

Comparison Report

**Wisconsin Electronic Control
Device training and Amnesty
International recommendations**



**Wisconsin Department of Justice
Training and Standards Bureau
May, 2009**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’S CONCLUSIONS.....	3
LETHALITY	3
Wisconsin Comparison	4
POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE AND TORTURE	4
Wisconsin Comparison	5
RECOMMENDATIONS TO AUTHORITIES.....	6
SUSPEND USE.....	6
U.N. GUIDELINES; RIGOROUS TRAINING & ACCOUNTABILITY.....	6
OFFICERS TRAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH U.N. STANDARDS	7
TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS.....	7
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DEPARTMENTS DEPLOYING ECDs... 	9
WARNING BEFORE USE	9
STRICT GUIDELINES AGAINST MULTIPLE OR PROLONGED SHOCKS	9
MENTAL ILLNESS	11
PROHIBITED DEPLOYMENTS	11
TARGET AREAS.....	12
DRIVE-STUN MODE	12
USE AGAINST SUBJECTS IN CUSTODY	13
USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH RESTRAINTS.....	13
MEDICAL CARE	14
STRICT REPORTING	14
CONTENTS OF USE OF FORCE REPORT	15
PUBLIC REPORTING	15
SUMMARY	16
APPENDIX: WI DISTURBANCE RESOLUTION MODEL.....	17

INTRODUCTION

Amnesty International (“A.I.”) published, “*Less Than Lethal? The Use of Stun Weapons in US Law Enforcement*” in December, 2008.¹ A copy of this report was sent to the Wisconsin Department of Justice. Training and Standards Bureau Director Ken Hammond directed Training Officer Glenn Rehberg to conduct a review of the Amnesty International report.

A.I.’s report consists of the following sections:

1. Introduction and Overview
2. Background
3. Review of Deaths Following Use of CEDs [“Conducted Energy Devices”]
4. Overview of Safety Concerns Arising from Amnesty International’s Review of Death Cases
5. Conclusions and Recommendations
6. Appendix A: Case Studies
7. Appendix B: Selected Data on Use of CEDs by US Law Enforcement
8. Appendix C: Medical and Scientific Studies on CEDs
9. Appendix D: Distribution and Deployment of Taser, Stinger, and Other Projectile CEDs

With the exception of the Introduction, each section contains subtopics addressing A.I.’s concerns and findings within that topic area.

The purpose of this review is to compare Wisconsin’s Electronic Control Device (“ECD”) training to Amnesty International’s recommendations. It is beyond the scope of this review to examine each subtopic within A.I.’s report. Amnesty International’s Conclusions and Recommendations are effectively summarized in Section 5. This report addresses those conclusions and recommendations.

¹ The publication is available at <http://amnesty.org/en/library/info/AMR51/010/2008/en>, AMR 51/010/2008. The version examined here is the “revised second edition of the report launched on 16 December 2008.”

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL'S CONCLUSIONS

In general, Amnesty International recommends limiting the use of ECDs to “specialist” officers subject to rigorous training and accountability systems, and limiting use of ECDs to situations where lethal force would otherwise be authorized. Amnesty International bases this recommendation on its in-house review of deaths following Taser use and A.I.’s perceived need for further studies into the effects of ECDs.

LETHALITY

Amnesty International states, “...Amnesty International believes that the use of electro-shock weapons against individuals who do not pose an immediate threat of death or serious injury to themselves or others is a disproportionate use of force which can constitute ill-treatment.”²

Amnesty International writes, “Based on the findings of this report, Amnesty International considers that enough information is already available to indicate that such devices are potentially lethal and that any use of CEDs must be very strictly regulated and controlled and limited to situations where the only alternative would have been the use of lethal force or firearms.”³

Amnesty International further states, “Based on the concerns raised in this report, as regards both the safety and the potential for abuse of such weapons, Amnesty International believes departments should either cease using CEDs or limit their use to situations where they can be effectively used to avoid the resort to lethal force or firearms.”⁴

