



MPD Corrective Action Matrix Draft

August, 2026

Table of Contents

1. Notice and Guiding Definitions
2. How to: Read the Corrective Action Matrix
3. Corrective Action Matrix
4. Mitigating and Aggravating Circumstances
5. How to: Read the Appendix
6. Appendix

Notice

With the establishment of this Corrective Action Matrix, members are on notice that the Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) is changing all prior practices regarding corrective action, including discipline. This Corrective Action Matrix is now the standard for the Minneapolis Police Department. This document replaces and supersedes all prior matrices. All decisions for policy violations occurring after the date of issuance of this Corrective Action Matrix will be based on the standards described herein.

Date of Issuance: [to be filled in]

Guiding Definitions (as defined in MPD P&P 2-100)

- **Corrective Action:** Any employment action taken in response to a complaint of misconduct. This includes both disciplinary action and non-disciplinary corrective action.
 - **Disciplinary Action:** Department actions taken to address misconduct that are identified as discipline under the applicable Labor Agreement: written reprimand, suspension, demotion, discharge. Disciplinary actions are based on the facts and circumstances of the situation, reflect the seriousness of the misconduct, and are described in the Corrective Action Matrix.
 - **Non-Disciplinary Corrective Action:** Department actions not disciplinary in nature, taken to correct behavior where there is a policy violation, in accordance with the Corrective Action Matrix. Examples of non-disciplinary corrective action include coaching and training.
- **Corrective Action Matrix:** A written, consistent, progressive, and transparent policy that provides ranges of disciplinary actions and non-disciplinary corrective actions for different types of misconduct.

This letter is the name of the category.

A Category is a level of corrective action, and the levels range from the lowest (A) to the highest (G).

In this example, the Category is C, which is the third level out of seven levels. The level of this category, and the word “moderate” that accompanies it, are intended to reflect the severity of the violation and the corresponding corrective action options.

1

A decisionmaker reviews the member’s corrective action history to identify how many times previously the member violated the same (or a similar) policy within the time period shown. The time period is measured from the date of the previous violation.

In this blue column, if a member violated the same (or a similar) policy for a second time within 4 years of the last time they violated that policy, the decisionmaker will use the “Second” row to choose the level of discipline for that policy violation.

3

C (Moderate)	Conduct that had or may have: moderate impact on community trust of MPD, or moderate impact on MPD’s operations, or moderate property damage, or moderate risk to public safety, or minor impact on public safety, or minor bodily harm, or moderate risk to bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First within 4 years	Suspension: 10Hrs	Suspension: 20Hrs	Suspension: 30Hrs
		Second within 4 years	Suspension: 30Hrs	Suspension: 40Hrs	Suspension: 50Hrs
		Third within 4 years	<i>Elevate to Category D</i>		

2

This is the definition of the Category.

When a member violates a policy, the decisionmaker compares that policy violation to the Category definitions to determine which Category best fits that policy violation. The decisionmaker uses the Appendix (a separate document) to inform this process.

4

The final three columns are the range of available correction action.

“Presumptive” is the starting point in assessing what corrective action to impose; it is the baseline level of corrective action the member would receive before consideration of any aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

Once the “Presumptive” level is identified, the decisionmaker may then use the Mitigating and Aggravating Circumstances (a separate document) to assess whether the corrective action should be aggravated *up* toward the “Maximum” of the Category or mitigated *down* toward the “Minimum” of the Category.

An example of an aggravating factor is the responsibility of a member’s Rank (e.g., Lieutenant), which means a higher Rank could increase the corrective action imposed. In this example, that means a first offense for a higher-ranking member could get up to a 30-hour suspension instead of the presumptive 20-hour suspension.

Category	Definition of Category	Violation	Range of Corrective Action for the Category		
A (Negligible)	Conduct isolated in nature that had or may have: negligible impact on community trust of MPD, or negligible impact on MPD's operations		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First within 1 year	Non-disciplinary corrective action (coaching, training, mediation)		
		Second within 1 year	Elevate to Category B		
B (Minor)	Conduct that had or may have: minor impact on community trust of MPD, or minor impact on MPD's operations, or minor property damage, or minor risk of bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First within 2 years	Letter of Reprimand		
		Second within 2 years	Suspension: 10Hrs		
		Third within 2 years	Elevate to Category C		
C (Moderate)	Conduct that had or may have: moderate impact on community trust of MPD, or moderate impact on MPD's operations, or moderate property damage, or moderate risk to public safety, or moderate risk to bodily harm, or minor impact on public safety, or minor bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First within 4 years	Suspension: 10Hrs	Suspension: 20Hrs	Suspension: 30Hrs
		Second within 4 years	Suspension: 30Hrs	Suspension: 40Hrs	Suspension: 50Hrs
		Third within 4 years	Elevate to Category D		
D (Considerable)	Conduct that had or may have: considerable impact on community trust of MPD, or considerable impact on MPD's operations, or considerable property damage, or considerable risk to public safety, or considerable risk to bodily harm, or moderate impact on public safety, or moderate bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First within 7 years	Suspension: 50Hrs	Suspension: 60Hrs	Suspension: 70Hrs
		Second within 7 years	Suspension: 70Hrs	Suspension: 80Hrs	Suspension: 90Hrs
		Third within 7 years	Elevate to Category E		

