Chicago Consent Decree Scorecard: Key Implementation Priorities

April 2025

This Scorecard identifies six key implementation priorities based on their potential impact, their likelihood to spur additional reforms in the Consent Decree, and their potential to address concerns about policing from community members and organizations, enhancing the safety and trust of Chicago communities.

Tracking Misdemeanor Arrests and Tickets ¶79-82				
Description	**Importance**	**Current Status**	**Challenges**	**Actions Needed**
CPD must keep records of how often they charge people with misdemeanor arrests and administrative violations and document the race and gender of those charged. CPD is required to publish this data, analyze it, and identify any changes needed based on the analysis.[1]	Understanding how and when CPD uses its power to issue tickets and make arrests is a crucial prerequisite to ensure that CPD uses fair and impartial policing practices in everyday interactions with Chicagoans.	Progress remains stalled. CPD has not completed the first step to develop an approved methodology for collecting, managing, and analyzing this data.[2] While CPD produced some policies and training materials for review, the IMT found no meaningful advancement since IMR 9.[3]	CPD still lacks an approved method of tracking how often they issue misdemeanor arrests and tickets, especially broken down by race and gender. In the past, CPD has cited unreliable data and staffing availability as challenges. However, in this reporting period, the IMT found no explanation for the lack of progress or indication that CPD will meet this requirement by the next reporting period.[4]	The City must start by developing a comprehensive plan for tracking and assessing information related to misdemeanor arrests and administrative violations and submit it for approval. To move forward, they must also divert real resources toward this work and continue establishing the Equity Office to facilitate reform.[5]

Improved Response to Behavioral Health Crises ¶106-112				
Description	Importance	Current Status	Challenges	Actions Needed
CPD must respond timely to all calls involving a person experiencing a behavioral health crisis with a crisis intervention-trained officer. This requires CPD to collect data and analyze the need for crisis-trained officers and produce a plan to implement an appropriate response in each police district.[6]	Proper crisis intervention emphasizes care over punishment for those experiencing a mental or behavioral crisis. Having a trained officer to respond in these instances when called can prevent unnecessary escalation, violence, arrest, and other harms.	Not completed. CPD made some progress toward meeting the requirements for responding to behavioral health crises with trained officers. Assigned staff increased for the first time since being cut nearly in half in 2021.[7] However, they have not submitted the Crisis Intervention Plan or the Officer Implementation Plan—both required since 2020.[8] Without these, the Monitor can't evaluate their approach, and progress i stalled. CPD is projecting to produce plans during the twelfth reporting period..[9]	CPD has not defined what counts as a "timely" response from a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officer, making it impossible to track whether calls are being handled appropriately.[10] The Crisis Intervention Unit is still severely understaffed, and CPD has not added the needed officers or fully updated their internal systems to support this work.[11]	CPD must finish and submit both the Crisis Intervention Plan and Officer Implementation Plan. They also need to define "timely" response, fill vacancies in the Crisis Intervention Unit, and update training and tracking tools. These steps are critical to building a system that can respond to mental health crises with care and safely.[12]

Automatic System for Identifying Potentially Dangerous Officers ¶583-591				
Description	Importance	Current Status	Challenges	Actions Needed
CPD must create and implement an automated early intervention and support system (EISS) that allows supervisors to spot early warning signs of at-risk behavior by officers and empowers them to intervene to address the issue before that officer causes harm to themselves, their fellow officers, or the communities they serve.[13]	Monitoring officer behavior through an early intervention system helps identify officers who are most likely to engage in misconduct and allows CPD to intervene before harm is committed.	A narrow pilot has been created. CPD is still in the early stages of building an automated system to flag officers who show signs of harmful or risky behavior. While CPD has launched a small pilot program in a few districts, it has not been properly evaluated. TheMonitor did not offer any new updates or signs of progress in IMR-11.[14]	Officers and supervisors still need training on how to use the system, and the data that CPD feeds the system is not complete or reliable.[15]	CPD must evaluate the pilot program before expanding it, improve data quality, and train supervisors and officers on how the system works. They also must finalize a department-wide plan that integrates all early warning tools into one reliable system.

Improvement of Data Systems ¶607				
Description	Importance	Current Status	Challenges	Actions Needed
CPD must create and implement a data systems plan to address CPD's information collection and management needs.[16]	Improving the City's data system ensures implementation is accurately tracked, shows if reforms are working, and ensures the City meets the requirements of the Consent Decree.	Progress in Motion. CPD has made significant progress in its efforts to improve its data systems, specifically through the development of a new Records Management System (RMS). CPD has signed a contract with Benchmark Analytics to implement the new system and has provided a timeline with milestones for its rollout.[17] This is a critical step toward addressing long-standing issues with data collection and analysis.	CPD's data system has been hindered by the lack of comprehensive RMS, making it difficult to meet the full range of data needs outlined in the Consent Decree. While the RMS is a substantial improvement, it will not resolve all data issues, and CPD must also address gaps in other areas of data collection, analysis, and response. .[18]	CPD must continue working to implement the new RMS, while developing a detailed Data Systems Plan that outlines all initiatives required by the Consent Decree. Only once the full Data Systems Plan is finalized will CPD be able to move toward full compliance[19]

