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.3 Roadblocks and Forcible Stopping* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.4 Notification Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.2.5 Missing Persons (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
41.3.6 Protective Vests/Pre-Planned High Risk Situations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
42 Criminal Investigation	
42.2.7 Informants (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
43 Vice Drugs and Organized Crime	
43.1.5 Covert Operations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
44 Juvenile Operations	
44.2.1 Handling Offenders (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
44.2.2 Procedures for Custody (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46 Critical Incidents Special Operations and Homeland Security	

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
46.1.6 Logistics Function (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.1.7 Finance/Administration Function (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
46.3.1 Liaison with other Organizations (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
52 Internal Affairs	
52.1.1 Complaint Investigation (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
52.1.3 CEO Direct Accessibility (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
54 Public Information	
54.1.3 News Media Access (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61 Traffic	
61.1.7 Stopping/Approaching (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.3.2 Direction/Control Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
61.3.3 Escorts (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70 Detainee Transportation	
70.1.6 Procedures Transport Destination (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
70.1.8 Notify Court of Security Hazard (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71 Processing and Temporary Detention	
71.3.1 Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
71.4.1 Physical Conditions (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
72 Holding Facility	
72.1.1 Training User Personnel* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
72.4.1 Securing Firearms (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
72.5.3 Sight and Sound Separation (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73 Court Security	
73.1.1 Role Authority Policies (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.3.1 Weapon Lockboxes (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.4.2 External Communications (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.5.12 Securing Firearms (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
73.5.18 Designated Control Point (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
74 Legal Process	
74.1.1 Information Recording (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81 Communications	
81.2.2 Continuous Two-Way Capability (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Findings</b>
81.2.3 Recording Information (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.2.4 Radio Communications Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.2.5 Access to Resources (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.2.8 Recording and Playback (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
81.3.1 Communications Center Security (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
<b>82 Central Records</b>	
82.2.2 Reporting Requirements (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
82.3.4 Traffic Citation Maintenance (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
<b>83 Collection and Preservation of Evidence</b>	
83.2.1 Guidelines and Procedures (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
83.2.6 Report Preparation (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
<b>84 Property and Evidence Control</b>	
84.1.5 Records Status of Property (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
84.1.6 Inspections and Reports* (LE1)	<b>Compliance Verified</b>
<b>91 Campus Law Enforcement</b>	
91.1.1 Risk Assessment and Analysis* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.3 Campus Background Investigation (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.4 Campus Security Escort Service (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.5 Emergency Notification System (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.7 Behavioral Threat Assessment (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.8 Security Camera Responsibilities* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.9 Emergency Only Phones and Devices* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.1.10 Administrative Investigation Procedures (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.2.1 Agency Role and Responsibilities (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.3.1 Agency Role and Responsibilities (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>
91.4.1 Position Responsible for Clery Act* (LE1)	<b>Not Applicable by Function</b>

**[Response from Agency Regarding Findings:](#)**

CEO Feedback not provided.

---

## SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT

---

3/5/2020

### *Planning and Methodology:*

---

Chief Hargis and Assessor Webb discussed some key issues impacting the agency. Chief Hargis discussed the increase in the city's population that continues to increase the agency's number of calls for service. Chief Hargis estimates increase will grow to over 20,000 in the next 10 years. As the Chief explained, an increase in calls for service requires an increase in staffing. Chief Hargis explained that for every 10,000 additional calls for service, the agency needs to increase staffing by approximately 20 positions, 10 officers assigned to routine patrol and 10 officers assigned to special units. The Chief also explained that the city is obtaining additional land through annexation and this will require additional city services. As the Chief explained, the addition of officers increases the burden on the taxpayer, but as the Chief stated, safety of the community is of paramount importance.

Chief Hargis also explained the increase in the homeless population is a concern for the agency. The goal of the Frederick Police Department is to provide protection for all community members and ensure there is a feeling of safety experienced by residents and visitors. The city is constantly working to manage the homeless population by providing accommodations and access to needed services. However, it is the responsibility of the agency to maintain order without violating the rights of any individual. Chief Hargis stated this can sometimes be a challenging task for officers.

Another area that Chief Hargis has concentrated on is Succession Planning. The Chief understands the need to implement a succession plan to ensure that the agency is ready to provide a continuation of service when there are position vacancies. To meet this goal, the agency places a priority on training current officers for future leadership roles while maintaining staffing levels at the authorized limit.

### *Community Partnership*

---

Members of the Command Staff understand the importance of developing, strengthening and maintaining community partnerships. The agency understands that several vulnerable populations within the community could benefit from increased interactions with the members of the agency.

To accomplish this task, the Command Staff has developed a plan to increase engagement with the youth of the community by implementing programs that allow officers the opportunity to interact with youth. A good opportunity for this is to increase department wide participation in the PAL program as well as enhance the Frederick Police Explorer Program. By supporting and participating in fundraising events and providing mentorship programs, members of the agency can show their support for the city's youth and encourage youth to live a positive, productive life.

The need to ensure those in the community experiencing a mental health crisis are provided assistance from knowledgeable officers is of paramount importance to the members of the Frederick Police Department. In order for officers to be prepared to offer assistance, the agency has a plan to enhance the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) with additional support, training and response capabilities. The agency has also implemented a plan to establish a mental health court, improve existing relationships with the City's social services agencies, support the WayStation programs by participating in fundraising events and explore alternate means of offering rehabilitation programs to community members suffering from substance abuse addiction.