Category	Definition of Category	Violation	Range of Corrective Action for the Category		
E (High)	Conduct that had or may have: high impact on community trust of MPD, or high impact on MPD's operations, or high level of property damage, or high risk to public safety, or high risk of bodily harm, or considerable impact on public safety, or substantial bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First <i>within 10 years</i>	Suspension: 90Hrs	Suspension: 120Hrs	Suspension: 150Hrs
		Second <i>within 10 years</i>	Suspension: 150Hrs and/or Demotion	Suspension: 180Hrs and/or Demotion	Suspension: 210Hrs and/or Demotion
		Third <i>within 10 years</i>	<i>Elevate to Category F</i>		
F (Severe)	Conduct that had or may have: severe impact on community trust of MPD, or severe impact on MPD's operations, or severe property damage, or severe risk to public safety, or severe risk of bodily harm, or high impact on public safety, or great bodily harm		Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum
		First <i>within 10 years</i>	Suspension: 210Hrs and/or Demotion and/or Discharge	Suspension: 240Hrs and/or Demotion and/or Discharge	Suspension: 270Hrs and/or Demotion and/or Discharge
		Second <i>within 10 years</i>	Suspension: 300Hrs and/or Demotion and/or Discharge	Suspension: 360Hrs and/or Demotion and/or Discharge	Discharge
		Third <i>within 10 years</i>	<i>Elevate to a Category G</i>		
G	Conduct that would disqualify an officer from continued licensure as a law enforcement officer (e.g., failure to maintain a peace officer license in the state of Minnesota)	First	Discharge		

The Minneapolis Police Department recognizes that every situation can be different and that there may be circumstances that influence the corrective action for the policy violation.

The table below identifies mitigating and aggravating circumstances. These circumstances may be [but are not required to be] considered and applied by the decisionmaker when they are selecting the level of corrective action within a Category. A **mitigating** circumstance can move the level of corrective action *down* from the “Presumptive” of a Category, while an **aggravating** circumstance can move the level of corrective action *up* from the “Presumptive” of a Category. **All mitigating and aggravating circumstances used by the decisionmaker must precede the policy violation being reviewed for corrective action.**

In the left column below, the circumstances are titled, and below each title is the indication of whether it can be used as a mitigating circumstance, an aggravating circumstance, or as either. In the right column, the circumstance and its considerations are detailed for the decisionmaker’s reference.

This table is non-exhaustive and is intended to provide a guiding framework for assessing mitigating and aggravating circumstances during the review of a policy violation.

Corrective Action Record Mitigating or Aggravating	A “corrective action record” contains a complete history of all complaints for which the MPD member has been the focus of a misconduct investigation during their tenure with MPD. Repeat violations (the same or similar), which fall within the prescribed time period listed in the Corrective Action Matrix, result in escalated corrective action within a Category. The decisionmaker may consider the following for any policy violation that occurred prior to the specific policy violation before them. Considerations include, but are not limited to: 1. Recency of sustained violations 2. Nature of sustained violations 3. Number of sustained violations ▪ <i>It is the expectation of MPD that first-time violations should not be automatically mitigated merely because it is a first-time offense</i> 4. Whether the member had notice of a prior alleged violation of policy and had a reasonable opportunity to correct behavior ▪ <i>It is the expectation of MPD that the corrective action record shall not be used as an aggravating factor if a focus member was not given notice of a prior alleged violation of policy and did not have a reasonable opportunity to correct behavior</i>
--	---

Positive Work History Mitigating	A “positive work history” is documentation of work performance that identifies how performance standards, expectations, and/or responsibilities were met or exceeded by the MPD member. This includes, but is not limited to: 1. Positive performance evaluations 2. Recognitions, commendations, officer compliments, and awards 3. Other documentation of positive work performance
Negative Work History Aggravating	A “negative work history” is documentation of work performance that identifies how performance standards, expectations, and/or responsibilities were not met by the MPD member. This includes, but is not limited to: 1. Negative performance evaluations 2. Performance improvement plans (“PIP”) 3. Other documentation of negative work performance
Responsibility of Rank Aggravating	The “responsibility of rank” of a MPD member refers to the expectations MPD has for its positions within the chain of command. Members of a higher rank are held to a higher standard of conduct, as well as a higher standard of knowledge of MPD policies. With a higher rank also comes an elevated responsibility of supervision, including, but not limited to, setting an example, ensuring policies are followed, and providing guidance for subordinates in accordance with policies. ▪ <i>It is the expectation of MPD that its members have knowledge of, and behave commensurate with, their rank</i>
Law Enforcement Experience Mitigating or Aggravating	“Experience” in law enforcement refers to the amount of time a MPD member has spent in law enforcement work, in addition to the types of roles (e.g., unit, specialty) that a member has served in during their law enforcement work history. This includes, but is not limited to, years spent in service to MPD. ▪ <i>It is the expectation of MPD that its members have knowledge of, and behave commensurate with, their level of law enforcement experience</i>