“Amnesty International believes that, as a “less-lethal” alternative to firearms, CED deployment should be subject to a similar standard, in that their lawful use should be limited to situations where, in accordance with UN standards, officers are faced with an imminent threat of death or serious (potentially life-threatening) injury which cannot be contained by less extreme options. This would allow appropriately trained officers to deploy such weapons as a last resort at or just before the point at which they would otherwise be justified in resorting to firearms.”⁵

² ‘Less Than Lethal’? The Use of Stun Weapons in US Law Enforcement, Amnesty International, pp. 4-5

³ Amnesty International, pp. 50-51

⁴ Amnesty International, p. 51, 3rd paragraph

⁵ Amnesty International, pp. 51-52

Wisconsin Comparison

Wisconsin's training curriculum places ECDs in "Control Alternatives" within the Disturbance Resolution Model's "Intervention Options," and thus does not meet Amnesty International's recommendation.

Mode	Purpose
A. Presence	To present a visible display of authority
B. Dialog	To verbally persuade
C. Control Alternatives	To overcome passive resistance, active resistance, or their threats
D. Protective Alternatives	To overcome continued resistance, assaultive behavior, or their threats
E. Deadly Force	To stop the threat

POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE AND TORTURE

Amnesty International states its concern that ECDs *"are inherently open to abuse as they are easy to carry and easy to use and they can inflict severe pain at the push of a button without leaving substantial marks."*⁶ A.I. also writes, *"...they can inflict severe pain at the push of a button without leaving substantial marks and can be used to inflict repeated and prolonged shocks. ...can also be used close-up as stun guns when an individual is already effectively under control or in custody and where the mode of control is through pain compliance. The infliction of severe pain on someone who is already incapacitated or otherwise under the control of a law enforcement officer breaches the international prohibition on torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."*⁷

Amnesty International recommends that, *"Electro-shock weapons, which have a high physical impact and cause extreme pain, should never be used as a general force tool. Where CEDs are authorized under the limited circumstances recommended above, they should be deployed only by specialist officers who are subject to rigorous training and accountability systems which conform to UN standards on the use of force."*⁸

Finally, Amnesty International *"...believes that any department or authority not prepared to restrict the use of CEDs as outlined above should, at the very least,*

⁶ Amnesty International, pp. 1-2

⁷ Amnesty International, p. 51

⁸ Amnesty International, p. 51, 3rd paragraph

suspend all use pending the outcome of such studies." [on the effects of ECDs, including studies on possibly vulnerable populations].⁹

Wisconsin Comparison

The training materials developed by the Training and Standards Bureau do not refer to international law, treaties ratified by the USA, or the UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials. Wisconsin training materials teach the legitimate use of force is limited by a hierarchy of laws and standards, including:

1. The U.S. Constitution
2. Wisconsin law
3. Agency Policy
4. Officer Training¹⁰

In addition, Wisconsin training materials do not refer to the UN's "*Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms, which require that force should be used only where 'strictly necessary'...*"¹¹ Wisconsin materials refer to the standard set by *Graham v Connor*, which requires all use of force to be "objectively reasonable."

Amnesty International does not define "*specialist officers*" or "*rigorous training and accountability systems*." All Wisconsin officers receive training on ethics and appropriate use of force, and all officers are subject to civil and criminal penalties for excessive use of force.

The Wisconsin Law Enforcement Standards Board ("LESB") has not recommended that agencies cease the use of ECDs pending results of medical studies on ECD effects on individuals suffering from drug use, mental illness, exertion, heart disease, psychosis, or positional restraint. The LESB and the Training and Standards Bureau continue to monitor such studies as they appear, including the National Institute of Justice studies repeatedly cited by Amnesty International.

Wisconsin does not share A.I.'s concern that ECDs should be prohibited as they "*are inherently open to abuse as they are easy to carry and easy to use and they can inflict severe pain at the push of a button without leaving substantial marks.*" Wisconsin does not evaluate whether weapons are suitable for use based on the possibility that an officer might use the weapon inappropriately and/or criminally. Any weapon is dangerous if used in such a manner.