Another important aspect to community engagement and partnership is communication. In an effort to provide transparency to all community stakeholders, the agency has implemented a plan to provide timely dissemination of information to the community through the use of the Public Information Officer, social media platforms, and increased interaction with the media. The agency also plans to update technology related to the available communication



platforms currently in use.

The last area of concern for the agency is creating understanding of all community members regardless of race, religion, ethnicity or gender identification. To accomplish this task, the agency has implemented a plan to identify leaders of all cultures to work with agency members to expand their existing programs and develop new programs designed to educate the community on the uniqueness and individual cultural within the community. The goal is to establish multi-cultural programs that provide educational information, law enforcement presentations on available services, and legal services. The agency wants to build trust between the community and the police. The agency believes this will help to increase crime reporting and an exchange of information that will improve the quality of life for all stakeholders.

#### *Standards Issues:*

There were no standards issue relating to community partnership.

#### *Suggestions*

#### *Training and Personnel Development*

---

The Command Staff has developed a plan of action that includes a comprehensive study of salaries for all positions, both civilian and sworn. An analysis will be completed with the collected data to determine if a salary adjustment is warranted. The agency understands that increased salary isn't the only factor to be considered when increasing retention, it is important to stay competitive with surrounding jurisdictions. In addition to a salary study, recruitment strategies for sworn positions will be reviewed and, where needed, revised. The goal is to reach a larger, diverse pool of applicants. The agency will use a recruiter training program to increase recruiter diversity, develop incentives in cooperation with the FOP and expand digital recruiting methods.

Another consideration that will be reviewed is the military incentive program to determine if this needs to be revised to better match the programs of surrounding jurisdictions.

Another area of weakness discovered by the Command Staff is a lack of ability for civilian employees to move up the corporate ladder. To address this issue, the position system will be reviewed and revised to create a hierarchy system. This will create opportunities of upward movement for civilians. The agency also intends to develop future leaders and managers. In order to do this, the agency plans to create a first line supervisor training course, enhance departmental training, provide training in leadership, accountability and communication. This is part of the agency's succession planning.

#### *Standards Issues:*

There were no standard issues relating to Training and Personnel Development

#### *Suggestions*

#### *Crime Fighting and Public Safety*

---

Members of the Police Command Staff discussed Crime Fighting and Public Safety as an area of focus for the Frederick Police Department. According to the agency's Guiding Principles, the approach to crime fighting and public safety is self-directed as well as community directed. In order to address the issues, the agency has developed a comprehensive plan that breaks down the focus area into several components.

Establishing effective enforcement initiatives was determined to be a top goal for the organization. The agency has begun to develop a comprehensive Traffic Safety and Enforcement Plan that will address citizen complaints, quality of life issues, high frequency traffic accident locations, and provide input and assistance to Traffic Engineering officials as needed. The agency has also identified a need to expand on the current Automated Enforcement Program by evaluating the effectiveness of speed monitoring equipment and the feasibility of increasing agency inventory. The agency believes this will deter motorists from driving too fast within neighborhoods, increasing safety for community

members.

Although the agency has a comprehensive investigative unit, the Police Command has implemented a plan to enhance investigative initiatives. Part of this plan includes disrupting the circulation of drugs within the community. Chief Hargis has recognized the need for implementing this initiative and has deployed innovative strategies to combat the issues. As an example, the Frederick Police Department applied for and received grant funding for a part-time heroin coordinator. The coordinator will research and track all components of calls for service involving heroin in order to provide agency personnel with crucial data to be used, not only in crime fighting, but in placing individuals in treatment programs with substantial positive results. In addition, enhanced training programs are being developed for all personnel in order to increase investigative skills to effectively manage current crime trends and identify potential future trends.

Agency Command understands the importance of maintaining manpower at the authorized limits. In order to accomplish this, the agency has conducted a workload analysis and a staffing needs assessment. Chief Hargis is confident this assessment will assist the agency in determining optimal staffing levels as well as identify any potential changes to patrol beat sizes.

### ***Standards Issues:***

There were no standard issues relating to Crime Fighting and Public Safety.

### ***Suggestions***

#### ***Facilities, Research and Technology***

---

Members of the Police Command staff discussed Facilities, Research & Technology as an area of focus for the Frederick Police Department. During assessor interviews, it was discussed that this is an area in which Department staff would like to see continued progress. While the agency's current methods of operations are in no way hindering its performance, areas for improvement were identified. The agency has its own training academy, that provides important skill development for new agency members. In addition, when training issues are identified, the agency is able to quickly push out new methods, policies and procedures very effectively to all affected staff. One of the agency's goals is to expand the academy grounds. In planning for the expansion of the training facility, the agency is developing a land use plan that include current renovations and upgrades and future expansion projects that will effectively incorporate all areas of the training facility.

The agency members have determined that the police headquarters building needs to be updated and seems to be a priority for command staff. The current facility is somewhat dated, and several organization functions are separated from each other leading to inefficiencies. For example, while secure, the Police Department must maintain its evidence operations in more than one place. While staff is able to provide a high level of service, a new or renovated facility could make operations more effective and efficient. In the process of developing the plans for the new facility, the Chief ensured that all members of the agency as well as community members were involved in the planning process. The agency has a plan to incorporate the feedback received, making all stakeholders key members of the decision-making process and therefore provide ownership with the final design.

