There is an administrative model and a judicial model (where the panel interacts with employee) Police Integrity Association in New South Wales does not recommend—consists of aboriginal folks and prisoners sent there (Queens, Australia)

Outside of the charge of this oversight working group, mediation and reconciliation tools can be a means to educate an officer and a means to educate complainants. This would be structured in a different way. Mediation normally means that once both parties agree there is no going back to complaint process. It’s tight in terms of expectations since you can’t go back to investigating complaint.

When record keeping mediation is taken out of the department they didn't feel like mediations were an appropriate tool for complaints. The seriousness of the offense would influence appropriateness. If there was no physical interaction, mediation is a good way to go. We’re working on part of our foundation so it is strong explain roles of all the other organizations. Public defenders offices, municipal court, ACLU—if they are failing, people expect that the complaint doesn't fill that void. Complaints gets fair and through investigations, one direction and then another to find where roles and responsibilities lie.

Mark’s presentation talked about goals, opportunity for performance improvement, service and system improvements, policy review. Possible UO oversight models will be reported to ELT, with equity transparent. UODPS studied other universities, maybe not identical but good starting point. The survey of other university oversight models described policy review, performance and system review as being two different things.

With the anticipated legislation passing, we've been charged to do its work, when we have sworn force. We do have oversight in place, but not what we'd need in a police force, what we present to ELT will influence current system, even if we go forward with same status, it will be useful to apply to current model.

Students, employees, visitors can make complaints through different points. Come up with models for complaint processing/response. The mechanics of resolving actual problems. Timeliness, transparency, documentation/tracking, multiple points of entry need to be corralled to see where complaints come from.

Goals are public confidence in complaint process, ensuring best practices and improvement of polices. Policy review is more of an objective than a goal. Even if officer is exonerated, there may be significant problems with policy. Where does dept. see that and change something, specific and mechanical, using the teachable moment of complaint review.

Coming up with policy and procedure? More of policies that affect procedures. The objective could be written as “to modify policy with needed refinement.”

Need a scalable system. We don’t want to treat every complaint the same, quickly as possible, use the appropriate amount of resources and time. Create a system that protects everyone’s rights. Is that a goal or objective? Goal.
There are more expensive models where oversight does investigation instead of just audit process. We need to be fiscally responsible, proportionate to size of campus and need of people involved, scaled to us.

The oversight group should have wide representation from communities on campus. What does wide representation mean, unique to community? Students, staff, faculty, visitors/community. Time intensive nature could limit representation. Something reflective of cultural diversity/culturally appropriate. Cultural awareness is of great value, being sensitive to “community values.”

What sort of diversity training is there for current UODPS officers? Student Affairs for cultural environment training, reserve academy teaches that as well. It’s not required by state, but required by UODPS. UODPS leadership believes this training is highly valuable, differences between municipal and campus, engage communication on regular basis. UODPS strives to hire people able to understand that, and screen out those who are inflexible and incapable of handling campus situations.

We will need an appeal method and a UODPS entry point along with other places. Not talking about risk management, not talking about legal obligations, the statute says we have to do it that way. Compliance outside of statutory compliance includes the labor contract, Garrity Rights, and the management of representing staff to make sure we’re addressing concerns; UODPS employees have rights.

An advisory role is one way it can be conceptualized it; I don’t think any units have hiring responsibility in oversight group. Feel like there needs to be bureaucracy between UO police department and oversight group advisory that’s up to administration. Hiring authority and internal investigation are within PD still. Structure of due process important.

Important that the public has confidence that UODPS is responding to needs, responding effectively, and creating trust. The process in which we do that still needs to be fleshed out, public has to trust us.

The idea of building trust starts way before this oversight process. There are behaviors expected and that is a continual process. Oversight process would be a model of those things too. Community-oriented trust building police force is a goal. Goal is to be responsive to UO community, does UODPS have role in oversight group membership? Concerned we’re getting outside of charge of committee, which is to review models of oversight and their pros and cons, we’re moving off into another direction. These goals and objectives are an evaluation tool to use while evaluating models.