Provide a chart of city’s process; UODPS is working on current chart of process. Let’s work through this version today, checking for content, clarity, and then go from there. Does this police commission body have adjudicative authority? This body means the model is finally implemented.

Is the police commission a group that works on policies or one that works ad hoc on complaints? It would be good to bifurcate those two models more clearly.

What would an appeals board actually do? I’d like to see complaints resolved within the department reviewing complaint decisions and policy issues are more important for the police commission. Policy concerns are not currently heard in relation to UODPS.

Is there a way of inserting an appeals board if person doesn’t like decision? At some level, wherever that component is inserted, it needs to be defined. An appeals board is not a good idea in the police commission. It’d have to be an adjunct.

Perhaps in an effort to earn the public’s trust, an hour once a month could be used to hear complaints. May be concerns if the complaint process was completely internal.

At the city, someone’s conduct is normally what generated a policy discussion. They would look at complaints from higher up to prevent it from happening again. There is a give and take on public trust and transparency. Neither model gives you everything you want. The city blended, but it’s too complex for UO community.

We want this to be about learning, improving policies, and a place to give voice to community as this new department is created. The UO community might not be interested in some people’s small complaints. Major ones can be looked at though.

What’s problematic is when you enter into a complaint; you can get into personnel action, bounded by confidentially. Police are just like any other staff on campus. Personnel action is not a public grieving process. People are then sometimes dissatisfied with decisions because they can’t know what happened.

A police commission can deal with changing policy for better, and that may stem out of a person’s direct experience.
It can form a perspective for future performance and clarify what happened to dispel rumors and move forward with changes or recommendations.

Positive learning can be built in operationally but is not required by legislation, which is what we’re working on now.

It would be good to look at complaints of previous years to decide what model to use. With a commission could we get a place to look at complaints and their statistics? Answer questions like “are folks feeling represented, heard, etc.”

What are current student resources for making complaints? There is the Office of Student Advocacy, which deals with issues institutionally and Legal Services which deals mainly with possible criminal, landlord issues. OSA could be an access point; they currently field that gap of students not really understanding the university system.

Nowhere does is say be “representative” on the first page. Add to 4th bullet? That works. The culture of UO campus is variable, but being representative is a good way of putting what we’re trying to accomplish.

What about mediation? That has evolved in the City of Eugene. Mediation is where it gets closed, even if it doesn’t work. The process EPD uses has been successful. Once both parties agree on something facilitated by a trained administrator, it doesn’t go on file. Now we’ve noticed staff members have even tried to solve something before it reaches that point. So when people can explain their side, it’s very educational. You just have to create a coordination process.

Normally a student is in defense of what they’ve done instead of a complaint against an officer. Mediation could free up other complaint processes; it would be internal. Maybe the commission requests UODPS to implement a mediation process. The decision point would be about orchestrating the process. This would be a separate recommendation outside of these models being proposed for oversight. Not relevant? It is relevant to the process of receiving complaints, the process overall?

With complaints, you have to decide what a decision for a court to make is and what an administrative decision is. Mediation is both voluntary and binding. Good examples for administrative issues are stops, contact where the person ended up not breaking the law. Should we have a section where we recommend a mediation process? More information is better.
Appropriate dispute resolution. The term of art, it describes the layered process. The opening paragraph could talk about any oversight system should promote alternate dispute resolution processes. Ease of access, empowerment, and resolution, provides learning for officer, dept, and community.

We need to ensure appropriate technologies to record contacts. They can rectify complaints very effectively. This speaks to values of agency, setting tone early that we have commitment to capturing the interactions. It is very transparent. It is also about tracking methodologies for employees and their track record.

It could be a part of Week of Welcome to let people know what to do in case of needing to make a complaint. Interactions can be very different. The approach should be warm and welcoming when freshmen arrive.

Larger policy discussions would be really good. Good to clarify in larger group what is our policy. Good Samaritan policies. What is good practice elsewhere? Focus on the learning environment. Good to include commendations, inquiries in discussions. Point out when responses have been handled great.

One needs to assess equally accountability and trust. Trust police, but community needs to be accountable. Mutual respect and trust between community and officers. Officers should feel that community supports their action, don’t over-cloud their involvement with the things community doesn’t understand or doesn’t like.

Giving commendations is a piece that could be very important. There is a greater detachment on campus of “things don’t happen here,” when really they do. There are always two sides to the story, and a lot of times a misinterpretation of facts. Officers need to be supported by system that is fair and equal. You never want to turn and outstanding employee into a disgruntled employee. People can redeem themselves. People make mistakes, get it, make adjustments, and become stellar or move forward. It’s important to accept responsibility, move forward. Don’t want a disregard mentality. This is not a system of retribution, but a community of learning. We want officers to be honest and have them take appropriate action towards mistakes.

This is a collaboration centered model, so the focus of the complaint process is cooperation. There is an invested interest in the community. UODPS could bring to the commission issues they are worried about. You don’t want to be in a contentious position against the people you
serve. We cannot improve relationship with community in an adversarial environment. Some might not want to be collaborative but much more anonymous.

The campus has its seasons. Stress in people’s lives changes. Cultural shift to One Oregon, thinking holistically “let me check” before giving misinformation. Perhaps there could be an office in the EMU where UODPS can give general information and be the face of UODPS. We’re beyond previous behavior, and oversight model means it’s over and we’re committed to being accountable.

Capture sense of the group. What mechanics would be from complaint intake to complaint resolutions? We’re only reporting on the pros and cons of different models. Policy review—at what level does commission review so as to not waste everyone’s time? SCAC- appointed members, formalization, and better input.