Attendees: Brian Smith, Linda King, Paul Shang, Katie Taylor, Jeannine Parisi, Mark Gissiner

The committee discussed adding the complaint resolution process to the “Know Your Rights” online information and creating a pamphlet with information about the complaint resolution process. The pamphlet ideally would be made available in different formats and in all the complaint intake offices. Which office/department would provide advocates for students?

Mark G. provided definitions of complaints as used by the Eugene Police Department (i.e., service complaint, policy complaint, serious misconduct complaint).

Suggestions for modifications to the complaint process flow chart will be incorporated, then sent to the committee along with meeting notes:

- Offer mediation much earlier in the process. Mediation once agreed upon by both parties could begin as soon as complaint is received and would be in lieu of Professional Standards Office investigation. More discussion about which office would offer mediation is needed.
- The District Attorney’s (DA’s) process needs to be described in greater detail on the organizational chart. DA decides if the complaint should proceed as a criminal allegation. If not, it would be treated as an allegation of misconduct.
- The significant decision point of the VPFA and the UO Police Chief coming to a decision about the investigation needs its own box. After which the complainant may appeal to the President.
- The question of what happens when the resolution committee does not agree with the outcome of the investigation was explored. The normal process consists of a report of findings being sent to the Chief, the VPFA and the Professional Standards Office. The report will assess the quality of the investigation and make suggestions based on their findings. The report will open dialogue between the responsible departments and offices regarding policy change, re-opening the case, or other actions.

With respect to transparency, an annual report was suggested as a way to communicate the numbers, types and results of complaints processed by the resolution committee.

Operational procedures for intake and complaint processing are needed. It will be recommended that the the Professional Standards Office develop such procedures. Such work is outside the responsibility of this complaint resolution working group.

Membership considerations:
- Need a diverse group representative of community. Students could be endorsed by ASUO, community groups could be informally recommended.
• There was discussion about how to specify membership, whether to create specifically described slots (e.g. student from Greek system, classified staff member, etc.) or to leave it to the judgment of the appointer (President)
• Other considerations:
  o Who appoints and how?
  o Is anyone ineligible to serve?
  o Application process: informal recommendations?
  o Odd number of committee members? (seven agreed upon)
  o Decision-making process?
  o Public entity requiring quorum?
  o Which members make quorum?
  o Minutes?
  o Ex-officio members would be drawn from, for example, Human Resources, a VPs office, Dean of Students, etc.
  o Who supports group? Department of Public Safety
  o Could have minimum requirements, for example, must have at least one student, one staff member, one faculty, etc.

“Parking lot” ideas for next meeting:

• How often to meet
• Define types of complaints
• Who can file complaints:
  o Anonymous?
  o 3rd Party complaints
  o Statute of limitations
• Look at other universities’ procedures