Along with allied agencies and stakeholders, the agency is researching the transition to an updated computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and records management system (RMS) systems. The agency has determined that the benefits of the integration of the two functions will provide new opportunities to better understand and collect their data. An updated RMS system would also provide Police Department personnel additional options in searching for and compiling critical data to support the agency's data driven policing strategy. One objective discussed with Assessors is the availability of the new system to operate on a uniform platform, both for hardware and software, to ensure an efficient system for managing all functions of the department.

The agency has also identified the need to expand the body-worn camera program. The purpose of the project is to evaluate the ever-changing technology of body worn cameras and the potential need to replace existing hardware. The

agency is also striving to ensure all members of the agency have access to body-worn cameras.

An aspect of the agency's overall facilities improvement plan includes the storage and replacement process for vehicle replacement. They are in the process of developing a plan that includes not only daily use vehicles of patrol vehicles but also specialty vehicles. The agency understands the need to have current technology within patrol vehicles. Therefore, a plan for the efficient replacement of technology tools within the vehicles is an important part of the overall technology plan. The intent is to ensure vehicles used on a daily basis provide the needed technologies to ensure the safety of community members as well as officers. In addition, the agency also understands the need to have specialty vehicles that are ready for use when needed. Part of this includes the availability of facilities for the storage of specialty vehicles in a safe and secure manner. This plan would allow the vehicles to be maintained in a ready status for possible deployment.

**Standards Issues:**

There were no standard issues relating to Facilities, Research and Technology.

**Suggestions**

**Summary:**

---

**Number of Interviews Conducted:** 96

**Assessors' Names:** Michael Webb and David Wolf

**Site-Based Assessment Start Date:** 11/18/2019

**Site-Based Assessment End Date:** 11/20/2019

<b>Mandatory (M) Compliance</b>	165
<b>Other-Than-Mandatory (O) Compliance</b>	0
<b>Standards Issues</b>	0
<b>Waiver</b>	0
<b>(O) Elect 20%</b>	0
<b>Not Applicable</b>	24
<b>Total:</b>	189

---

**Percentage of applicable other-than-mandatory standards:**

0 %

---

## COMMUNITY FEEDBACK AND REVIEW

---

### *Public Information Session*

---

The agency held a Public Information Session on Monday November 18, 2019. The meeting was held at the City Annex, 140 W Patrick Street, Frederick MD and began at 6 pm. There were three people in attendance.

Ms. Julie Gilroy stated she is the Accreditation Manager for the Frederick (MD) Sheriff's Office. Ms. Gilroy stated the Frederick Police Department works hand in hand with other agencies to complete the CALEA experience. Ms. Gilroy stated the Accreditation Manager of Frederick is outstanding and always willing to lend a helping hand to other agencies in the program.

Kris Fair and Peter Brehm of the Frederick Center voiced their thanks to CALEA for the Accreditation program. Ms. Fair stated she has been involved with the Frederick Police Department for 6 years. For the last 3 years, the Center has worked in cooperation with the Frederick Police Department and Training Academy to educate the community on the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Brehm stated the Frederick Police Department provides a member of the agency to act as the liaison to the Fredericks Center Board. Mr. Brehm stated this relationship has been very beneficial to both the Center and the agency. Mr. Brehm also stated all members of the agency are admirable, pro-active, efficient and always provide a professional response.

Ms. Fair added that the Frederick Police Department has helped to keep the peace within the community while allowing community members and groups maintain their individual rights.

Both Ms. Fair and Mr. Brehm praised the Frederick Police Department members.

### *Telephone Contacts*

---

The agency held a Public Phone in Session in Tuesday November 19, 2019 from 1 to 3 pm. Assessors received five phone calls.

Ms. Danielle Doll of the Downtown Frederick Partnership stated his organization has a close working relationship with the Frederick Police Department. Mr. Doll stated the agency provides excellent support to the community and members are easy to work with. Mr. Doll stated he has never had any issue with the agency or agency members and had nothing but positive supportive comments about the agency.

Victor Brito, Chief of Police of the Rockville MD Police Department, stated the Frederick Police Department is an excellent agency. Chief Brito also stated that agency members are very professional and think out of the box when problem solving issues within the community. Chief Brito also stated the Frederick Police Department has an excellent Training Academy and they are doing excellent work.

Mr. Tony Nernajo, volunteer board member, stated he has attended the agency open house and summer camp programs. Mr. Nernajo also stated that the Frederick Police Department actively communicates with the community, ensuring everyone knows what is going on within the city. Mr. Nernajo stated the agency is doing a remarkable job.

Mr. Miles Ward, Director of the County Human Relations Agency, stated he is very impressed with the Frederick Police Departments commitment to community involvement. Mr. Ward stated he attends the Chief's forum meetings and he states they are very professional and informative. Mr. Ward also stated the agency is open with information, always demonstrates transparency with minority recruitment and answers questions in a timely manner. Mr. Ward stated he has

conducted training at the agency and all members have been courteous and friendly.

Mr. Richard Kane, Captain, Montgomery County Sheriff's Office, stated the agency has a long term commitment to the CALEA Accreditation process. Captain Kane stated Dana Kelly is a leader within the local PAC, always ready to assist other departments with the process. Captain Kane also stated Dana assists other Accreditation Managers just learning DMS. Captain Kane stated he has the highest regard for Dana Kelly and all members of the Frederick Police Department.

### *Correspondence*

---

The Assessors did not receive any correspondence before or during the on-site.

### *Media Interest*

---

The agency did not experience any media interest during the on-site.