Culpability/Intent Mitigating or Aggravating	The “culpability” or “intent” of a MPD member refers to the motivation, purpose, and/or state of mind of that member when committing the policy violation. Considerations include, but are not limited to: 1. The degree to which the member’s actions were: a. intentional b. knowing c. deliberate d. reckless e. negligent 2. Whether the policy violation was unintentional stemming from: a. an objectively reasonable misunderstanding b. an objectively reasonable judgement call c. a minor procedural or clerical error 3. The degree to which the action taken was in response to concern for others (e.g., wellbeing, safety)
Attitude/Conduct Mitigating or Aggravating	The MPD member’s attitude, conduct, and approach to the entire misconduct investigation process—from the time of the incident to the time a decision is made by the decisionmaker—may be considered. This includes, but is not limited to: 1. A member’s self-report of the incident in a proper/timely manner (e.g. Duty to Report notification) 2. The member’s acceptance of responsibility for the violation (e.g. Expedited Disposition, <i>Loudermill</i>, Administrative Interview)
Unusual and Serious Workplace Tensions/Stressors Mitigating	“Tensions” or “Stressors” that are both unusual in the workplace and serious in the workplace may be considered by the decisionmaker. This includes, but is not limited to, the degree to which a member’s conduct was reasonably attributed to extraordinary circumstances in the workplace not within the member’s control and that could be reasonably expected to affect the member’s conduct. ▪ For illustration, this could be an analysis of mandatory excessive patrol hours worked under extraordinarily stressful conditions during an ongoing civil disturbance.

Serious Personal Emergency Mitigating	A “serious personal emergency” is an extraordinary event of a non-MPD nature that was not within the member’s control—most often an unforeseeable and significant family emergency—to which the member’s conduct was both reasonably attributable and could be reasonably expected to affect the member’s conduct. For illustration, this could include a member leaving their shift prematurely to rush to the hospital upon notification their child was in a serious accident.
Outdated Policy and Procedure Mitigating	MPD endeavors to maintain a Policy and Procedure Manual that is up-to-date with all of its relevant policies of the moment. When a policy violation occurs, and that policy’s language is no longer operational due to a failure of the Department to reflect the necessary and current updates, the decisionmaker may review whether the violation, in comparison to the policy’s language, is consistent with what was clearly established and legally permissible MPD practice on the day of the incident. A decisionmaker shall not use this mitigating circumstance to circumvent appropriate corrective action by using current MPD practice instead of practice(s) in effect on the day of the incident.
Technological Issues Mitigating	MPD recognizes that technology is not always perfect. The decisionmaker may consider, in the context of a policy violation’s established facts, whether a member’s conduct occurred as a result of a technological issue outside of the member’s control that could be reasonably expected to affect the member’s conduct and to which the member’s conduct was reasonably attributable. This includes, but is not limited to, a software glitch, timing error, or automated system fault. A decisionmaker shall not use this mitigating circumstance to circumvent appropriate corrective action where a member had alternative means to conduct the action in accordance with policy or had available time to conduct the action in accordance with policy.

The Appendix is a supporting document that a decisionmaker uses with the Corrective Action Matrix. When a decisionmaker is determining what corrective action should be imposed for a policy violation, they use the Appendix as follows:

1. The decisionmaker reviews the specific policy violation before them and looks at the Appendix to see where that policy violation appears.
2. Once they locate that violation in the Appendix, the decisionmaker reviews that violation's row, which tells them the Category options they can choose from.
3. After the decisionmaker learns which Category options are available to them, they return to the Corrective Action Matrix to look at each of those Category options.
4. The decision maker will analyze the facts and circumstances of the specific violation before them, applying those to the Category options the Appendix gave them, so they can determine which Category should be chosen. Such a process also involves reviewing the corrective action history of the individual who violated the policy.

The Appendix is non-exclusive and non-exhaustive. For any policy violations that do not appear in it, the decisionmaker will utilize the Category definitions to select an appropriate Category, in addition to being informed by comparable policy violations that are listed within the Appendix.

Illustration

- The Chief is presented with a case where Officer Pati O'Furniture violated policy by failing to attend a required police training.
- The Chief opens the Appendix to locate where a member's failure to attend a required training appears.
- Under chapter 2-500, with the header of Training, the Chief locates a policy violation entitled "Failure to attend required training" (shown below).