Gathering Feedback from Communities Throughout Chicago ¶46-47				
Description	Importance	Current Status	Challenges	Actions Needed
CPD is required to solicit and respond to feedback from a broad section of community members about policing and develop procedures to annually evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts to build collaborative community partnerships.[20]	CPD must serve communities in ways that meet the needs of the people who live there. This requires that CPD constantly evaluate whether it is using the best methods to hear from and work with a wide range of community members.	Progress in Motion. CPD has taken steps to improve how it tracks and evaluates community partnerships. They created a new tracking template used by all 22 districts and trained over 95% of officers on it through a new eLearning course.[21] These efforts helped CPD reach a new level of progress in this area.[22]	While CPD is making improvements, their engagement still does not consistently reach marginalized communities.[23] The department has not finalized its overall community engagement policy and must work diligently to ensure feedback leads to real change.[24]	CPD should complete and share its new community engagement policy and ensure consistent use of the tracking tools across all districts.[25] They should continue to expand "community conversations" to intentionally include people from communities most impacted by policing.

Investigating Officer-Involved Deaths ¶492				
Description	Importance	Current Status	Challenges	Actions Needed
All criminal investigations into CPD officer-involved deaths must comply with the Police and Community Relations Improvement Act (PCRIA) by being conducted by an external law enforcement agency with substantial expertise in homicide investigations.[26]	To garner trust and ensure fairness and accountability, officer-involved deaths should be investigated by a third party rather than CPD investigating its own officers. Compliance with this paragraph would also bring CPD into compliance with state law.	Not completed. CPD still has not taken the steps required to ensure that investigations into officer-involved deaths are conducted by outside agencies, as required by Illinois law.[27] With no progress toward meeting this obligation the City has not reached any level of compliance with this paragraph.[28]	The City has struggled to coordinate with external agencies, such as the Illinois State Police (ISP), to conduct independent investigations. The City was unable to reach an agreement with ISP and is looking to other law enforcement agencies to serve as third-party investigators.[29] However, there is no formal plan or agreement in place, and no clear policy outlining how these investigations should happen.[30]	CPD and the City must finalize a plan that ensures all officer-involved death investigations are handled by outside agencies.[31] They should also solidify partnerships with other law enforcement bodies—regional or statewide—and clearly document these plans to meet the standards of the Consent Decree and Illinois law.[32]

BACKGROUND

In August 2017, the Illinois Attorney General filed a lawsuit against the City of Chicago in response to the U.S. Department of Justice's findings of widespread unconstitutional conduct by the Chicago Police Department (CPD). This lawsuit led to a court-enforced agreement, known as the Consent Decree, that mandates extensive reforms across hundreds of police practices. A Consent Decree requiring effective, lasting reforms is one way to begin to build trust between Chicago's residents and police.

Since the Consent Decree took effect in 2019, the City and CPD have been working on its implementation. However, only 16% of the required reforms have been integrated into CPD's daily operations.[33] This slow progress raises serious concerns about the City and CPD's commitment to implementing these important reforms.

Nonetheless, recent evaluations show that the City has made significant progress in this reporting period, achieving new compliance milestones in about 25% of monitored paragraphs, including 42 that reached full compliance. This momentum is encouraging and shows that meaningful reform is possible when there is dedicated effort. We urge the city to continue building on this progress and to accelerate the pace of implementation, ensuring that reforms become embedded in the fabric of CPD's daily operation.

This Scorecard is updated as of Independent Monitor Report 11 (IMR-11), the most recent evaluation by the Independent Monitoring Team (IMT) appointed by the federal court to assess CPD's progress under the Consent Decree. The IMT's twice-annual reports provide an evaluation of each paragraph of the Consent Decree for which there is an update in that time period. All Independent Monitor Reports and the Consent Decree can be found on the IMT's website, www.cpdmonitoringteam.com.

REFERENCES

[1] *State of Illinois v. City of Chicago*, Case No. 17-cv-6260 (N.D. Ill) at ¶¶ 79-82 ("Consent Decree"); Independent Monitoring Report 8, Appendix 2 at page 69.
[2] Independent Monitoring Report 8, Appendix 2 at page 71.
[3] Independent Monitoring Report 11, pp. 20
[4] IMR 10, IMR-11, p. 20
[5] IMR-11, p. 8, pp.19-20
[6] Consent Decree, ¶¶ 106-112; Independent Monitoring Report 8, Appendix 3 at pages 52-65.
[7] IMR-11, 22-23
[8] IMR-11, p. 25
[9] IMR-11, p. 26
[10] IMR-11, p. 26
[11] IMR-11, p. 25
[12] IMR-11, pp. 25–29
[13] Consent Decree, ¶¶ 583-591.
[14] IMR-11, p. 62
[15] IMR-10, Appendix 10 —
[16] Consent Decree, ¶607.
[17] IMR-11, p. 63
[18] IMR-11, p. 63
[19] IMR-11, pp. 63–65
[20] Consent Decree, ¶¶ 46-47
[21] IMR-11, p. 15
[22] IMR-11, p. 16
[23] IMR-11, p. 17
[24] IMR-11, p. 17
[25] IMR-11, pp. 16–18
[26] Consent Decree, ¶492.
[27] IMR-11, p. 61
[28] IMR-11, p. 55
[29] IMR-11, p. 61
[30] IMR-11, p. 61
[31] 50 ILCS 727/1-10(b)
[32] IMR-11, p. 61
[33] Independent Monitoring Report 10 at page 3.