

COMMUNITY POLICE OVERSIGHT BOARD
DALLAS CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AGENDA

Public Notice

RECEIVED

210663

2021 AUG -6 PM 3:34

TUESDAY, August 10, 2021
VIRTUAL MEETING VIA WEBEX
5:30 P.M. – 8:30 P.M.
VIRTUAL MEETING

POSTED CITY SECRETARY
DALLAS, TX

CITY SECRETARY
DALLAS, TEXAS

The Community Police Oversight Board meeting will be held by videoconference. The meeting will be broadcast live on Spectrum Cable Channel 95 and online at bit.ly/cityofdallastv.

The public may also listen to the meeting as an attendee at the following videoconference link:

<https://dallascityhall.webex.com/dallascityhall/onstage/g.php?MTID=ea204b44896d5e1a389a9babf0674d9f>

Access Code: cpob2021

AUDIO PHONE CONFERENCE LINE:

Event line: 408-418-9388 | **Access Code:** 146 985 3955

CALL TO ORDER

PUBLIC COMMENT/OPEN MICROPHONE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of the June 8, 2021 Minutes [Board Chairman Enobakhare, Jr.]

Attachment: Minutes

ACTION ITEMS

2.
 - a. Karesha Daniels Complaint Review & Decision Regarding Additional Investigation by OCPO [OCPO Special Investigator Williams and Board Chairman Enobakhare, Jr.]

Attachment: Case Summary Memo

BRIEFING ITEMS

3.
 - a. Report on CPOB Chair & OCPO Director Monthly Meeting with the DPD Chief of Police Eddie Garcia [Board Chairman, Enobakhare, Jr. & OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

A quorum of the City Council may attend this board meeting.

- b. Update RIGHT NOW series [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

- c. Update on Complaint Data Including Council District [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

- d. Update on Review of DPD Protest Policies [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

- e. Update CPOB Membership with National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

- f. OCPO Work Anniversaries & Staffing [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo

- 4. Monthly Activity Report [OCPO Complaint Intake Specialist Woods]

Attachments: Monthly Activity Report Memos
OCPO June and July Complaint Summaries
Monthly Activity Charts

- 5. Board Training: *“The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight: Key Principles and Practices for Effectiveness and Sustainability”*, NACOLE Report [OCPO Director McClary]

Attachment: Memo & Executive Summary of Report

- 6. Board Training Schedule [Board Chairman Enobakhare, Jr.]

Attachment: Memo

- 7. Board Member Update on Scheduling Town Hall Meetings [All]

Attachments: Memo

UPCOMING MEETING

8. September 14, 2021

Attachments: Schedule

PUBLIC COMMENT/OPEN MICROPHONE

ADJOURN

A closed executive session may be held if the discussion of any of the above agenda items concerns one of the following:

1. seeking the advice of its attorney about pending or contemplated litigation, settlement offers, or any matter in which the duty of the attorney to the City Council under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of Texas clearly conflicts with the Texas Open Meetings Act. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.071]
2. deliberating the purchase, exchange, lease, or value of real property if deliberation in an open meeting would have a detrimental effect on the position of the city in negotiations with a third person. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.072]
3. deliberating a negotiated contract for a prospective gift or donation to the city if deliberation in an open meeting would have a detrimental effect on the position of the city in negotiations with a third person. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.073]
4. deliberating the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of a public officer or employee; or to hear a complaint or charge against an officer or employee unless the officer or employee who is the subject of the deliberation or hearing requests a public hearing. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.074]
5. deliberating the deployment, or specific occasions for implementation, of security personnel or devices. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.076]
6. discussing or deliberating commercial or financial information that the city has received from a business prospect that the city seeks to have locate, stay or expand in or near the city and with which the city is conducting economic development negotiations; or deliberating the offer of a financial or other incentive to a business prospect. [Tex Govt. Code §551.087]
7. deliberating security assessments or deployments relating to information resources technology, network security information, or the deployment or specific occasions for implementations of security personnel, critical infrastructure, or security devices. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.089]

HANDGUN PROHIBITION NOTICE FOR MEETING OF GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES

"Pursuant to Section 30.06, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with a concealed handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a concealed handgun."

"De acuerdo con la sección 30.06 del código penal (ingreso sin autorización de un titular de una licencia con una pistola oculta), una persona con licencia según el subcapítulo h, capítulo 411, código del gobierno (ley sobre licencias para portar pistolas), no puede ingresar a esta propiedad con una pistola oculta."

"Pursuant to Section 30.07, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with an openly carried handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a handgun that is carried openly."

"De acuerdo con la sección 30.07 del código penal (ingreso sin autorización de un titular de una licencia con una pistola a la vista), una persona con licencia según el subcapítulo h, capítulo 411, código del gobierno (ley sobre licencias para portar pistolas), no puede ingresar a esta propiedad con una pistola a la vista."

Community Police Oversight Board

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item 1

The Community Police Oversight Board meetings are recorded. Agenda materials and recordings may be reviewed/copied by contacting the Board Coordinator at 214-671-8283.

Meeting Date: June 08, 2021

Convened: 5:53 p.m.

Adjourned: 9:50 p.m.