2-500	Training								
	Failure to attend required training		B	C	D				

- In that row, the available options listed are Category B, Category C, and Category D.
- Knowing these three options, the Chief returns to the Corrective Action Matrix.
- The Chief reviews the specific facts and circumstances of Officer O'Furniture missing the required training, including the impact(s) of that violation.
- The Chief also reviews Officer O'Furniture's corrective action history and may review mitigating and aggravating circumstances.
- Finally, the Chief analyzes all that information together and applies it to each of the definitions of Category B, Category C, and Category D that the Appendix showed as options. The is done to determine which Category (B, C, or D) best fits Officer O'Furniture's specific failure to attend the required training.

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1-300	Trademark							
	Violations relating to unauthorized use of the MPD trademark	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1-400	Performance							
	Isolated instance of tardiness for a shift	A						
	Isolated instance of tardiness for a required meeting	A						
	Neglect of Duty, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to meet conditions of employment or maintain required certification		B	C	D	E	F	G
	Insubordination		B	C	D	E	F	
1-400	Supervision							
	Failure to supervise, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
2-100	Chain of Command Reporting							
	Failure to make required notifications to MPD Chief or Watch Commander, per policy		B	C				
	Failure to make required notifications to supervisor or Internal Affairs (e.g., Duty to Report), per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
2-100	Duty to Intervene							
	Failure to intervene, per policy (the Category selected for this violation shall be the same Category the underlying violation would receive)		B	C	D	E	F	G
2-100	Complaint Reporting and Processing							
	Failure to take, receive, or appropriately accept a complaint of misconduct		B	C	D	E		
	Interference with or obstruction of a misconduct investigation				D	E	F	
2-100	Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation							
	Workplace discrimination, harassment, or retaliation based on protected class status, per MPD policy and/or City policy				D	E	F	G
	Using discriminatory, biased, or racially insensitive language based on protected class status in the workplace, per MPD policy and/or City policy				D	E	F	G
2-500	Training							
	Failure to attend required training		B	C	D			
2-500	Minnesota POST Board Licensing							
	Failure of a sworn member to maintain a valid and active Minnesota POST Board license							G

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Minnesota POST Board violations that are grounds for losing one's peace officer license							G
3-100	Uniforms and Grooming							
	Violations related to appearance and attire	A	B					
3-300 to 3-800	Timekeeping and Hours Worked							
	Failure to have an 8-hour consecutive block off within a daily cycle, or failing to comply with required rest periods, per policy		B	C	D			
	Working more than 16 hours within a daily cycle or within any 24-hour rolling period, or failing to comply with total hours worked requirements, per policy		B	C	D			
	Untimely entry of hours worked	A	B	C	D			
	Failure of a supervisor to deny requests to work overtime, buyback, or other shift extensions that would cause a member to violate the limitation on hours work policy requirements		B	C	D			
	Failure to input the correct code for timekeeping in MPD timekeeping software	A	B	C				
	Failure to input the correct information in MPD timekeeping software Notes for permitted secondary employment, per policy	A	B	C				
	Prohibited use of overtime, voluntary overtime, critical staffing overtime, court-related overtime, buyback, and/or phone-call related overtime (e.g., changing your schedule to earn overtime when you are scheduled to work a regular shift)		B	C	D	E		
	Leaving an assignment without permission / AWOL (Absent Without Leave)		B	C	D	E	F	
3-700	Court-Related							
	First failure to appear in court, regardless of duration of time	A	B					
	Second or subsequent failure to appear in court, regardless of duration of time		B	C	D			
3-800	Secondary Employment							
	Violations relating to an expired secondary employment form		B					
	Failure to obtain prior approval to work a job site		B	C	D			
	Failure to obtain prior approval for usage of a squad		B	C				
	Failure to log on with MECC during permitted secondary employment		B	C				
	Working at a prohibited job site for secondary employment (e.g., adult entertainment)				D	E	F	
4-200	Lost or Damaged Equipment							
	Loss or damage of MPD equipment (excluding firearms, less-lethal weapons, radios, and automobiles)	A	B	C				

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Loss or damage of firearms, less-lethal weapons, radios, automobiles, and other similar MPD equipment		B	C	D	E	F	
4-200	Body Worn Camera (BWC) / In Car Camera (ICC)							
	Failure to add correct or required metadata to BWC/ICC (e.g., missing CCN), per policy	A	B					
	Failure to complete a start-up check for BWC/ICC, per policy	A	B					
	Failure to document or narrate the reason for the failure to activate, late activation, or early de-activation of BWC/ICC, per policy	A	B	C				
	Late activation of BWC/ICC prior to arrival, per policy	A	B					
	Late activation of BWC/ICC after arrival, per policy	A	B	C	D			
	Failure to activate BWC/ICC, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Early de-activation of BWC/ICC, per policy	A	B	C	D	E		
	Intentional de-activation of BWC/ICC not within policy					E	F	
	Intentional disabling or destruction of BWC/ICC recording not within policy					E	F	
	Intentional destruction or alteration of data for the purpose of hiding evidence				D	E	F	G
4-400	Vehicle Accidents, Vehicle Inspections, and Seatbelts							
	Failure to properly inspect a vehicle	A	B					
	Failure to wear seat or shoulder belts, per MPD policy and/or City policy	A	B	C				
	Violations relating to take-home vehicles		B	C	D	E	F	
	Preventable vehicle collision not resulting in injury with either no damage or less than \$1,000 damage	A	B	C				
	Preventable vehicle collision resulting in injury and/or \$1,000 damage or more		B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to complete a Minnesota State Accident Report, per policy		B	C				
	Failure to leave the vehicle in the position it came to rest following the accident, per policy	A	B	C				
	Failure of a supervisor to respond to a vehicle accident, per policy		B					
	Failure of a supervisor to assign an uninvolved party to investigate the vehicle accident, per policy	A	B					
4-500	Records Access and Confidentiality							
	Improper use, access, disclosure, or permission to disclose confidential records, reports, data, or other not public information				D	E	F	G
4-600	Report Writing							