### *Public Information Material*

---

The agency followed a comprehensive plan for decimating all public information material related to the on-site. Press Releases for the public hearing and call in session were distributed by the City and FPD Public Information Officers. In addition, notification was sent by Email to all citizens signed up to receive FPD and City of Frederick alerts, the Chesapeake Region Law Enforcement Accreditation Alliance (CRLEAA ), and all Neighborhood Advisory Groups (NACS). Notification was also made by posting on-site information on Social media, specifically FPD Facebook page and FPD Twitter feed, Nextdoor and the City of Frederick Facebook page.

### *Community Outreach Contacts*

---

Assessor Webb interviewed Willa Naegle, Manager of WayStation Crisis Services. Ms. Naegle stated Waystation provides mental health services for the community. The WayStation services include day programs and outpatient assistance. In addition, their crisis programs often interact with the Frederick Police Department to assist with mental health commitments. Ms. Naegle stated the agency often conducts training with members of the Frederick Police Department to ensure all agency members are current on proper interactions with individuals with an intellectual disability. The center also conducts training at the police academy for new recruits and offers ongoing training at roll calls. Ms. Naegle stated agency members are very professional and patient with mental health clients. WayStation employees exchange information regarding the center's patients to ensure agency members can identify persons at risk. Ms. Naegle stated she works very closely with agency members and also assists the victim services unit.

Assessor Webb interviewed Travis Walker, Walk-in Behavioral Health Program Manager. Mr. Walker is employed by the Mental Health Association of Frederick County. He stated the organization offers many programs that include outpatient, walk-in, urgent care, hotline for suicide prevention, childcare options, and healthy family counseling. Mr. Walker stated the organization works closely with the Frederick Police Department to provide Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) as well as ongoing training programs for agency members. He also stated that the agency is a great partner and very responsive to the needs of the mental health community. Mr. Walker shared that agency members are always open to feedback and both organizations have ongoing communication pathways. In conclusion, Mr. Walker stated that the agency is a leader in the state of Maryland in forming partnerships with mental health professionals.

Assessor Webb interviewed Ms. Shauna Mulcahy, Director of Community Engagement with The Arc of Frederick. The Arc organization provides services for those with intellectual disabilities. Ms. Mulcahy stated she is responsible for developing individual plans for those with disabilities. The planning also involves families, to provide resources and services. The Arc organization also provides coaching support that allows those with disabilities to live on their own. Ms. Mulcahy stated a key factor of the success of the Arc organization is dependent on the supportive relationship that has been developed with the Frederick Police Department. Their organization provides training to the members of the Frederick Police Department on communication skills for individuals with disabilities. In addition, they utilize simulation training with police officers to replicate the experience of individuals with intellectual disabilities. The training also

provides the police officers with different techniques to communicate with community members with disabilities. Ms. Mulcahy stated that it is transformational for officers to understand the challenges experienced by those with disabilities. The training is conducted at the police academy for recruits and on-going refresher training every three years for experienced officers. The Arc organization has developed an excellent partnership with the members of the Frederick Police Department.

Assessor Webb interviewed Erin Buck Skees, Outreach Coordinator of the of the Maryland School for the Deaf. Ms. Skees stated the Maryland School for the Deaf is a state funded public school with over 500 students. The school maintains a positive relationship with the Frederick Police Department. Ms. Skees shared that administrators of the school provide training for police officers that includes Police Academy classes, sign language training, scenario-based training, deaf awareness, basic signs, deaf culture and school awareness. The agency also provides the police department with information on the dormitories in case an emergency response is needed. Ms. Skees believed that their ongoing partnership is critical for the successful resolution of emergency situations.

Assessor Webb interviewed Corporal Corey Borns, Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM), and Dr. Suzy Boisclair of the Frederick Police Department Victim Services Unit. Corporal Borns stated the agency saw a need to provide CISM to officers involved in stressful situation. Corporal was involved in the development of a six (6) person CISM team. The team offers support for all members of the agency including dispatchers. They are in the process of expanding the team to include a dispatcher. Corporal Borns stated the team is primarily used for one-on-one support after crisis situations. Dr. Boisclair stated the CISM team is very effective in debriefing groups involved in stressful incidents. Dr. Boisclair also stated the team works with the Trauma Resource Network. The Network provides up to six (6) free sessions for agency members.

Assessor Webb interviewed Mr. Michael Moore, President of the local Rotary and Chief of the Misdemeanor Division of the State's Attorney's Office. Mr. Moore stated the Rotary Club has a strong community partnership with the Frederick Police Department. Mr. Moore stated the Rotary Club, in cooperation with the Frederick Police Department, supports the Police Activities League and the Christmas Shopping "Santa PAL Day" for parents. He also stated the club sponsors an Officer of the Month Program and rewards an officer identified by the police department as being excellent. The club also sponsors an Officer of the Year award. Mr. Moore stated the Rotary Club has a close working partnership with the Frederick Police Department.

Mr. Moore stated the Maryland State's Attorney's Office experiences the highest activity and they are very involved with the Frederick Police Department. Mr. Moore stated an officer of the State's Attorney's Office will partner with a police department on professional development. This may include attendance at the training academy, in-service training, mock trials, courtroom readiness and legal service updates. Mr. Moore stated the State's Attorney's Office has a great working relationship with the Frederick Police Department. He stated the agency will consult with the State's Attorney's Office for charging decisions. Mr. Moore stated the agency takes a team approach to charging decisions and look to make informed decisions that are in the best interest of the community. Mr. Moore also stated the partnership the agency has with the State's Attorney's Office allows for effective decision making, which is making a difference for the community. Mr. Moore stated the implementation and use of body cameras is an example of the established partnership. Mr. Moore did state the agency is using a problem-solving approach to address the homelessness population experienced by the City of Frederick. Mr. Moore stated he is impressed with the agency's preventative approach to policing.