Board Member(s) Present:

Jesuorobo Enobakhare, Jr., **Chair** – District 3
Jose Rivas, **Vice Chair** – District 7
Ozzie Smith – District 1
Jonathan E Maples – District 2
Loren Gilbert- Smith – District 4
Kristian Hernandez – District 6
Ronald Wright – District 8
Tami Brown Rodriquez – District 9
Ezekiel Tyson – District 10
Ejike E. Okpa, II – District 11
Deatra Wadsworth – District 12
David Kitner – District 13
Alan Marshall – District 14
Juan Olivo – District 15

Board Member(s) Absent:

Andre Turner – District 5

Staff Present:

Kanesia Williams, City Attorney's Office
Tonya McClary, Police Monitor OCPO
Kevin Williams, Special Investigator OCPO
Taylor Woods, Interim CPOB Coordinator/ Complaint Intake Specialist OCPO

AGENDA:

Call to Order: 5:53 p.m.

Public Comment/ Open Microphone

Public comments were received by two speakers.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes for May 11, 2021 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the May 11, 2021 Community Police Oversight Board meeting.

Motion made by Deatra Wadsworth
Item passed unanimously: X
Item failed unanimously:

Motion seconded by David Kitner
Item passed on a divided vote:
Item failed on a divided vote:

2. Action Items

a. Michael Fowler Complaint Review & Discussion Regarding Additional Investigation by OCPO

Special Investigator Kevin Williams briefed the Board on Michael Fowler's request for a review of his complaint. The Board asked questions and had a discussion on that matter. The Board took a vote to see if it wanted OCPO to do an independent investigation of Mr. Fowler's complaint.

A motion was made to do an independent investigation on the use of force used against Michael Fowler.

Motion made by Loren Gilbert Smith
Item passed unanimously:
Item failed unanimously:

Motion seconded by Kristen Hernandez
Item passed on a divided vote: X
Item failed on a divided vote:

b. Darren Reynolds Complaint Review & Discussion Regarding Additional Investigation by OCPO

Special Investigator Kevin Williams briefed the Board on Darren Reynolds's request for a review of his complaint. The Board asked questions and had a discussion on the matter. The Board took a vote to see if it wanted OCPO to do an independent investigation of Mr. Reynolds's complaint.

A motion was made to do an independent investigation on the use of force used against Darren Reynolds.

Motion made by Alan Marshall
Item passed unanimously:
Item failed unanimously:

Motion seconded by Ezekiel Tyson
Item passed on a divided vote: X
Item failed on a divided vote:

3. Briefing Items

CPOB Chair & OCPO Director Monthly Meeting with the DPD Chief of Police Eddie Garcia

- a.** Director McClary and Board Chair Enobakhare met with Chief Garcia to discuss more ways the Department could collaborate regarding how they want to handle some of the complaint reviews going forward. Chief Garcia also discussed the importance of the Board.

Update RIGHT NOW! Series

- b.** Chairman Enobakhare and OCPO Director McClary alerted the Board that OCPO will be launching a series of quarterly events to compliment the townhalls and listening sessions that each CPOB member is conducting. Community members will be able to break out into sessions to craft recommendations that the community would like to see regarding policing in Dallas.

4. Monthly Activity Report

Complaint Intake Specialist Woods gave updates on complaints and inquiries received by OCPO for the Month of May. There were 71 complaints and inquiries received for the month. 30 where actual complaints and 41 where inquiries and only 4 complaints were disagreed on by OCPO Director McClary.

5. Board Training: Community Police Engagement: “Improved Outcomes in Racially Charged Police Encounters – Making the case for Decision Based Training”.

OCPO Director McClary lead a discussion on an article from the International Association of Chief of Police. The Board gave feedback and asked questions.

6. Board Training Schedule

There were 2 trainings for the month:

June 8th = OCPO Board Training: Community Police Engagement: “Improved Outcomes in Racially Charged Police Encounters – Making the Case for Decision-Based Training”.

June 9th = NACOLE: Role of the First Line Supervisor in Facilitating Change in Law Enforcement Organizations.

7. Board Members Update on Scheduling Town Hall Meetings

Ozzie Smith Dist. 1 – Nothing to report

Jonathan Maples Dist. 2 – Nothing to report

Jesurobo Enobakhare Dist. 3 –Town Hall scheduled for July 27, 2021

Loren Gilbert Smith Dist. 4 – Nothing to report

Andre Turner Dist. 5 – Absent

Kristian Hernandez Dist. 6 – Nothing to report

Jose Rivas Dist. 7 – Nothing to report

Rev. Wright Dist. 8 - Nothing to report

Tami Brown Rodriguez Dist. 9 – Updated the Board on how joint Town Hall meeting with Districts 13 & 14 went on June 1, 2021

Ezekiel Tyson Dist. 10 – Town Hall Scheduled on June 22, 2021

Ejike E. Okpa Dist. 11 – Nothing to report

Deatra Wadsworth Dist. 12 – Nothing to report

David Kitner Dist. 13 – Updated the Board on how joint Town Hall meeting with Districts 9 & 14 went on June 1, 2021

Alan Marshall Dist. 14 – Updated the Board on how joint Town Hall meeting with Districts 9 & 13 went on June 1, 2021

Juan Olivo Dist. 15 – Nothing to report

8. Upcoming CPOB Meeting

August 10, 2021 at 5:30p.m.

Public Comment/ Open Microphone

There were no closing public comments.