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Clerical errors in written report fields required by policy where the information is still detailed substantively elsewhere in the written report (e.g., Use of Force details page dropdown selection error)	A						
	Failure to make a statement in any case that a member could be required to testify about in court and/or those incidents that involve homicides, major crimes, felony arrests, gross misdemeanor arrests, or misdemeanor arrests that have unusual circumstances		B	C	D	E		
	Failure to ensure offense reports are complete and accurate (refer to 5-300 and 9-100/9-200 for violations pertaining to Stop, Search, Citation, and Arrest (SSCA) or Use of Force (UOF) reports)	A	B	C	D			
	Failure to use the appropriate offense code for a report, per policy	A	B	C				
5-100	Code of Conduct							
	Failure to provide name and badge upon request	A	B					
	Failure to introduce or identify self by rank, last name, and agency during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy	A						
	Violations of the Use of Discretion, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Engaging in conduct in an official capacity that detracts from the public's faith in the integrity of the criminal justice system		B	C	D			
	Failure to carry out duties with integrity, fairness, and impartiality, thus detracting from the public's faith		B	C	D			
	Knowingly making false accusations of any criminal, ordinance, traffic, or other law violation, per policy			C	D	E	F	
	Failure to truthfully, completely, and impartially report, testify, and present evidence in all matters of an official nature			C	D	E	F	G
	Violations involving truthfulness as it pertains to omissions of fact			C	D	E	F	
	Consumption of alcoholic beverages or chemical substances while on duty, per policy				D	E	F	G
	Carrying any firearm or ammunition while off-duty and while under the influence of alcohol or any controlled substance				D	E	F	G
	Working on-duty while under the influence of alcohol or while impaired by a controlled substance, per policy				D	E	F	G
	Taking any off-duty law enforcement action while under the influence of alcohol or while impaired by a controlled substance, as provided in policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Conduct meeting the elements of DWI (Driving While Impaired) while off-duty				D	E	F	G

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Conduct meeting the elements of DWI (Driving While Impaired) while on-duty or while driving a City vehicle, including all types of City-owned vehicles					E	F	G
	Engaging in any conduct known, or that should be reasonably known, to constitute sexual harassment, whether on-duty or off-duty			C	D	E	F	G
	Engaging in any sexual contact or conduct constituting lewd behavior while on-duty, per policy				D	E	F	
	Failure to avoid regular personal associations with people who are known to engage in criminal activity where such associations will undermine the public trust and confidence in the employee or agency, per policy				D	E	F	
	Failure to remain occupied with City business while on-duty by engaging in a distraction of a short duration (e.g., checking Instagram notifications on a personal phone for 60 seconds)	A						
	Failure to remain awake/alert while on-duty or working secondary employment (e.g. asleep in squad)			C	D	E	F	
	Neglecting calls for service or avoiding responding to calls for service		B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to treat fellow employees with respect (does not include discrimination/bias/harassment/retaliation)	A	B					
	Use of derogatory, indecent, or unnecessarily harsh language: not directed at a person, per policy (does not include discriminatory/bias language)	A	B	C				
	Use of derogatory, indecent, or unnecessarily harsh language: to address or reference another person, including profanity used as insult (does not include discriminatory/bias language)		B	C	D			
	Ridiculing, mocking, deriding, taunting, belittling, willfully embarrassing, humiliating, or shaming a person (does not include discriminatory/bias language)		B	C	D			
	Compromising personal integrity, or that of MPD or the City, by accepting, giving, or soliciting any gratuity which could be reasonably interpreted as capable of influencing official acts or judgments or by using status as a MPD member for personal, commercial, or political gain, including the taking of bribes			C	D	E	F	G
	Compromising personal integrity, or that of MPD or the City, by taking or attempting to influence actions when a conflict of interest exists			C	D	E	F	G
	Interference with or obstruction of any criminal investigation being conducted by MPD or any other law enforcement agency				D	E	F	
	Violations involving committing a misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor, including theft			C	D	E	F	G
	Violations involving committing a felony, including theft						F	G