⁹ Amnesty International, p. 51, 3rd paragraph

¹⁰ *Defense and Arrest Tactics* Student Manual, August 2007, WisDOJ LESB, pp. 1-2

¹¹ Amnesty International, p. 5, 2nd paragraph

RECOMMENDATIONS TO AUTHORITIES

Amnesty International makes the following recommendations to federal, state and local authorities:¹²

SUSPEND USE

“Governments and law enforcement agencies should suspend the use of CEDs pending further studies or limit their use to situations where they are immediately necessary to avoid or reduce the likelihood of recourse to firearms. The arbitrary or abusive use of CEDs should be punished as a criminal offence in law.”

The LESB has not recommended that agencies cease the use of ECDs pending results of medical studies on ECD effects on individuals suffering from drug use, mental illness, exertion, heart disease, psychosis, or positional restraint. The LESB and Training and Standards Bureau continue to monitor such studies as they appear, including the National Institute of Justice studies cited by Amnesty International.

Wisconsin places ECDs within “Control Alternatives” in Intervention Options. Wisconsin specifically trains that the goal of Control Devices (such as ECDs and OC “pepper” spray) is to overcome active resistance or its threat. Active resistance involves a subject who is physically counteracting an officer’s control efforts—under circumstances in which the behavior itself, the environment in which the behavior occurs, or officer/subject factors create a risk of bodily harm. Wisconsin does not classify ECDs as deadly force.

Wisconsin trains officers that they “...cannot use force to punish someone...to retaliate against someone...to show someone who’s boss...to teach someone a lesson.”¹³ Wisconsin officers who use inappropriate force are subject to civil and criminal penalties.

U.N. GUIDELINES; RIGOROUS TRAINING & ACCOUNTABILITY

“Law enforcement departments should have in place specific guidelines, rigorous training and accountability systems for the use of CEDs that are consistent with UN standards on the use of force before such weapons are deployed. The training curriculum and programs should be independent of any company or commercial interests involved in the manufacture and marketing of such weapons.”

¹² Amnesty International, p. 52

¹³ *Defense and Arrest Tactics*, p. 1

Wisconsin statute [66.0511\(2\)](#) requires every law enforcement agency to have a Use of Force policy or standard.

The Law Enforcement Standards Board has produced ECD training materials for Wisconsin law enforcement officers. A mandatory 2-hour orientation block is included within the 520-hour basic academy. In addition, an optional 8-hour block is available for use by DAAT instructors who are also certified by an ECD manufacturer (if the manufacturer certifies instructors). This allows those instructors to use an independent curriculum not produced by the manufacturer. Finally, a 2-hour supplemental course has been produced to orient manufacturer-certified ECD users to where ECDs fall within Wisconsin's Disturbance Resolution Model, medically significant behavior, and follow-through considerations.

OFFICERS TRAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH U.N. STANDARDS

“Law enforcement officials should be trained to use all force strictly in accordance with the standards set out under the UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials and the UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials. These require officers to use force only to the minimum extent necessary to achieve a lawful objective, in proportion to the threat posed and in a manner designed to minimize damage or injury.”

Wisconsin trains officers to the standard set by *Graham v Connor*—that all force used must be “objectively reasonable.” Neither Wisconsin nor the U.S. Supreme Court require that officers use the “minimum” force necessary. Wisconsin's standard is designed to achieve a proportional relationship between threat level and amount of force used, thereby minimizing inappropriate damage or injury.

TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS

“All use of force training programs should include regular conceptual and operational training on international human rights standards, including the absolute prohibition against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.”

Wisconsin's Use-of-Force training does not include training on international human rights standards.