Motion to Adjourn:

Motion made by Alan Marshall
Item passed unanimously: X
Item failed unanimously:

Motion seconded by Loren Gilbert Smith
Item passed on a divided vote:
Item failed on a divided vote:

Adjourn: 9:50 PM

APPROVED BY:

ATTEST:

Chairman Jesuorobo Enobakhare
Community Police Oversight Board Chairman

Taylor Woods
Interim Community Police
Oversight Board Liaison

Memorandum Item 3A



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE **August 10, 2021**

TO **Members of the Community Police Oversight Board**

SUBJECT **CPOB & OCPO Monthly Meeting with DPD Police Chief**

Every month CPOB Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. and OCPO Director McClary meet with DPD Police Chief Eddie Garcia.

Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. will inform CPOB members what was discussed at the July 13, 2021 and August 10, 2021 meetings.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum Item 3B



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE: August 10, 2021

TO: Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT: Update RIGHT NOW! Series

OCPO will be launching a series of events to compliment the town halls & listening sessions that each CPOB member is conducting.

The first two events will happen on August 18th at 7:00p.m. and August 24th at 7:00p.m. These listening sessions will focus on the City of Dallas FY22 budget. OCPO is interested in learning what the Dallas community thinks about the public safety budget, specifically regarding policing.

The listening sessions will be co-facilitated by CPOB Chairman Jesuorobo Enobakhare, Jr. Together Director McClary and Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. will bring back what they learn from the Dallas community to City leaders and the CPOB.

It is the hope that these listening sessions will not only reveal concerns from the community but also ideas about how the community would like to see their money spent on policing issues. The desire for all the RIGHT NOW! sessions is to bring new and innovative ideas to City leaders, DPD, community partners and other stakeholders to improve policing in Dallas. Another key goal is to ensure that Dallas is a city that not only embraces 21st century policing ideals but is actually engaged in 21st century policing.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum Item 3C



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT Update on Complaint Data Including Council District

At the June 8th CPOB meeting, Board member Okpa, II asked if the monthly complaint statistics that OCPO provides the Board could include information about the council district where the incident regarding the complaint took place.

OCPO Director told the Board that she would find out if that was possible and report back to the Board at the August 10, 2021 meeting.

During his July monthly meeting with Chief Garcia, Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. made a formal request of the Chief to include council district data with complaint information. During that meeting Chief Garcia told Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. that he would work with his department to see if providing that information was possible.

Director McClary followed up with this request and met with IAD staff to understand if and how this information could be provided to the CPOB and OCPO. It was a fruitful conversation.

Director McClary asked if IAD could put the status of the request in memo form so it can be shared with the Board. That memo is attached.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum



DATE: August 3, 2021

TO: Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT: Complaints to include council district data

The IAPro software does not track any incident type by council district, nor does it have the capability to track any incident type by geographical area. Currently the Department is working with CI-Technologies (IAPro) to complete an upgrade which will allow geographic tracking capability. After the upgrade, IAPro software will still not have the capability to track an incident type by council district.

Upon conclusion of the software upgrade, Internal Affairs personnel will contact CI-Technologies and request that IAPro software be modified to include the tracking of incident types by council district. It is not known if CI-Technologies will be able to fulfil this request, or what cost would be incurred. The request to CI-Technologies will be made in a timely manner after determining the upgrade process to the Department's IAPro software was successfully implemented.

Please contact me if you have any questions.



Irene Alanis
Major of Police
Internal Affairs Division
Office of the Chief of Police

Memorandum Item 3D



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT Update on Review of DPD Protest Policies

OCPO Director McClary was tasked with reviewing DPD's Protest Policies by the CPOB. It was her desire to complete that project by the August 10, 2021 CPOB meeting. However, Director McClary needs more time.

This summer OCPO had its first law student working with the office, Joshua Brown who is a 2L from UNT School of Law. Working with Joshua, Director McClary, was able to make significant progress on the review. However, there is still more work to be done. Below are the steps that have been taken so far and next steps to complete the project:

1. There was a review of what OCPO could identify as the full scope of DPD's Protest policies. In doing the review, OCPO learned that some of the policies are contained in SOPs for various departments and could also possibly be in sections that may not be obviously related to protest and/or crowd control. Director McClary has requested that DPD provide her with the full scope of DPD protest policies.
2. OCPO also did another review of the DPD After Action report that was submitted to City Council following the 100 days of protests that took place in 2020. During its second review of the report, OCPO identified at least 7 areas that it needs to follow-up on with DPD.

For example:

As of September 8, 2020, the Dallas Police Department was still short 500 body worn cameras. This was to be remedied by the end of that year. Additionally, all 1,500 Axon Body 2 cameras are to be swapped with the new and improved Axon Body 3 cameras—these give officers less discretion regarding activation functionality in critical situations. (9/8/20 Community Police Oversight Board Meeting at 2:55:15).

Director McClary needs to find out from DPD if the 500 cameras were purchased by the end of 2020. If not, Director McClary wants to know what the plan is to get the additional cameras. Also, what is the plan and timeline for switching out the 1,500 Axon Body 2 cameras for the Axon Body 3 cameras.

Director McClary recognizes that the reforms in the After Action Report were developed under the previous administration of Chief Renee Hall, however, she wants to understand what Chief Garcia's desires are regarding the recommended changes.