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Violations of MPD's social media policies		B	C	D	E	F	
	Engaging in Threats of Harm, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to explain the reason for contact with a person as soon as practical during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy (see 9-200 for violations pertinent to SSCA)	A	B					
	Failure to inform people during interactions that they are being recorded by BWC/ICC during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy	A	B					
	Failure to attempt to answer relevant questions a person may have regarding the law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy (see 9-200 for violations pertinent to SSCA)	A	B					
	Failure to gather information from all involved parties before taking action and to engage in neutral decision-making during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy (see 9-200 for violations pertinent to SSCA)	A	B	C				
	Failure to explain actions during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy (see 9-200 for violations pertinent to SSCA)	A	B					
	Failure to ensure reasonable delays are explained to the people involved during a law enforcement action or professional services interaction, per policy	A	B					
	Failure to provide any person stopped or detained with a victim assistance card ("blue card"), per policy		B					
	Failure to provide victims, people in professional service interactions, or any person who requests one with a victim assistance card ("blue card") or other policy-permitted informational card, per policy	A	B					
	Discrimination, harassment, or retaliation on the basis of protected class status, including condoning discrimination through inaction, passive acceptance, or by implying agreement				D	E	F	G
	Using discriminatory, derogatory, or biased language or take actions to taunt or denigrate a person, regarding a person's protected class status, including talking to or about a person				D	E	F	G
	Physically displaying material in or on City property that may be considered discriminatory, derogatory, or biased regarding a person's protected class status (e.g., cartoons, posters)				D	E	F	G
	Posting, displaying, or transmitting content on personal social media accounts, or through City technology, that is disparaging or evidences knowing and intentional discrimination toward a person or group based on protected class status and that would lead an objectively reasonable person to doubt the member's ability to perform the duties of a peace officer in a fair and impartial manner				D	E	F	G

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Considering a person's protected class status, or substitutes for/stereotypes of race or national origin, when taking, or refraining from taking, any law enforcement action					E	F	G
	Considering a person's immigration status when taking, or refraining from taking, any law enforcement action (not including exceptions in P&P 9-401)					E	F	G
5-300	Use of Force							
	Failure to verbally warn of intention to use force prior to the use of force, per policy		B					
	Level 1 Use of Force: Failure to notify a supervisor		B					
	Level 1 Use of Force: Failure to document in all required sections		B	C				
	Level 1 Use of Force: Unnecessary, not proportional, and/or not objectively reasonable		B	C				
	Level 2 Use of Force: Failure to document in all required sections		B	C	D			
	Level 2 Use of Force: Failure to make required notification to supervisor		B	C	D			
	Level 2 Use of Force: Failure to conduct a supervisor force review		B	C	D	E		
	Level 2 Use of Force: Unnecessary, not proportional, and/or not objectively reasonable		B	C	D	E	F	G
	Level 3 Use of Force: Failure to document in all required sections			C	D	E		
	Level 3 Use of Force: Failure to make required notification to supervisor			C	D	E		
	Level 3 Use of Force: Failure to conduct a supervisor force review			C	D	E		
	Level 3 Use of Force: Unnecessary, not proportional, and/or not objectively reasonable			C	D	E	F	G
	Insufficient supervisor review of reports, per policy		B	C	D			
	Intentional use of prohibited force (e.g., Maximal Restraint Technique)					E	F	
	Failure to utilize de-escalation techniques, per policy		B	C	D	E		
	Improper handcuffing		B	C	D			
	Failure to accommodate injury/disability with regard to handcuffing			C	D	E		
7-800	De-Escalation							
	Failure to fulfill one's Duty to De-escalate, per policy		B	C	D	E		
	Using tactics that unnecessarily escalate an encounter or create a need for force		B	C	D	E		
	Using words or actions that a reasonable person would conclude are intended to incite or escalate reactive behavior		B	C	D	E		
	Failure to substantively document de-escalation efforts, per policy		B	C				

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
5-400	Firearms							
	Negligent or unsafe handling of a firearm that has reasonable potential to cause discharge of the firearm			C	D			
	Negligent or unsafe handling of a firearm that results in discharge of the firearm			C	D	E		
	Negligent or unsafe handling of a firearm that has the reasonable potential to cause injury			C	D			
	Negligent or unsafe handling of a firearm that results in injury			C	D	E	F	
	Reckless or intentional discharge or handling of a firearm resulting in injury or a reasonably foreseeable potential to cause an injury				D	E	F	
	Violations relating to unauthorized modifications to a duty weapon or other declared firearm		B	C	D	E		
	Violations relating to unauthorized ammunition			C	D	E		
	Failure to report the discharge of a firearm				D	E	F	
6-200	Media Relations							
	Violations relating to media relations, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
7-300	Bias Crimes							
	Failure to report crimes, or alleged crimes, of bias							G
7-100	Calls for Service							
	Failure to self-assign or failure to request dispatch to assign self to a call for service		B					
7-314	Domestic Abuse Incident Procedure							
	Failure to conduct one or more of the steps of the domestic abuse protocol, with no/negligible impact on preliminary/secondary investigation and no/negligible increase in risk of harm to the victim	A						
	Failure to conduct one or more of the domestic abuse protocol, resulting in more than negligible impact on preliminary or secondary investigation, or resulting in potential for or actual harm to the victim		B	C	D			
	Failure to conduct any steps of the domestic abuse protocol, per policy			C	D	E		
7-350	Rendering Medical Aid							
	Good-faith effort to render medical aid when the medical aid provided is not consistent with professional training	A	B					
	Failure to render or obtain any necessary emergency medical care whenever a person is injured, complains of injury or illness, or requests medical attention, per policy		B	C	D	E		

