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When we last met you asked me to do two things. Write up a quick summary of two models, and also write up a summary of current model within DPS. We’ll take time today for committee writing. We’ll make changes, edits, have a first go at this. Capture your thoughts, strengths and weaknesses

This is a small enough set of goals to be useful. Envision leadership and UODPS keeping these goals in mind as they work in whatever oversight model is implemented. Are there any questions? Are the goals listed captured correctly?

If we go with something that includes an appeals board, it will feel a little more than advisory. Let’s revisit the word advisory. “Advisory” may be redundant? But it successfully captures what we’re getting at. Are we missing a core element? Make a separate bullet legal, labor, and risk not with “best practices.”

Is that a goal or description of content? It could be a goal. Trust should be in there at some point.
In intro, “oversight should employ best practices to meet these goals:” Not the word “quick” but “responsive” works.

There should be a reporting piece that is released publicly. It’s not really a goal. Could be transparent.
Concerning the word “advisory,” this body would exist to council public safety and leadership. They have no authority beyond council. Build value into the system, recommendations are sound, balanced, useful.
If we select the police review board, that doesn’t feel like an advisory system, but more active. Maybe we come back to that word after selecting a model. Advisory not supervisory, keeps system in line for functioning properly, not overstepping bounds.

What does reflect cultural diversity mean? The broader goal of an oversight system is being responsive to the entire campus. We said “respond to the unique community and respond to the culturally diverse nature of the campus.”

Go on to first model: Commission with Appeals Board. A true hybrid model, a police commission gets at recommendations, but has no mechanism to address complaints.
What authority would an appeals board have? It’s an executive setting, would an officer be there? There’s a lot more depth and process in setting up an appeals board. There could be a system with an appeals board in the larger campus with a police commission member on the board. Want more information on commission.

It may be a good idea to start relatively modestly and have room to evolve. Perhaps a police commission without an appeals board would work. The commission doesn’t respond to complaints but takes it as “good to know.” With the low number of complaints each year, we don’t want to build some palace, expensive to maintain; only used a few times a year.

Explanation of City of Eugene process flow chart: We should create the same type of flow chart of where key decision making points are. For complainant, it doesn’t work to not be able to vent in some place. Sometimes they’re happy sometimes they’re not. Big issues 80% not satisfied, smaller 25%. When everyone involved has calmed down, seen the perspectives of both sides, the main point is that there are a lot of key decision making points.

Somebody’s unhappy with an officer’s conduct, that individual doesn’t say what happened; we don’t share specifics of disciplines. Individual doesn’t know what happened, would receive a letter stating it as sustained, un-sustained, or unfounded.

Need to be aware of how other laws and rules (e.g., NCAA, public records law, etc.) would impact oversight work.

There is a demand on campus to have a place to discuss arming of officers, whether it’s commission model or current campus advisory group. There’s a given there about having a robust policy advising part.

We need a place where people with negative experiences can go. When I see the term appeals board, I think it reviews decisions made, has authority to change actions. It doesn’t have authority to review internal decisions. That is covered in “incorporate legal, labor, and RM policies.”

Are they responding to chief by hearing appeal/complaint and discussing with chief or president? If they’re dissatisfied, they have the right to go to the citizen review board. This happens rarely. It works if you have a process where someone says you have to do this to. You have to have a place to put it to bed. There’s a question of whether or not the chief should reopen a case. Got to have somewhere or someplace to tell complainant what happened; yes we agree, however we’ll look for ways to improve policy.
Although you lay out why the decision couldn’t be flipped, but did review case. City of Eugene review board makes decisions that night, things don’t linger. You need a system of value, being more robust on how to deal with people who don’t speak English. Lingering loses people’s faith in system.

We’re trying to make the commission a bit of everything, when it normally can’t be. If you’re going to turn a commission into an all come type of body, think about officers. There can be an incident review; we did it anyway at the city. Want a place where people can vent.

We have to have a place for people to go, do we want a commission that does policy oversight? There should be two. It validates their more specific purposes.

We need to find out results of investigation before making any decisions by the review board. Prevent outlandish claims in public. The pat down was inappropriate, what’s your policy? One thing, we may lose sense of scalability, really building a lot of process. Not a lot of history of complaints or incidents at UO. Caution against 1 to 1 relationship with city’s situation. Be careful about overbuilding this, worry about magnitude of this system.