3. Director McClary also conducted research on 6 police departments across the country to compare them to what DPD currently has regarding protest. The goal is to compare and contrast with other police departments to see if there are changes and/or additions Director McClary would like to make to DPD regarding its protest policies. The cities were chosen for significance in the world of policing, size of the department and/or because of the department's reputation for 21st century policing practices. Director McClary would like to expand the list to a few more cities to make sure she is getting an even more diverse pool of experience from various police departments across the country. The police departments studies so far are listed below:

- Minneapolis Police Department
- New York Police Department
- Chicago Police Department
- Houston Police Department
- San Jose Police Department
- Los Angeles Police Department

4. Director McClary also conducted research into some of the common reasons why officers use force to see how that potentially impacts crowd control. Two those areas are:
 - Mental health crisis
 - Excited delirium

Director McClary also thinks that it is important to interview key staff of DPD that are in charge of implementing protest like the Mobile Field Unit. Hearing from officers in the field will be invaluable to making the protest policies come alive and illuminate what is on the pages of the DPD General Orders. It is also important for Director McClary to see training on crowd control and other tactics that DPD uses to handle protests. During the next phase of this project Director McClary will work with DPD to explore these possibilities.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum Item 3E



DATE August 10, 2021

CITY OF DALLAS

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT Update CPOB Membership with National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE)

In June 2021, the CPOB became an official member of the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE). OCPO paid for a two-year organizational membership for the Board. **The membership is valid through June 30, 2023.**

Board members will now be added to the NACOLE List Serve which has lots of information regarding law enforcement oversight across the country. Currently Director McClary forwards messages from the list serve to Board members.

Board members will now be able to directly take advantage of programs on the web and in this region without the assistance of OCPO staff. Board members are also entitled to membership discounts on various educational programs and the NACOLE Annual Conference.

The CPOB will now be able to vote at the NACOLE Annual Meeting on various issues including the election of the NACOLE Board members. This also allows members of the CPOB to serve on NACOLE committees. The designated voting member of the board can also run for the Board of Directors of NACOLE.

Director McClary has listed CPOB Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. as the designated voting member for the CPOB. This means that he or his designee can vote at the NACOLE Annual Meeting.

Attached are the following items:

1. Welcome letter from NACOLE
2. Copy of the Certificate of Membership (This will be kept on file at the OCPO office)
3. Current Bylaws for NACOLE (09-25-2019)

Director McClary encourages CPOB members to check out the NACOLE website at www.nacole.org to explore everything the organization has to offer.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager



July 8, 2021

Ms. Tonya McClary
Community Police Oversight Board
1500 Marilla St., 5CS
Dallas, TX 75201

Dear Ms. McClary:

Welcome to the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement! You are now a member of the only organization representing civilian oversight practitioners, volunteers, policy makers and scholars in the United States. Our primary mission is to advance and support civilian oversight throughout the United States as a vital part of increased government accountability and transparency. Your membership and contributions make it possible for NACOLE to continue its work in training, scholarship, and outreach, and is valid through June 30, 2023.

Enclosed is a copy of your membership certificate and a copy of our current by-laws. I encourage you to visit our website at www.nacole.org to view additional information on upcoming events. Registration for our 2021 Annual Conferences – both virtual and in-person – is open and we have other scheduled training events to continue providing our members with ongoing education and resources.

Please watch for invitations to many exciting programs offered on the web and in your region. These activities allow you to network with members, non-members, and other professionals with similar knowledge and expertise. On behalf of the NACOLE Board of Directors, I invite you to participate in these activities and to share your skills.

Among our ranks are individuals with considerable experience in meeting the challenges of oversight. You may simply need to talk with someone one-on-one to address staffing challenges, or policy and training issues. Our membership consists of a wide-range of policy analysts, investigators, administrators, mediators and oversight and hearing review board members. They come from large, complex organizations as well as one-person shops and they all have gained insight through experience and by utilizing the training and support services of NACOLE.

Our history is full of great leaders and pioneers in oversight and we invite new members to participate actively — including in a leadership capacity. Visit our website or feel free to contact me to find out more about leadership opportunities and how you can make our organization more dynamic and vigorous. Additionally, be sure to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn and sign up for our listserv, which shares oversight news from around the United States and world.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if there are questions that I may answer about the organization. I can be reached at (317) 721-8133 during the day or by e-mailing me at staff@nacole.org. Additionally, please feel free to contact the co-chairs of our Membership Development and Engagement Committee: Ms. Nicolle Barton and Mr. Willie Bell at info@nacole.org.

We look forward to meeting you in person or virtually and working with you in the days and years to come.

Warm regards,



Karen U. Williams
Staff Assistant
NACOLE



Certificate of Membership

2021-23

*Community Police Oversight Board
Dallas, Texas*

Is an Organizational Member of the

*National Association for Civilian
Oversight of Law Enforcement*

Susan Hutson
President

Florence Finkle
Secretary

**BYLAWS OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
(NACOLE)
(09-25-2019)**

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of this corporation shall be the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. It is established as a voluntary, tax-exempt, non-profit professional association formed under the sponsorship of interested persons for the purpose of advancing the cause of civilian oversight.

ARTICLE II – PURPOSES

Mission

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law's mission is to create a community of support for independent, civilian oversight entities that seek to make local law enforcement agencies transparent, accountable, and responsible to the communities they serve, and to encourage full racial, ethnic, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, religious, and national origin representation and participation in this organization and the agencies overseen by its members.

[Revised on 9/25/2019 at the Annual Meeting in Detroit, MI to be consistent with NACOLE's Mission, Vision, Goals, and Values statement]

Notwithstanding any other provision of these articles, the corporation shall not carry on any other activities not permitted to be carried on by a corporation exempt from U.S. Federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or corresponding provisions of any future United States of America Internal Revenue Laws.