Assessor Wolf interviewed Michael O'Connor, the Mayor of the City of Frederick. Mayor O'Connor stated he has completed 2 years of his first 4-year term. Prior to being elected mayor, Mr. O'Connor was an alderman for several years. Mayor O'Connor is passionate about the City of Frederick and was genuine and sincere. The Mayor stated that Chief Hargis commands a professional police department and is very supportive of the CALEA process. Mayor O'Connor is pleased with the strategic plan implemented by Chief Hargis as well as the Department's interaction with the public. When asked about his role in the process, Mayor O'Connor stated that he is the "biggest cheerleader for the City of Frederick and its police department."

Assessors interviewed Karen Paulson, Director of Human Resources. Ms. Paulson stated she has been with the City of Frederick for 2 ½ years. Ms. Paulson explained that the police handle the day to day processes however there is a clear partnership between Human Resources and the police department. Ms. Paulson stated Human Resources reviews the agency written directives to ensure they relate to the HR function and follow procedures set by the city. In addition, HR conducts a detailed analysis of the recruitment process to determine what is working and what processes need to be enhanced. Ms. Paulson stated the department is currently processing 255 applicants. Ms. Paulson stated the highest percent of applicants came from current employee referrals. Ms. Paulson stated the police department is working hard to determine the best use of the departments recruiting efforts. To accomplish this, the department uses current Frederick police officers to explain the benefits offered by the City of Frederick. The department also uses electronic recruiting methods, such as Facebook and the department website, and have had great success with this venue. Ms. Paulson stated the department implemented a one-day testing process where all applicants will complete the entire testing process in one day. Ms. Paulson also stated the Human Resources function completes the onboarding process for all new recruits.

Assessors interviewed Robin Grove, Director of the Child Advocacy Center (CAC). Ms. Grove stated she has been the Director since 2015. Ms. Grove explained the Frederick Police Department is very active with CAC. She stated the agency is an excellent partner, supportive, follow established policy, always available and have an excellent level of community engagement. Ms. Grove stated the agency supports CAC events. Ms. Grove explained the agency does an excellent job with case processing, are always open to training opportunities and are always willing to listen to community members. Ms. Grove did suggest the only area of growth for the agency would be the current levels of staffing. Ms. Grove did say the agency is doing excellent work.

Assessors interviewed Alderwoman Kelly Russel. Alderwoman Russel stated the Frederick Police Department is an excellent police department. She states the Chief continues to grow and develop the relationship with the community. Alderwoman Russel noted the level of community engagement is maintaining a strong relationship with the community. Alderwoman Russel did state the one area of growth the agency can improve is with recruitment. She stated the agency loses too many academy recruits. Alderwoman Russel believes there is a missing link in the hiring process to select individuals that are best suited and likely to be successful as police officers. Ms. Russel also stated the current police facility is not suited for the size of the agency. Alderwoman Russel stated the city is currently developing plans for a new facility with the site selection process being completed now. Alderwoman Russel is hopeful the new facility will be completed within the next 4 years.

## STATISTICS AND DATA TABLES

### Overview

The following information reflects empirical data submitted by the candidate agency specifically related to CALEA Standards. Although the data does not confirm compliance with the respective standards, they are indicators of the impact of the the agency’s use of standards to address the standards' intent

### Traffic Warnings & Citations - Reaccreditation Year 1

Race/Sex	Warnings	Citations	Total
White Non-Hispanic Male	2141	2064	4205
Black Non-Hispanic Male	1044	1196	2240
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	505	636	1141
Other Male	214	119	333
White Non-Hispanic Female	1783	1158	2941
Black Non-Hispanic Female	666	505	1171
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	243	140	383
Other Female	113	66	179
TOTAL	6709	5884	12593

### Legend


White Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Other Male	



### Traffic Warnings & Citations - Reaccreditation Year 2

Race/Sex	Warnings	Citations	Total
White Non-Hispanic Male	3534	2131	5665
Black Non-Hispanic Male	1973	1343	3316
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	812	546	1358
Other Male	358	143	501
White Non-Hispanic Female	2918	1217	4135
Black Non-Hispanic Female	1110	509	1619
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	372	139	511
Other Female	221	90	311
TOTAL	11298	6118	17416

### Legend

White Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Other Male	

### Traffic Warnings & Citations - Reaccreditation Year 3

Race/Sex	Warnings	Citations	Total
White Non-Hispanic Male	2938	1876	4814
Black Non-Hispanic Male	1695	1330	3025
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	739	637	1376
Other Male	347	180	527
White Non-Hispanic Female	2452	1217	3669
Black Non-Hispanic Female	981	512	1493
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	334	174	508
Other Female	141	52	193
TOTAL	9627	5978	15605

#### Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:

Total Emergency Repair Order issued 1/1/18-12/31/18

W/M - 206

B/M - 108

Hispanic M - 102

Other/ M - 23

W/F - 158

B/F - 54

Hispanic F - 23

Other/ F - 8

#### Legend

White Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Other Male	

**Traffic Warnings & Citations - Reaccreditation Year 4**

Race/Sex	Warnings	Citations	Total
White Non-Hispanic Male	1524	1083	2607
Black Non-Hispanic Male	828	724	1552
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	378	359	737
Other Male	157	83	240
White Non-Hispanic Female	1201	627	1828
Black Non-Hispanic Female	450	228	678
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	140	102	242
Other Female	87	26	113
TOTAL	4765	3232	7997

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Other Male	

### ***Biased Based Profiling***

Complaints from:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Traffic Contacts	0	1	1	2
Field Contacts	0	0	1	0
Asset Forfeiture	0	0	0	0

### ***Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:***

Both incidents were investigated by Internal Affairs and determined to be unfounded. Please refer to CALEA standard 1.2.9 for additional details

### ***Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:***

Both complaints were investigated and determined to be unfounded.