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Failure, following a Level 3 Use of Force, to render or obtain any necessary emergency medical care whenever a person is injured, complains of injury or illness, or requests medical attention, consistent with training				D	E		
	Willful failure to render or obtain any necessary emergency medical care whenever a person is injured, complains of injury or illness, or requests medical attention, where the officer knew or should have known there was a reasonable chance of great bodily harm or death				D	E	F	
7-400	Emergency Driving and Vehicle Pursuits							
	Failure to continuously use lights and sirens during pursuit/emergency driving, per policy	A	B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to use lights and/or siren (one or both) throughout the entire duration of the pursuit/emergency driving, per policy			C	D	E		
	Failure to complete required pursuit reports/narratives, per policy		B	C				
	Failure to terminate a pursuit after loss of visual contact for a significant period of time (e.g. 10-15 seconds), per policy		B	C				
	Initiating a pursuit not within policy		B	C				
	Exceeding the authorized squad limit during a pursuit, per policy		B	C	D			
	Unauthorized vehicle type involved in a pursuit, per policy		B	C	D	E	F	
	Failure to notify dispatch of discontinuation in a pursuit		B	C				
	Failure to notify dispatch of involvement in a pursuit		B	C				
	Failure to acknowledge the role of pursuit supervisor		B	C				
	Failure to terminate a pursuit after direction from the pursuit supervisor		B	C	D	E	F	
	Driving the wrong way on a freeway (not including the freeway ramp)			C	D	E	F	
	Using an unauthorized roadblock during a pursuit			C	D	E	F	
	Using unauthorized intentional vehicle contact during a pursuit				D	E	F	
9-200	Towing							
	Violations pertaining to procedures for towing a vehicle	A	B	C				
9-100, 9-200	Search and Seizure Procedures							
	Warrantless search (Person) without reasonable articulable suspicion (RAS) or probable cause (PC), inclusive of weapons pat-downs, investigative detentions, and stops			C	D	E	F	G

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Warrantless search (Vehicle) without RAS or PC, inclusive of weapons pat-downs, investigative detentions, and stops			C	D	E	F	G
	Warrantless search (Other Property/Dwelling) without RAS or PC			C	D	E	F	G
	Field interview: failure to explain the purpose of the encounter, that the individual does not have to respond to questions, and/or that the individual is free to leave		B	C				
	Investigative Detention: Expanding the scope without additional legitimate basis			C	D			
	Investigative Detention: Failure to inform a subject of the reason for the detention and the reason for release		B	C				
	Investigative Detention: Failure to notify dispatch			C	D	E		
	Investigative Detention: Failure to complete any Police Report for investigative detentions that involve weapons pat-downs, per policy			C	D			
	Investigative Detention: Failure to document weapons pat-downs, the discovery of a subject's lawfully-possessed weapon during a weapons pat-down, interviews, and/or other required information in the Police Report, per policy		B	C				
	Investigative Detention: Failure to release a subject of an investigative detention when RAS has been dispelled or PC was not developed in a reasonable time			C	D	E	F	
	Investigative Detention: Failure to have two members present for a weapons pat-down when feasible	A	B	C				
	Investigative Detention: Conducting a weapons pat-down on a subject in an unlawful manner (e.g. reaching into pockets proactively)			C	D	E		
	Vehicle Stop: Failure to utilize safety precautions during a vehicle stop, per policy		B	C	D			
	Vehicle Stop: Questioning of a passenger during a vehicle stop for reasons not within policy		B	C	D			
	Vehicle Stop: Conducting a vehicle stop for offenses prohibited by policy		B	C	D			
	Vehicle Stop: Failure to document the unsafe vehicle operation or imminent safety hazard when conducting a vehicle stop for this reason		B	C				
	Vehicle Stop: Citation for equipment violation during a vehicle stop not within policy		B	C				
	Vehicle Stop: Failure to follow the Lights On! Coupon procedures	A						
	Vehicle Stop: Failure to inform a subject of a traffic stop the reason for the stop, per policy		B	C	D			
	Vehicle Stop: Failure to notify dispatch of required information for a traffic stop		B	C				
	Consent Search (Building/Yard): Failure to follow recording procedures for consent searches		B	C	D			