ARTICLE III - OFFICES

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement is incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland. The Board of Directors shall determine the principal office location and mailing address.

ARTICLE IV - MEMBERSHIP

Membership in NACOLE is subject to individuals meeting the qualifications as described in ARTICLE IV, Section A. Members shall be divided into three categories.

A. Categories of Membership

1. Regular members are defined as those persons:

- Who are not sworn law enforcement officers;
- Who work for or constitute agencies which are established by legislative or executive authority to investigate and/or review issues and complaints against law enforcement; and/or
- Who have worked for and/or have constituted agencies, which are established by legislative or executive authority to investigate and/or review complaints against law enforcement.
- Who are mayors, county or municipal managers or who otherwise hold an executive position or are on a board, council, commission or committee with authority to direct, control, and/or oversee the activities and/or performance of the chief law enforcement officer of a political subdivision.

2. Associate members are defined as any persons interested in the oversight of law enforcement. Associate members shall be able to participate in all Association activities including serving on committees, but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers or members of the Board of Directors.

3. Organizational members are defined as agencies or boards who provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. These agencies or boards will receive one transferable regular (voting) membership. All agency or board affiliate members are eligible to serve on committees, however election or appointment to the Board of Directors shall be limited to the designated voting member of the agency or board. Cities or other political subdivisions may obtain one organizational membership to cover all of the entities within it, which meet the requirements for regular membership.

[Revised 9/25/07 at the Annual Meeting in San Jose, CA to authorize non-U.S. agencies to become organizational voting members]

[The intent of the Bylaws is to authorize only one person per voting membership (organizational) to be elected to and serve on the Board of Directors at the same time. Interpretation approved by the Board 10/8/08.]

[Revised 11/1/09 at the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX to clarify that no more than one person within an agency holding an organizational membership is eligible for appointment/election to the Board and further than any such elected/appointed member must be the organizations designated voter.]

4. Life membership shall be granted to:

- (a) The Founding Members of NACOLE;
- (b) Past Presidents after having honorably completed their full term of office;

- (c) To any individual who has retained active regular membership for 20 continuous years or who has 20 continuous years of service with an agency or board that has held continuous Organization membership during that person's tenure; and
- (d) To any individual who retires from police oversight activities and at the time of retirement has retained active regular membership for 10 continuous years or who retired from police oversight activities and at the time of retirement has 10 continuous years of service with an agency or board that has held continuous Organizational membership during that person's tenure.

[Revised on 9/25/07 at the Annual Meeting in San Jose, CA by adding language to provide for life memberships.]

[This section is interpreted to authorize the granting of Life Memberships to individuals who retire after completing ten or more years of service with an entity holding a continuous NACOLE Organizational Membership during that person's tenure. Interpretation approved by the Board 12/12/07.]

[New language added at the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX, 11/1/09 to clarify the criteria for the awarding of Life Memberships consistent with the above interpretation.]

[Life members shall be entitled to vote as a Life member and in addition, in cases where the Life Member has been identified as an Organizational Designated Voter, the Life member shall be entitled to also vote in that capacity. Interpretation approved by the Board 9/19/10]

- 5. Student members are defined as individuals currently enrolled either full or part-time in a college or university program in the area of criminology, criminal justice, law, sociology, political science, public administration, journalism, or a related field and who are interested in the oversight of law enforcement. Student members shall be able to participate in all Association activities including serving on committees, but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers or members of the Board of Directors.

[Revised on 9/22/10 at the Annual Meeting in Seattle WA, 9/22/10 to provide for student memberships]

B. Dues

All categories of members shall be required to pay the dues set for that level of membership in order to retain that membership. The Board of Directors shall establish annual membership dues for the period July 1 – June 30 for all membership categories.

[Revised on 11/1/09 at the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX to establish a specific membership period.]

C. Termination of Membership

A member may resign their membership at any time by submitting their resignation in writing to the President or the Secretary of this Association. A member who has not paid his/her dues by September 1 each year shall be dropped from the membership roster. Notice of this provision shall be included in dues notices/invoices, which shall be mailed or emailed to the last known postal service or email address of delinquent members at least 30 days prior to terminating membership.

[Revised on 11/1/09 at the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX to clarify procedure for terminating membership for non-payment of dues.]

D. Voting

Only regular members according to ARTICLE IV, Section A, are eligible to vote on Association business.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS

The officers of the Association shall be an elected President, Vice President, and an appointed Secretary and Treasurer. Only regular members in accordance with Article IV, Section A who have been a member in good standing for one (1) year and have attended at least one (1) of the two previous national conferences shall be eligible for election or appointment as officers of the Association. Members standing for election as President shall have been elected as members of the Board of Directors and shall have served in that capacity for no less than two (2) years. Members standing for election as Vice-President shall have been elected as members of the Board of Directors and shall have served in that capacity for no less than one (1) year. Their duties shall be:

[Revised 10/3/18 at the Annual meeting in St. Petersburg, FL to provide continuity in leadership and experience with the Organization by requiring service on the Board of Directors of no less than two years to be eligible for election as President and no less than one year to be eligible for election as Vice-President.]

A. President

The President shall be elected to the position by a vote of association members at the annual conference and shall serve for a term of two years. The President shall not be eligible to be elected to a consecutive term as President. The President shall be the presiding officer of the Association and an ex-officio member of all committees; shall be available to consult with the members on Association matters between meetings; shall appoint committees from time to time; and shall generally represent

the interests of the Association with related associations, agencies, and organizations.

