Attendees: Doug Tripp, Mark Gissener, Sam Chapman, Serena Parcell, Katie Taylor, Manny Garcia, Brian Smith, Jeannine Parisi, Paul Shang

Brian will ask for two week extension to allow group to run through tabletop scenario.

It was suggested that the GTFF be asked to refer committee candidates to the ASUO for endorsement to the President.

To what degree should the senate be involved in the creation of this committee?

Discussion about specific pages in draft report circulated to this group on November 20, 2011:

Page 6 3.vii.b – Add wording to reflect that President will consult with original appointing body before re-appointing members.

Caution against language that reduces authority of President. That this process is consistent with other committees on campus is important. There is concern regarding member turnover causing difficulties for committee to become cohesive working group.

Page 10 e. Policy changes should only affect officers after the Policy changes have taken place.

Page 11 Clarify that the committee votes on affirmance.

Clarify that redaction consists of personally identifiable information, names, titles, etc.

Page 10 2. Clarify what information is accessible to committee. Redacted report and associated public record, consider interviews from complainant or officer. This brings up the issue that any new discussions would be new evidence.

Will meetings include public forum?

Will complaint be video recorded?

Page 8 Mediation shall be voluntary and binding. The complaint will not be referred back to Professional Standards Lieutenant.
Shall attorneys attend meetings for procedural reference? Consider legal implications for employees and the University

Page 9 two justifications in b., adjust wording to combine with e on Page 10.

Mark Gissener will provide sample of process timeline as used by Eugene Citizen Review Board. Possibility of extension for certain circumstances could be worked in, but consider that quality of investigation/review diminishes with time.

Page 4 2.a. Aggrieved person, changed to person who witnessed event, could be victim or person outside of event.

Page 7 add not: Committee shall not make public comment...

Clarify in most reasonable place document, how policy modification will work.

Page 11 Confidentiality: Rework wording to reflect that meetings are public record.

Page 11 expand on language to describe the elements that committee is looking for in an investigation when findings are consistent with the facts of the case, “complete, thorough, fair, reasonable”, etc.

Comments due to Brian by Wednesday 11/30, next meeting will consist of tabletop scenario.