Brian passed out a grid of goals and objectives. We had a list of goals and objectives, so Jeannine Parisi and Mark Gissiner recommended putting goals in a matrix to compare and evaluate aspects we like and don't like.
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Should we broaden the goal to “Gain confidence of all constituencies, build trust?"

The model best suiting officers will likely not best suit the students, this is a gray area with a lot of tension. The officers’ roles are quite different; they need to have their own respect for system they’re in, but the parts of the system officers’ trust would be different than students, faculty, and staff trust in. It is very important to have officers trust the system. The can be substantial consequences in complaint process for officers, so it matters greatly.

This is not well defined, how do you measure trust, defined or not? Measure confidence? Create a fair system of accountability instead of confidence and trust?

At UC Berkeley, they have a retired police officer on oversight committee which signals fairness to other officers because there is someone who knows the job. The fairness piece starts at time the complaint is received and the investigation is done. Need to be done in fair and equitable fashion, not just the review board but all of the process leading up to review. There are some objectives, like multiple points of entry, that marketing ourselves to the complaint process is perhaps not wise, we would not want to have making a complaint be zero cost to complainants, which in turn could up the amount of complaints. Encouraging complaints would seem unfair. An individual can be charged for false allegation. Service complaints have relatively low consequences.

Intake is very important; whoever does that need to have enough knowledge to classify appropriately. Process needs to be accessible, understandable. Civil rights, in a felony car stop, looks weird and scary, might come in as a complaint with someone saying “I know it was police harassment,” and then UODPS’s job is helping folks understand what law enforcement officers do, working with what comes in the door is qualitatively different. Multiple entry points for connecting to complaint process, what is a complaint, what's an inquiry? We need a place that receives all types, fairly comprehensively.
Multiple points need to go to single point of entry. We’re all points of entry in some way, how many people would have triage abilities? We should talk about training out of UODPS for triage type skills. For campus to be a little more active, informed. If faculty and staff know that you send complaints "here" teach them how to do that. With AAEO, OARs mandate that complaints of discrimination are something they have to take, there are some cases where it can be one entry point. What about Collective Bargaining Rights? Does that limit ability? At least three points of entry - Students, HR, and Government relations (for community complaints). These are collection points, not final points of intake. And there are deviations. It would be good to be conscious of that; if AAEO has to investigate and UODPS does too. Collection of information is the first step, and we then go from there. We don’t want folks shopping around. Know what’s been negotiated in contract.

If we have some main points of entry go to one person who classifies complaints; they need to be able to speak to all of these constituencies and very good at explaining the process or answering questions about complaint. Professor guides student to complaint process entry point. It may be like our suicide policy - if you know of someone wanting to commit suicide - documents flow into single point with mental health department on campus. The training of any intake people same with Cleary, sexual assaults, disability complaints, discrimination, essentially model the common structure. We want to avoid the potential intimidation of an officer in uniform being first person you talk to. Some allegations of officer misconduct go through police auditor’s office. IGA with them for how that is processed particularly because citizens will probably go there first.

Question about intake—how much work do you want complainant to do? Would they get to a point but then get shuffled along? The hands-off approach versus "go here" being a more user/customer friendly model. It will be a philosophical decision for the UO to make.

The dept. for parking’s complaint process is online and in person, then they are sent to the parking appeals person. That person collects and investigates, makes a decision (deny, agree, etc.). Then, if complainant chooses, it goes to the parking appeals board. Individual or small group does work of original complaint; appeals board then renders a decision that is final. This is one model of a concept. There could be an outside of dept., independent person/group that is syncing up disparate systems. Perhaps we build on an existing model. There are hundreds of appeals for parking, but officer complaints have been only 4 in the last year. There is a lot more process to investigation, because it is much more involved perhaps it’s almost equal to the amount of work that parking appeals does. Without the auditor process, investigation is done by internally by the dept. We would need someone to staff review board, train other members, etc. I would be expensive to set up auditor process all through the start of the program.

Certain kinds of complaints get processed outside of UODPS itself. We would ask EPD to do investigation if it might be criminal. If we were actually UOPD we could contract with OSP. So there are third party investigations. There is a cost and decision process for sending to third party in some kinds of cases where officers would not to carry that burden.
If you were to have a review board, would they review cases where officer was cleared by outside review? Would you allow review of outside investigations by board? Complainant will not know what kind of discipline was taken. Timing can be a problem because people leave town. The community may be biggest source of complainants, though.

Goals—not going to press for police auditor, iteration of other three. Let’s plan to work through goals that we agree on, and then evaluate. Look at models and we can pull out goals.