[Revised 9/14/11 at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans LA by adding language to provide that the President shall be eligible for reelection; however may be elected to serve for no more than three consecutive terms as President.]

[Revised 10/3/18 at the Annual meeting in St. Petersburg, FL to provide that the President shall be elected for a two-year term and shall not be eligible for re-election as President; however, shall be eligible to be elected to the Board of Directors unless prohibited by Article VI, Section C.]

B. Vice-President

The Vice-President shall be elected to the position by a vote of association members at the annual conference and shall serve for a term of two (2) years. The Vice-President shall be eligible for reelection. The duties of the Vice-President shall be to learn the duties and activities of the presidency and functions of the Association, to fulfill the duties of the President in the event of the President's absence or disability and to undertake any duties assigned to him/her by the President.

[Revised 9/14/11 at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, LA to change the title of President-Elect to Vice-President and to provide that the Vice-President shall be eligible for reelection.]

[Revised 10/3/18 at the Annual meeting in St. Petersburg, FL to provide for a lengthier two-year term for the Vice-President and allow for reelection without limitation unless prohibited by Article VI, Section C.]

C. Secretary

The Secretary shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Board of Directors on an annual basis. The Secretary shall be responsible for the minutes of meetings of the Association and its Board of Directors as well as all non-fiscal records of the Association.

D. Treasurer

The Treasurer shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Board of Directors on an annual basis. The Treasurer shall be responsible for the assets, funds, and fiscal records of the Association.

E. Removal

The Board may, by a two-thirds (2/3) vote (8 members) remove the President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer for cause. Prior to any such removal, at least three members of the Board shall have filed a request in writing that the President or when the proceedings involve the President, the Vice President, schedule such action at a regular or special Board meeting. The President or when the proceedings involve the President, the Vice President may at his or her discretion, approve or reject the request. If the President or the Vice President approves the request, the person subject to removal shall be notified and shall be provided an opportunity to address the Board prior to the vote. Any individual removed from the position of President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer in accordance with the provisions herein, may continue as a Board member, unless otherwise removed in accordance with Article VI. Any such removal as authorized herein shall be reported in writing to the membership within 30 days.

[Revised on 9/25/07 at the Annual Meeting in San Jose, CA to provide a procedure for the removal of officers.]

ARTICLE VI - BOARD OF DIRECTORS

A. Powers

Management of the Association shall be vested in the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall be and is hereby fully authorized to execute all powers of the Association and its property; to establish rules and regulations proper or necessary for the transaction of the business of the Association; and to establish objectives and determine policies with relation to Association needs.

The Board of Directors may delegate to any person or committee any of the powers and duties herein granted them as a Board of Directors. In making such appointments and delegating such authority, the Board of Directors does not abrogate its responsibilities or duties as set forth in these by-laws.

B. Composition

The Board of Directors shall consist of the following members:

1. President
2. Vice-President
3. Eight Members at Large (including the Secretary and Treasurer who are appointed by the Board).
4. Immediate Past President

C. Term of Office—And Eligibility

Only regular members in accordance with Article IV, Section A who have been a member in good standing for one (1) year, whose NACOLE dues are fully paid at the time that he/she filed a declaration of intent to stand for election or appointment and who have attended at least one (1) of the two previous national conferences shall be eligible for election or appointment as Members of the Board of Directors of the Association.

[Language added at the Annual Meeting in Austin, TX, 11/1/09 to clarify that dues must be fully paid at the time of filing a declaration of intent to seek election or indicating an interest in appointment to the Board of Directors.]

Officers and members of the Board of Directors shall be elected by the voting membership at the annual meeting according to the procedures as described in Article VII of these by-laws with the commencement of the term of office to take place during the annual conference. Terms of office shall be staggered so that, as close as possible, one-third of the Board, excluding the President, Vice-President and the Immediate Past President, are elected each year. No member of the Board of Directors shall be eligible to be elected to serve more than three consecutive three-year terms or a total of 12 consecutive years on the Board regardless of position.

[Action taken on 9/27/00 at the Annual Conference, Lihue, Hawaii. Two candidates running for office were not present at the conference, however delegates from their agencies were present which presented the question "...whether the Regular Membership held by each Organizational Member can be 'split' to allow one person from the Organizational Membership to run for office, and a second one to vote." The Executive Committee decided "Organizational Members hold one Regular Membership that cannot be split." This decision precluded conference delegates from Minneapolis and Syracuse from voting since individuals from each of those agencies who were not present at the conference had declared themselves as candidates for office, which required them to be the designated voting members.]

[Action taken at a Pre-Annual Meeting on 9/29/00 at the Annual Conference, Lihue, Hawaii. The Election Committee informed those present of the following issue: "If an organization holds a NACOLE Organizational Membership and no separate Regular Membership for any of its representatives, can a representative of that organizational who is not present run for a NACOLE office or election to the board and a representative of that organizational who is present still cast a vote?" The Board decided, "the one Regular Membership accorded to the Organizational Member could be used either to support the election of the non-present representative or to permit the representative who is present to vote during the election. Two Regular memberships would be required to permit the absent representative to stand for office and another representative to vote during the elections."]

[The intent of the Bylaws is to authorize only one person per voting membership (organizational) to be elected to and serve on the Board of Directors at the same time. Interpretation approved by the Board 10/8/08.]