### ***Legend***

Traffic Contacts	
Field Contacts	
Asset Forfeiture	

### Use Of Force - Reaccreditation Year 1

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Firearm									15
Discharge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display Only	7	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	15
ECW									3
Discharge Only	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Display Only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemical/OC	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Weaponless	21	5	28	8	6	0	0	0	68
Canine									0
Release Only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Release and Bite	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Uses of Force	31	8	36	8	7	0	0	0	90
Total Number of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Total Use of Force Arrests	18	6	19	4	6	0	0	0	53
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Agency Custodial Arrests	1230	594	973	269	364	55	17	15	3517
Total Use of Force Complaints	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

### Reaccreditation Year 1 Notes:

Total Number of Incidents Resulting in Officer Injury or Death - our agency does not break this statistic down by race/sex.

### Legend

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Use Of Force - Reaccreditation Year 2**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Firearm									97
Discharge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display Only	30	4	41	3	17	2	0	0	97
ECW									9
Discharge Only	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Display Only	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	5
Baton	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	4
Chemical/OC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weaponless	57	14	64	15	20	10	0	0	180
Canine									0
Release Only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Release and Bite	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Uses of Force	92	20	108	18	39	13	0	0	290
Total Number of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death	32								32
Total Use of Force Arrests	52	13	63	11	22	6	0	0	167
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries	12	0	12	0	3	3	0	0	30
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Agency Custodial Arrests	1321	657	1043	272	291	66	18	12	3680
Total Use of Force Complaints	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5

**Reaccreditation Year 2 Notes:**

The use of force numbers displayed above represent numbers for instances of use of force not numbers of persons force was used upon.

The Frederick Police Department does not track officer injuries by race and sex.

*Legend*

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	



**Use Of Force - Reaccreditation Year 3**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Firearm									66
Discharge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display Only	24	4	32	2	4	0	0	0	66
ECW									8
Discharge Only	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Display Only	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baton	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
Chemical/OC	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
Weaponless	111	32	154	33	25	7	0	1	363
Canine									1
Release Only	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Release and Bite	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Uses of Force	140	37	202	35	29	8	0	1	452
Total Number of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death	25	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	37
Total Use of Force Arrests	32	9	48	8	8	4	0	0	109
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries	21	4	22	4	1	2	0	0	54
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Agency Custodial Arrests	1309	618	1212	361	289	88	25	14	3916
Total Use of Force Complaints	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4

**Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:**

Total Number of Use of Force Arrests does not include Use of Force numbers for the following incident types:

Emergency Petitions

Assists to other agencies

Persons detained but not charged

Persons arrested and released without charges

Persons encountered during searches / search and seizures





*Legend*

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

*Use Of Force - Reaccreditation Year 4*

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Firearm									26
Discharge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display Only	12	3	10	0	1	0	0	0	26
ECW									5
Discharge Only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display Only	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Baton	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Chemical/OC	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Weaponless	58	21	66	7	27	3	0	0	182
Canine									2
Release Only	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Release and Bite	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Uses of Force	77	24	84	7	29	3	0	0	224
Total Number of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death	37	2	4	0	1	0	1	0	45
Total Use of Force Arrests	26	6	40	3	11	2	0	0	88
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries	15	2	10	0	3	1	0	0	31
Total Number of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Agency Custodial Arrests	698	319	733	180	200	39	12	6	2187
Total Use of Force Complaints	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Legend*

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	

Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

## ***Grievances***

Grievances	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Number	3	0	0	4

### ***Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:***

There were no grievances filed in 2018.

### ***Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:***

One grievance was filed in November 2018 and was not included in the 2018 Year 3 Statistics

Three grievances were filed between 1/1/2019 and 10/3/2019

## ***Personnel Actions***

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Suspension	2	3	3	2
Demotion	0	0	0	0
Resign In Lieu of Termination	3	3	0	1
Termination	0	0	1	0
Other	0	47	20	17
Total	5	53	24	20
Commendations	227	5	60	97

### ***Reaccreditation Year 1 Notes:***

Other - the number of verbal or written warnings, reprimands, counseling or other actions not otherwise categorized are not tracked.

Commendations = Physical Awards e.g. Officer of the Year, Unit Citations, Employee of the Year, Volunteer of the Year, Life Saving Award, Mutual Aid Award, Bronze Star, Academic Achievement Award, Citizen Award, Letters of Appreciation/ Acknowledgement, Outstanding Performance Awards, Service Awards

### ***Reaccreditation Year 2 Notes:***

Other – Informal disciplines such as verbal reprimands are not formally tracked

FPD employees received a total of 33 Additional Awards (not captured in the above stats) which included Letters of Appreciation/Acknowledgement, Outside Performance Awards, Service Awards

Commendations = Physical Awards e.g. Officer of the Year, Unit Citations, Employee of the Year, Volunteer of the Year, Life Saving Award, Mutual Aid Award, Bronze Star, Academic Achievement Award, Citizen Award

### ***Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:***

Other = Performance Action Forms - incidents noted for performance. Not necessarily disciplinary in nature.