Wisconsin trains officers that use of force must be objectively reasonable and cannot be used in a punitive, retaliatory, or inappropriate manner contrary to training. Wisconsin training materials do not explicitly prohibit torture and cruel,

inhuman or degrading treatment, although these acts would be in violation of the Code of Ethics, use-of-force training, and state and federal law.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO DEPARTMENTS DEPLOYING ECDs

Amnesty International makes additional recommendations for departments choosing to deploy ECDs. A.I. provides the following minimum standards it believes are necessary to safeguard against abuse or injury, provided the 'Recommendations to Authorities' listed above are also met:¹⁴

WARNING BEFORE USE

"Officers should give a clear warning to the subject, bystanders and other officers, where practicable, before activating a CED, unless to do so would place another person at risk. Officers should be instructed that drawing, "arcing" ("sparking") and placing of a laser sight red dot onto a subject constitutes the use of a CED and should only be used when it may be reasonably necessary to fire the weapon."

Wisconsin stresses the importance of verbalization in conjunction with use of force application. Wisconsin defines DAAT as a *"system of verbalization skills coupled with physical alternatives."*¹⁵ In addition, Wisconsin's ECD curriculum instructs officers to use heavy control talk to control subjects, if practical and feasible, before deploying the ECD.¹⁶

Wisconsin does not teach that drawing, sparking, or sighting an ECD is the same as using an ECD. Agency policies may be more explicit.

STRICT GUIDELINES AGAINST MULTIPLE OR PROLONGED SHOCKS

"There should be strict guidelines to avoid repeated, multiple, or prolonged shocks. In particular:

- a. Officers should be trained to apply only one shock of five seconds or less in order to allow officers to bring the subject under control through a safe restraint method. Officers should be instructed that a subject may not be able to comply with verbal commands while incapacitated by the muscle contractions or other immediate aftereffects of the electric shock. Policies should also state that less than one five-second standard cycle contained*

¹⁴ Amnesty International, pp. 52-55

¹⁵ *Defense and Arrest Tactics*, p. 5

¹⁶ *Electronic Control Devices Student Manual*, June 2008, WisDOJ LESB, pp. 14, 16, 18, etc.

- in current models is often sufficient to incapacitate a subject sufficiently to bring the person under control.*
- b. Any additional shock should generally be avoided and applied only under the same standard as the first shock (ie when immediately necessary to protect life or prevent serious injury), and the justification for each shock should be given separately in a use of-force report.*
 - c. Departments should introduce guidelines which prohibit the application of continuous shocks beyond the five-second maximum default charge permitted by current models.*
 - d. No more than one officer should activate a CED against a person at a time.*
 - e. The use of CEDs on children, persons of small stature, pregnant women, the elderly, people with heart disease and other “at risk” populations should be avoided in all circumstances unless officers are faced with an immediate threat to life which cannot be contained by less extreme options. Law enforcement agencies should be trained to be aware that “at risk” populations include people suffering from the effects of drugs or mental illness who are highly agitated, delirious and/or struggling violently; people with pacemakers or other implanted electrical devices; people suffering from epileptic seizures; people with respiratory problems such as asthma or who are obviously physically frail or in poor health.”*

Wisconsin’s training materials address A.I.’s recommendations in part as follows:

- a. The ECD Student Manual states that, “...repeated or prolonged application can have an additive effect and could cause injury... Before each application of an ECD...reassess the situation. If use of the ECD is not providing effective control to permit taking the subject into custody, consider whether it would be appropriate to disengage and/or escalate to another intervention option.”¹⁷ Additionally, officers are instructed to “Assess whether to disengage and/or escalate each time you deliver an additional cycle.”¹⁸ Wisconsin does not state that one cycle is “often sufficient” to bring a subject under control, as officers are expected to assess level of control achieved.*
- b. Separate justification for each application is addressed in paragraph “a.”, above. Wisconsin does not teach ECD use only in circumstances where officers are threatened with death or great bodily harm. Finally, Wisconsin does not mandate the specific use-of-force report used by individual agencies.*
- c. Wisconsin ECD training is not manufacturer-specific, and does not address the length of cycles. It states, “Be aware that repeated or prolonged application of an ECD can have an additive effect and could cause injury, especially in someone whose health is already compromised in some way, including by drug use, injury, or over-exertion, as can happen in people displaying **medically significant behavior**. Before*