[Revised on 9/14/11 at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, LA to provide that no person shall serve more than 12 consecutive years on the Board regardless of position.]

D. Vacancies

Except in cases involving the Immediate Past President or when the vacancy is created by the election of a serving Board member as President or Vice President, the Board of Directors shall fill vacancies occurring before the expiration of terms of office by appointment of Association members to the Board. In the event the Immediate Past President becomes incapacitated or specifically indicates his or her desire to discontinue full and active participation as a Board member, the Board may appoint a former Past President, a Founding member or a former Board member to serve in his or her stead. In the event a serving Board member is elected to the office of President or Vice President, any unexpired term shall be filled by election in accordance with the provisions of Article VII.C of these Bylaws and the Election Rules. In the event the members fail to nominate and elect a member to fill any such vacancy at the Annual Meeting, the Board shall do so within sixty (60) days. Persons so chosen shall serve until the expiration of the terms that they have been designated to fill. This will not prohibit them from being eligible to serve additional full terms as defined in Article VI, Section C.

[Revised at the Annual Meeting 9/22/10 in Seattle, WA to provide authority and a process for the appointment of specified members to serve on the Board in cases where the Immediate Past President becomes incapacitated or indicates his or her unwillingness to serve.]

[Revised at the Annual Meeting 9/17/14 in Kansas City, MO to provide for the election of members to fill unexpired terms of office on the Board created by the election of a Board member as President or Vice President.]

E. Duties

In accordance with the Board policy and priority guidelines established by the members of the Association, the Board of Directors shall be responsible for the following:

1. Direction, coordination, and evaluation of the Association, including study of alternative program possibilities and establishment of preferential ratings of such alternatives to guide in the allotment of Association resources.
2. Creation of permanent and Ad Hoc national committees and task forces depending on the policy and priorities of the total Association, definition of their functions, and allocation of specific assignments.
3. Representation of the Association and maintenance of its relationship with other organizations.
4. Finances of the Association including the rendering of an annual accounting to members concerning sources and amount of income and nature and amount of expenditures.
5. Membership policies and practices of the Association within the limits prescribed by these by-laws.

6. Selection and employment of staff assistance on a temporary or full-time basis from time to time as determined by need.
7. Personnel policies and practices of the Association within the limits prescribed by these by-laws.
8. Provision at regular intervals for an evaluation and appraisal of operations in relation to fulfillment of Association goals.
9. Review and resolution of intra-organizational issues and problems.
10. All other business of the Association in the fulfillment of the Association's purposes.

F. Meetings

The Board of Directors shall hold no fewer than one meeting in a given year, at such times and places or by such procedures and processes as may be determined by the President. Reasonable notice of the time, place, and method of each meeting shall be given to each member of the Board of Directors.

G. Absences

In the event a member of the Board of Directors is absent for three consecutive meetings without good cause (as determined by the Board of Directors) there shall be sufficient reason to find that a vacancy exists in the terms of membership held by the member involved.

H. Removal

The Board may, by two-thirds (2/3) vote (8 members), censure, suspend or expel any member of the Board for cause. Prior to any such censure, suspension or expulsion, the President shall appoint a Select Committee consisting of two Board members and one NACOLE member at large, who shall review the facts and circumstances of the case to ascertain the suitability of such member to remain as a member of the Board. The Select Committee shall make its recommendations to the Board within 30 days. The Board shall schedule a hearing to provide the member an opportunity to present mitigating information if he/she chooses to do so. Following the hearing, which shall be held within 30 days from the date on which the President receives the recommendation of the Select Committee unless otherwise agreed by all parties, the Board at its next regular meeting, shall rule on the recommendation of the Select Committee. The decision of the Board shall be final.

[New section added at the Annual Meeting in San Jose, CA 9/25/07 to provide a procedure for the removal of Board members.]

I. Quorum

A majority of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of all

business.

ARTICLE VII - ELECTION PROCEDURES

A. Eligibility for Office

1. Shall be in accordance with Article V of these by-laws.
[The intent of the Bylaws is to authorize only one person per voting membership (organizational) to be elected to and serve on the Board of Directors at the same time. Interpretation approved by the Board 10/8/08.]

B. Election Committee

1. Appointment of Committee
 - a. No less than six-months prior to the annual meeting, the President shall appoint, an Election Committee.
 - b. The term of office of the Election Committee shall be one (1) year.
 - c. The Election Committee shall be solely responsible for conducting the election of Officers and Board of Directors.

2. Duties

The duties of the Election Committee shall be:

- a. The establishment of procedures, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, to regulate and guide the nomination and balloting processes.
- b. To receive declarations of candidates and pertinent background information for each position in the regular election of Officers and Board of Directors as stated in these by-laws.
- c. The establishment of procedures, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, that defines a proxy vote for election purposes only, which shall include:
 - 1) A proxy vote form,
 - 2) Circumstances for casting a proxy vote.
 - 3) How a proxy vote is to be cast and when.

- d. Sixty (60) days prior to the election of Officers and Board of Directors, the Chair of the Election Committee shall file with the Board of Directors a progress report on the election and the candidates for office.
 - e. The Election Committee shall be responsible for the distribution of ballots and the general conduct of the election.
 - f. Upon completion of the ballot tally by the members of the Election Committee, the Chair shall verify the tally and submit to the Secretary a tabulation of ballots for each office of the organization.
- Each candidate for office may appoint an observer to monitor the counting of ballots.
- g. The Chair shall announce to the membership at the annual meeting those candidates who have compiled the highest number of votes for each office.