Additional Awards = Letters of Appreciation/Acknowledgement, Outside Performance Awards, Service Awards - 129

### ***Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:***

Other = Performance Action Forms- incidents noted for performance, not necessarily disciplinary in nature

\*\*Commendations = Physical Awards e.g. Officer of the Year, Unit Citations, Employee of the Year, Volunteer of the Year, Life Saving Award, Mutual Aid Award, Bronze Star, Academic Achievement Award, Citizen Award

173 Additional Awards = Letters of Appreciation/Acknowledgement, Outside Performance Awards, Service Awards

**Complaints and Internal Affairs - Reaccreditation Year 4**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>External/Citizen Complaint</b>				
Citizen Complaint	28	42	36	9
Sustained	5	0	2	2
Not Sustained	1	1	0	0
Unfounded	7	6	8	1
Exonerated	1	0	0	0
<b>Internal/Directed Complaint</b>				
Directed Complaint	54	57	33	17
Sustained	8	5	7	3
Not Sustained	2	1	1	0
Unfounded	1	8	1	2
Exonerated	0	0	0	1

**Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:**

External/ Citizen Complaints - additional closures: Resolved at intake = 6

Internal/ Directed Complaints - additional closures: Administratively Closed =1; Resolved at intake = 9

As of 9/27/19 one of the Internal/ Directed Complaints is still under review

*Calls For Service - Reaccreditation Year 4*

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Calls for Service	93133	106235	104811	52088
<b>UCR/NIBRS Part 1 Crimes</b>				
Murder	1	1	3	2
Forcible Rape	23	28	26	15
Robbery	70	87	74	27
Aggravated Assault	249	352	168	85
Burglary	141	149	138	47
Larceny-Theft	1223	1107	1302	490
Motor Vehicle Theft	48	43	51	30
Arson	14	13	10	8



### *Motor Vehicle Pursuit*

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Pursuits</b>				
Total Pursuits	1	5	3	3
Forcible stopping techniques used	0	0	0	0
Terminated by Agency	0	5	2	1
Policy Compliant	1	2	2	3
Policy Non-Compliant	0	3	1	0
<b>Collisions</b>				
<b>Injuries</b>				
Total Collisions		0	1	0
Officer	0	0	0	0
Suspect	0	0	0	0
ThirdParty	0	0	0	0
<b>Reason Initiated</b>				
Traffic	1	4	1	1
Felony	0	1	2	1
Misdemeanor	0	0	0	1

### *Reaccreditation Year 3*

Collision - One suspect vehicle was involved in a collision with a fixed object after the officer lost sight of the suspect and had terminated the pursuit.

**Agency Breakdown Report - Reaccreditation Year 1**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Command	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Supervisory Positions	21	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	26
Non-Supervisory Positions	79	15	7	2	3	1	2	1	110
Sub Total									146
<b>Non Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managerial	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Supervisory Positions	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Non-Supervisory Positions	10	21	1	2	0	0	0	1	35
Sub Total									43
Total									189

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Agency Breakdown Report - Reaccreditation Year 2**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Command	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Supervisory Positions	21	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	26
Non-Supervisory Positions	72	14	6	2	4	1	2	1	102
Sub Total									139
<b>Non Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managerial	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Supervisory Positions	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Non-Supervisory Positions	11	23	0	3	0	0	0	1	38
Sub Total									46
Total									185

**Reaccreditation Year 2 Notes:**

Stats taken from Agency Roster dated 12/31/17

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Agency Breakdown Report - Reaccreditation Year 3**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Command	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Supervisory Positions	20	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	26
Non-Supervisory Positions	71	16	7	3	3	0	2	1	103
Sub Total									139
<b>Non Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managerial	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Supervisory Positions	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Non-Supervisory Positions	10	24	0	3	0	0	0	1	38
Sub Total									46
Total									185

**Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:**

Numbers taken from Personnel Roster dated 12/31/18.  
Two grant funded employees not counted in above statistics.

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Agency Breakdown Report - Reaccreditation Year 4**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Command	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Supervisory Positions	23	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	30
Non-Supervisory Positions	70	17	6	3	3	0	2	1	102
Sub Total									142
<b>Non Sworn Personnel</b>									
Executive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managerial	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Supervisory Positions	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Non-Supervisory Positions	11	25	0	3	0	0	0	1	40
Sub Total									48
Total									190


**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Agency Demographics Report - Reaccreditation Year 1**

	Service Population		Available Workforce		Current Sworn Officers		Current Female Sworn Officers		Prior Sworn Officers		Prior Female Sworn Officers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Non-Hispanic	47065	62%	28303	62%	127	87%	19	13%	129	88%	19	13%
Black Non-Hispanic	9265	12%	5821	12%	11	7%	2	1%	12	8%	2	1%
Hispanic Latino Any Race	10639	14%	6099	13%	4	2%	1	0%	4	2%	1	0%
Other	8003	10%	5004	11%	3	2%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>74972</b>		<b>45227</b>		<b>145</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>146</b>		<b>23</b>	



**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic	
Black Non-Hispanic	
Hispanic Latino Any Race	
Other	

**Agency Demographics Report - Reaccreditation Year 2**

	Service Population		Available Workforce		Current Sworn Officers		Current Female Sworn Officers		Prior Sworn Officers		Prior Female Sworn Officers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Non-Hispanic	47065	62%	28302	62%	120	86%	17	12%	129	88%	19	13%
Black Non-Hispanic	9265	12%	5821	12%	11	7%	2	1%	12	8%	2	1%
Hispanic Latino Any Race	10639	14%	6099	13%	5	3%	1	0%	4	2%	1	0%
Other	8003	10%	5004	11%	3	2%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>74972</b>		<b>45226</b>		<b>139</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>146</b>		<b>23</b>	