¹⁷ *Electronic Control Devices*, p. 10

¹⁸ *Electronic Control Devices*, p. 16

each application of an ECD, as with any other use of force, reassess the situation. If use of the ECD is not providing effective control to permit taking the subject into custody, consider whether it would be appropriate to disengage and/or escalate to another intervention option.”¹⁹

- d. Wisconsin’s training materials include a mandatory Performance Assessment Task. This requires officers to successfully “handcuff under power” in a simulated team environment.²⁰ Implementation of a team approach reduces the possibility of multiple simultaneous deployments.
- e. Wisconsin’s training materials inform officers of populations that should receive careful consideration, but does not prohibit ECD use “under all circumstances.” Instead, officers are directed to consider the totality of the circumstances, their own agency policy, and whether their alternative force option increases the propensity of injury.²¹

MENTAL ILLNESS

“Where officers have reason to believe that an individual is acting in a disturbed, violent or threatening manner as a result of mental illness, all possible efforts should be made to involve mental health specialists in dealing with that person before resorting to CEDs or other forms of force. If there is no alternative to the use of CEDs in such a case, steps should be taken to ensure that the mentally ill or disturbed individual receives appropriate treatment by mental health professionals at the earliest opportunity afterwards.”

All Wisconsin officers receive 16 hours of training in Crisis Management within the 520 hour basic training curriculum. Crisis Management includes training on Emotionally Disturbed Persons, mental disorders, including serious and persistent mental illnesses (depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and anxiety disorders) as well as personality disorders, alcohol and other drug abuse, developmental disabilities, Alzheimer’s disease or other dementia disorders.

In addition, the Professional Communication Skills curriculum instructs officers in a 5-step “Crisis Intervention” model to assist subjects suffering from chronic mental illness, chemical abuse, and/or acute mental or emotional crisis.²²

PROHIBITED DEPLOYMENTS

“Departments should prohibit the use of CEDs in the case of fleeing suspects and on individuals who are handcuffed or in other restraints unless they pose an immediate threat of death or serious injury that cannot be contained by less extreme measures. A similar prohibition should be placed on the use of CEDs in situations where the location or other circumstances may cause a heightened risk of death or injury, including individuals in elevated positions, near flammable

¹⁹ *Electronic Control Devices*, p. 10

²⁰ *Electronic Control Devices*, Instructor Materials, Learning Plan 4, “Cuffing Under Power”

²¹ *Electronic Control Devices*, pp. 6-8

²² *Professional Communication Student Manual*, March 2007, WisDOJ LESB, pp. 82-90

materials, in or near water or in physical control of a vehicle in motion, including cars, trucks, motorcycles and bicycles.”

Wisconsin’s training materials make officers aware of populations that should be carefully considered before deployment. Officers are directed to consider the totality of the circumstances, including risk factors, their own agency policy, and whether an alternative force option increases the propensity of injury.²³

Wisconsin training explicitly cautions users regarding ECD use on children and older persons, pregnancy, suspects in elevated positions, bystanders and/or children near the suspect, flammability, suspects running away, and peaceful civil disobedience.

Wisconsin allows ECD use in situations where officers are not in danger of death or great bodily harm, including against suspects who are restrained. Officers receive training regarding use of force against restrained subjects, and are expected to consider the subject’s level/stage/degree of stabilization when determining whether a particular use of force is appropriate.²⁴

TARGET AREAS

“Officers deploying CEDs should be trained to avoid targeting the subject’s chest, where feasible. CEDs should not be aimed at the head, neck or genitals of a subject unless wholly unavoidable nor should the laser sight be aimed at the eyes.”

Officers in Wisconsin are taught that the ideal ECD deployment, if practicable, is at the suspect’s back, with a minimum 4-inch spread between probes, at locations where clothing fits more tightly.²⁵ However, they are not prohibited from targeting the suspect in the chest.

Officers are taught that subjects struck by probes in sensitive tissue areas such as the neck, face, groin, or female breast should be transported to a medical facility for probe removal.