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Consent Search (Building/Yard): Failure to document in the police report the required information for a consent search		B	C	D			
	Conducting a search without regard/respect for property and in a manner that minimizes damage			C	D	E	F	G
	Failure to leave searched property as close as reasonably possible to its pre-search condition		B	C				
	Failure to notify a supervisor of damage to property that occurred during a search		B	C	D			
	Conducting a warrantless fresh pursuit entry against policy				D	E	F	
	Strip Search: Conducting a strip search against policy				D	E	F	
	Strip Search: Failure to obtain supervisor approval prior to conducting a strip search			C	D	E	F	
	Strip Search: Failure to have the approving supervisor present during the strip search			C	D	E		
	Strip Search: Failure to utilize proper gender procedures when conducting a strip search			C	D	E	F	
	Strip Search: Failure to document a strip search			C	D	E		
	Body Cavity Search: Conducting a body cavity search against policy				D	E	F	
	Body Cavity Search: Failure to obtain supervisor approval prior to conducting a body cavity search			C	D	E	F	
	Failure to conduct a lawful search with a gender-appropriate member, per policy		B	C				
	Search Documentation: Failure to document RAS or PC in a police report at all, per policy		B	C				
	Search Documentation: Failure to inform on-duty supervisor of pending search report prior to end of shift		B					
	Search Documentation: Leaving a shift prior to supervisor approval of pending search report	A	B					
	Search Documentation: Failure to make necessary report changes noted by supervisor prior to end of shift		B	C				
	Conducting a search of a person being transported in an ambulance against policy			C	D	E	F	
	Insufficient supervisor review of reports, per policy		B	C	D			
	Failure of a supervisor to initiate corrective action if it is determined that a legal basis for a law enforcement action did not exist, per policy			C	D	E	F	
	Failure of an on-duty supervisor to review pending reports by end of shift or to timely review reports in queue, per policy		B					
	Conducting a search of a person for a voluntary transportation in a squad against policy		B	C	D			
	Failure to inspect a transport vehicle upon conclusion of transport		B	C	D			
	Failure to document consent search for weapons during a voluntary transport and the reasons for any transportation		B	C	D			
	Failure to follow disorderly conduct and obstruction of legal process procedures, per policy		B	C	D			

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Failing to, or improperly, securing persons with fastened seatbelts during transport in any vehicle equipped with seat belts (not resulting in injury)	A	B					
	Failing to, or improperly, securing persons with fastened seatbelts during transport in any vehicle equipped with seat belts (resulting in injury)		B	C	D			
	Failure to transport detained individuals separately or by gender, per policy		B	C	D			
	Transporting a person in prone position, per policy				D	E	F	
	Transporting a subject of an investigative detention without basis to transport, per policy			C	D	E		
	Failure of a transporting member to complete a custodial search on an arrested person before transport			C	D	E	F	
8-300, 9-200	Arrest Procedures							
	Failure to follow arrest procedures, per policy		B	C	D	E		
	Citation without PC			C	D	E		
	Arrest without PC			C	D	E	F	
	Failure to articulate PC, per policy		B	C				
	Failure to release when PC no longer exists		B	C	D	E		
	Improper Rule 6 determination		B	C	D			
	Improper citizen's arrest determination		B	C	D			
	Failure to complete Authority to Detain / JPC / 36-Hour		B	C	D			
	Failure to obtain supervisory approval for an arrest		B	C				
	Failure to verify identity of private person who made the citizen's arrest		B	C	D			
	Failure to verify identity of arrestee prior to citation		B	C	D			
	Failure to book an arrestee, or contact HCSO, upon additional discovery of a warrant		B	C	D			
	Improper DWI booking/release		B	C	D	E		
	Failure to separate arrestees		B	C	D			
	Leaving an arrestee unattended			C	D	E	F	
	Failure to notify MECC, as provided as policy		B					
	Failure to follow Escape of an Arrested Person procedures			C	D	E		
	Failure to submit arrest evidence		B	C	D			
	Failure to complete required arrest reports or Private Person Arrest Form		B	C				

Chapter	Violation Topic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
9-400	Immigration-Related Policy							
	Failure to abide by the City's Separation Ordinance or MPD policy on immigration matters (does not include Duty to Intervene, see 2-100)		B	C	D			
10-200	Investigation Priority							
	Reported crimes will be investigated to the fullest extent possible without regard to the status of the victims or the areas of the City in which the crime occurs		B	C	D			
10-400	Evidence and Property Handling							
	Minor clerical errors relating to storage or release of evidence/property (e.g., wrong case number, mislabeling)	A	B					
	Violations relating to storage or release of evidence/property (not including minor clerical mistakes)		B	C	D	E	F	
	Violations relating to the intentional and willful destruction of evidence or tampering				D	E	F	