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic	
Black Non-Hispanic	
Hispanic Latino Any Race	
Other	

### Agency Demographics Report - Reaccreditation Year 3

	Service Population		Available Workforce		Current Sworn Officers		Current Female Sworn Officers		Prior Sworn Officers		Prior Female Sworn Officers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Non-Hispanic	38295	55%	102010	81 %	121	87%	20	14%	120	86%	17	12%
Black Non-Hispanic	12536	18%	10280	8 %	11	7%	3	2%	11	7%	2	1%
Hispanic Latino Any Race	11037	16%	7845	6 %	4	2%	0	0%	5	3%	1	0%
Other	6752	9%	5219	4 %	3	2%	1	0%	3	2%	1	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>68620</b>		<b>125354</b>		<b>139</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>139</b>		<b>21</b>	

#### Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:

**Service Population** - City of Frederick - Calculated from data obtained from U.S. Census Bureau / American Fact Finder - 5 year estimates population 2013-2017

**Available workforce** - Frederick County - Calculated from data obtained from U.S. Census Bureau / American Fact Fin EEO 6r. State and Local Government Job Groups by Sex, and Race/Ethnicity for Residence Geography, Total Population Universe: Civilian labor force 16yrs and over

#### Legend

White Non-Hispanic	
Black Non-Hispanic	
Hispanic Latino Any Race	
Other	



### Agency Demographics Report - Reaccreditation Year 4





	Service Population		Available Workforce		Current Sworn Officers		Current Female Sworn Officers		Prior Sworn Officers		Prior Female Sworn Officers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Non-Hispanic	38295	55%	184800	75 %	126	88%	21	14%	121	87%	20	14%
Black Non-Hispanic	12321	17%	21810	8 %	10	7%	2	1%	11	7%	3	2%
Hispanic Latino Any Race	11037	15%	21625	8 %	4	2%	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%
Other	7677	11%	17870	7 %	2	1%	1	0%	3	2%	1	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>69330</b>		<b>246105</b>		<b>142</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>139</b>		<b>24</b>	

#### Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:

Service Population Data - Data Collected from US Census American Fact Finder Community Facts - 2017 ACS 5-Year Population Estimates

Available Workforce - Data collected from Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Special Tabulation Form the 2013-2017 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) and US Census American Fact Finder

#### Legend

White Non-Hispanic	
Black Non-Hispanic	
Hispanic Latino Any Race	
Other	

**Sworn Officer Selection - Reaccreditation Year 1**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Applications Received									
Applicants Hired	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
Percent Hired	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A
Percent of Workforce Population	6%		0%		1%		0%		N/A

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Selection - Reaccreditation Year 2**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Applications Received									
Applicants Hired	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
Percent Hired	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A
Percent of Workforce Population	4%		0%		1%		0%		N/A

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Selection - Reaccreditation Year 3**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Applications Received									
Applicants Hired	13	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	22
Percent Hired	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A
Percent of Workforce Population	10%		5%		1%		0%		N/A

**Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:**

These figures represent data taken from NeoGov for the hiring processes for the 60th and 61st Academy Classes

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Selection - Reaccreditation Year 4**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Applications Received									
Applicants Hired	3	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	10
Percent Hired	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A
Percent of Workforce Population	5%		1%		1%		1%		N/A

**Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:**

2019 Numbers (1/1/19-6/30/19) represent numbers for selection process for 62nd academy class.

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Promotions - Reaccreditation Year 1**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Tested									
Eligible After Testing									
Promoted									
Percent Promoted	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A

**Reaccreditation Year 1 Notes:**

There were no promotion processes held in 2016. All persons promoted in 2016 were as a result of promotion processes conducted in 2015.

3 = White Non-Hispanic Female

1 = Black Non-Hispanic Male

5 = White Non-Hispanic Male

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Promotions - Reaccreditation Year 2**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Tested	31	7	2	1	1	0	0	0	42
Eligible After Testing	24	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	30
Promoted	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
Percent Promoted	32 %	14 %	50 %	0 %	0 %	%	%	%	N/A

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

**Sworn Officer Promotions - Reaccreditation Year 3**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Tested									
Eligible After Testing									
Promoted	9				1				10
Percent Promoted	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N/A

**Reaccreditation Year 3 Notes:**

There were no promotion processes held in 2018. All 2018 promotions were the result of promotion processes conducted in 2017.

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	



**Sworn Officer Promotions - Reaccreditation Year 4**

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic Latino Any Race		Other		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Tested	22	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	30
Eligible After Testing	22	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	30
Promoted	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Percent Promoted	14 %	25 %	0 %	0 %	%	%	0 %	0 %	N/A

**Reaccreditation Year 4 Notes:**

The numbers for Tested and Eligible After Testing were taken from the promotion process held in 2019 for ranks Corporal, Sergeant and Lieutenant.

The numbers for persons promoted are from the promotion process which took place in 2017.

Promotions from the results of the 2019 process did not take effect until July 1, 2019.

**Legend**

White Non-Hispanic Male	
White Non-Hispanic Female	
Black Non-Hispanic Male	
Black Non-Hispanic Female	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Male	
Hispanic Latino Any Race Female	
Other Male	
Other Female	