DRIVE-STUN MODE

“As a “less lethal” incapacitating weapon, Tasers and similar devices should be deployed primarily in dart-firing mode. Use of such weapons in drive stun mode should be authorized only when strictly necessary and under the same deployment guidelines and restrictions as the dart-firing mode, i.e. only when no lesser options are available to an officer and there is an immediate threat of death or serious injury. The stun gun function of a CED projectile weapon should never be used to force a person to comply with an order given by an officer where there is no immediate threat to the life of safety of the officer or others.”

²³ *Electronic Control Devices*, pp. 6-8

²⁴ *Defense and Arrest Tactics*, p. 28

²⁵ *Electronic Control Devices*, p. 15

Wisconsin's training materials do not differentiate between contact deployments and deployments at a distance. The tactical decision whether to employ the ECD at a distance or in contact is left to the officer and the officer's evaluation of the particular situation and circumstances.

Wisconsin places ECDs within "Control Devices" and does not require the same justification for use of a contact deployment as that required to justify lethal force.

USE AGAINST SUBJECTS IN CUSTODY

"CEDs should not be used against individuals in custody unless they present an immediate threat of death or serious injury and no lesser options are available. CEDs should not be issued routinely to jail or prison staff, nor should they ever be used in prisons, jails, custody suites or police stations solely for compliance or control purposes."

Wisconsin does not instruct officers to limit ECD use to situations in which they are in danger of death or great bodily harm.

Wisconsin teaches that the purpose of use of force is "to achieve and maintain control of resistive subjects, to defend themselves or others, and to prevent escape."²⁶ Thus, Wisconsin training does not conform to A.I. standards stating ECDs should never be used in prisons, jails, or police stations for "control purposes."

Wisconsin training sufficiently addresses appropriate and inappropriate uses of ECDs, requiring all such deployments to be objectively reasonable. In addition, Wisconsin statute [941.295\(2\)\(c\)](#) expressly authorize jail and prison staff to possess ECDs.

USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH RESTRAINTS

"CEDs should not be used in conjunction with other restraint procedures that restrict breathing, such as chemical irritants, pressure to the chest, placing a suspect face-down. Following a CED activation, officers should use a restraint technique that does not impair breathing. Dangerous restraint procedures such as "hogtying" and carotid choke-holds should be prohibited in all circumstances."

Wisconsin trains officers that the best way to control a suspect is to handcuff them in a prone position. Wisconsin teaches a multiple-officer handcuffing technique which does not impair suspect breathing, beyond the suspect being in a prone position.²⁷

²⁶ *Defense and Arrest Tactics*, p. 1

²⁷ "Multiple Officer Ground Handcuffing," *Electronic Control Devices*, pp. 32-34

Wisconsin does not prohibit ECD use on a person who has been sprayed with pepper spray, although officers are warned to not to use an ECD on flammable liquids, including OC propellants.

Wisconsin neither teaches nor prohibits hogtying or lateral-vascular neck restraint. "This does not preclude agencies from utilizing additional training to fulfill individualized agency needs. The design of DAAT's Intervention Options leaves agencies with guidelines for each tactic's purpose. It is the responsibility of each agency...to research and determine what Mode the selected tactic would fall under. This would be achieved by understanding the tactic's purpose and instituting the proper amount of training."²⁸

MEDICAL CARE

"All persons who have been exposed to a CED activation should receive a medical evaluation as soon as possible and should be closely monitored while in custody. If the person to whom a CED has been applied is believed to have a pacemaker or other implanted device in place, immediate referral should be made to a hospital. Similarly, if the subject is found to have any other pre-existing medical condition that might lead to increased medical risk immediate referral to a hospital should be considered. In all cases, where possible, barbs should be removed by personnel with medical training, especially when penetrating sensitive locations (head, genitals, close to vital organs etc) or where there is a risk of organ penetration, or where higher power XP cartridges with longer darts are used."

All Wisconsin officers are trained to evaluate and monitor subjects for health concerns as part of "Follow-Through Considerations" following any use of force. Wisconsin's ECD curriculum trains officers to recognize "medically significant behavior" and its relationship to in-custody death.

Officers are instructed to obtain medical assistance if the suspect requests it, if a person has an adverse reaction to an ECD application, or if officers observe any other problem or feel that medical assistance is warranted.²⁹ Officers are taught that subjects struck by probes in sensitive tissue areas such as the neck, face, groin, or female breast should be transported to a medical facility for probe removal.³⁰

STRICT REPORTING

"Federal, state and local agencies should ensure strict reporting by the departments concerned on each use of a CED weapon, with detailed investigations, auditing and monitoring. Every CED use of force report should include downloaded data from the CED used, photographs of all relevant

²⁸ *Defensive and Arrest Tactics Instructor Manual*, WisDOJ LESB, June 2008, p. 10

²⁹ *Electronic Control Devices*, p. 20

³⁰ *Electronic Control Devices*, pp. 20-21

evidence, including impact points of the probes before and after removal of the subject, and information from the AFID “confetti” from the cartridge.”

Wisconsin does not mandate how individual agencies report their uses of force. Officers are taught to write complete reports in the Report Writing block of basic instruction.

CONTENTS OF USE OF FORCE REPORT

“The use of force report should include a record of each display, “arc” and training of the “red spot” laser light on a suspect, whether the CED activation was in dart-firing or “drive stun” mode and the reasons why the device was deployed in any of the uses listed above. The number of cycles and duration of shock (where recorded), and the reason for each cycle, should be reported in each instance. The age, race and gender of each person against whom a CED is deployed should also be reported.”

Wisconsin does not mandate how individual agencies report their uses of force. Officers are taught to write complete reports in the Report Writing block of basic instruction.

PUBLIC REPORTING

“Each department should provide a detailed break-down of its CED use in regular, publicly available reports. Such reports should include the data in aggregate form given under 11 [Contents of Use of Force Report]. The statistical information provided in such audits and public reports should also include the data listed under the PERF guidelines (guidelines 44 and 45).”

Wisconsin does not mandate how individual agencies report their uses of force. Wisconsin statute [66.0511\(2\)](#) requires every law enforcement agency to have a Use of Force policy or standard.

SUMMARY

A review of Amnesty International's report shows that Wisconsin training materials do not meet many of A.I.'s recommendations.

Some of the recommendations, such as content of use-of-force reports, are local issues to be implemented by local agencies. These are out of the purview of the LESB.

Other recommendations, such as placing ECD use at the level of deadly force, have not been adopted. Studies on ECD effects continue to go forward, and the LESB and Training and Standards Bureau will continue to monitor these studies, including those conducted by the National Institute of Justice.

This review, and other Amnesty International recommendations, will be brought before the Tactical Advisory Committee for their consideration. Specifically:

- Should LESB training materials explicitly caution against 2 officers simultaneously deploying an ECD on the same suspect?

The Wisconsin Department of Justice, Training and Standards Bureau, and LESB will continue to monitor ECD developments.

APPENDIX: WI DISTURBANCE RESOLUTION MODEL

APPROACH CONSIDERATIONS

Decision-Making

- Justification
- Desirability

Tactical Deployment

- Control of Distance
- Relative Positioning
- Relative Positioning with Multiple Subjects
- Team Tactics

Tactical Evaluation

- Threat Assessment Opportunities
- Officer/Subject Factors
- Special Circumstances
- Level/Stage/Degree of Stabilization

INTERVENTION OPTIONS

MODE

- A. Presence
- B. Dialogue
- C. Control Alternatives
- D. Protective Alternatives
- E. Deadly Force

PURPOSE

- To present a visible display of authority
- To verbally persuade
- To overcome passive resistance, active resistance, or their threats
- To overcome continued resistance, assaultive behavior, or their threats
- To stop the threat

FOLLOW-THROUGH CONSIDERATIONS

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| A. Stabilize | Application of restraints, if necessary |
| B. Monitor/Debrief | |
| C. Search | If appropriate |
| D. Escort | If necessary |
| E. Transport | If necessary |
| F. Turn-Over/Release | Removal of restraints, if necessary |