C. Elections

- 1. Elections shall be held through a secret ballot process, listing the names of the persons nominated. The form of the ballot may be at the discretion of the Election Committee. The ballot for elections of officers and Board of Directors shall become final thirty (30) days prior to the date established by the Board of Directors for the purpose of election to office. The exception shall be nominations for office submitted from the floor on the day of elections.
- 2. All regular members shall be entitled to vote in elections for Officers and Board of Directors and shall not cast more than one vote per office providing that they have been a regular/organizational member in good standing at least 30 days prior to the election.
- 3. Election of candidates to office shall be by the highest number of votes cast for any one office.
- 4. The ballot for the Officers and Board of Directors shall consist of all names of candidates seeking each office. The candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected to said offices.

ARTICLE VIII - ADDITIONAL COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

- A. Committees and Task Forces may be created and abolished by the President with the

advice and consent of the Board of Directors as necessary to plan and review the goals and purposes of the Association. These Committees and Task Forces shall report to the Board of Directors and shall, within budget authorizations, create their own sub-units as required to complete their assigned tasks.

- B. Committees and Task Forces may consist of members of the Board of Directors and any other members of the Association. In making appointments, the President shall give consideration to: (1) special competence, (2) geographic distribution, and (3) continuity of experience, (4) term of service, (5) membership recommendations, and (6) optimum use of Association resources.

ARTICLE IX - MEETINGS OF MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

A. Annual Meetings

The annual meeting of the members of the Association shall be held on a date and at a location each year as shall be determined by the Board of Directors.

Notice of Annual Meeting

Notices of the annual meeting of the members of the Association shall be in writing and shall set forth the date, time and place thereof. Such notices of meetings shall be mailed or caused to be mailed by the Secretary not fewer than sixty days before each meeting and shall be addressed to each member of the Association at his/her address as it shall appear on the records of the Association.

B. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the members of the Association may be called by the Board of Directors or shall be called by the Secretary upon written request by two-thirds of the members of the Association. Such special meetings shall be held on such dates and at such places as shall be specified in the respective notices thereof.

Notice of Special Meetings

Notices of special meetings of the members of the Association shall be in writing and shall set forth the date, time, and place thereof. Such notices of meetings shall be mailed or caused to be mailed by the Secretary not less than twenty or more than forty days before each meeting. The notices of meetings shall be addressed to each member of the Association at his/her address, as it shall appear on the records of the Association.

C. Quorum

At any annual or special meeting of the members of the Association, a minimum of 10 voting members must be present in order to constitute a quorum for the transaction of

business.

D. Procedures

The President shall rule on all procedural matters not specifically covered in these by-laws and shall be guided in this duty by Robert's Rules of Order Revised.

E. Voting

In voting on issues before the Association, each regular member, as defined in Article IV Section A, Part 1, shall be entitled to one vote, and a majority vote of such regular members present and voting on such matters shall be necessary for passage.

ARTICLE X - BUDGET AND FINANCE

The Board of Directors shall annually determine the budget of the Association and shall have overall responsibility for the Association's financial affairs.

ARTICLE XI - SOURCES OF INCOME

The Association may receive income from both public and private sources including grants for special purposes.

ARTICLE XII - AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

These by-laws and any amendments or supplements thereto may be adopted, amended, altered, supplemented or repealed by a majority vote of the voting membership present in person or by proxy at any general meeting of the Association when due notice of a proposed by-law amendment has been given to the general membership thirty days prior to the annual or special meeting.

[Approved 10/14/98; revised 11/03/02, Cambridge, MA; 12/13/05, Miami, FL; 9/25/07, San Jose CA; 11/1/09 Austin, TX; 9/22/10 Seattle, WA; and 9/14/11 New Orleans, LA]

Memorandum Item 3F



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT OCPO Work Anniversaries & Staffing

Current Staff:

On August 3, 2021 Special Investigator Kevin Williams and on August 4, 2021 Complaint Intake Specialist Taylor Woods respectively, celebrated 1 year on the staff of the OCPO.

Having these two staff positions focused on investigations and complaints, has significantly aided in bringing a level of service to the CPOB and the Dallas community that was very needed when OCPO and the Board started operating in October of 2019 with only a temporary staff person.



New Staffing:

OCPO will be hiring an Executive Assistant who will manage with the Director the day-to-day administrative needs of the CPOB and OCPO. That person will also be trained to become the new Board liaison for the CPOB.

Interviews for that position will take place the week of August 23rd.

Director McClary hopes that as OCPO grows, the quality of service to the CPOB and the Dallas community will only become more enriched by the talent that the staff bring to police oversight in Dallas.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum 4

June 2021



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT **Office of Community Police Oversight June 2021 Complaint Report**

Attached you will find the June monthly complaint statistical report from the Office of Community Police Oversight (OCPO). This report provides a summation of the total number of external complaints turned into the OCPO and IAD, the source of the complaints, and the disposition of the complaints. Also attached is an external complaint workflow process diagram and general definition document that defines categories for no investigation which are listed as “No Investigation” on the monthly reports.

Attached are also summaries of the complaints and inquiries received by OCPO in June.

July numbers have already been reviewed and will be included in the Board packet as a separate item.

Please do not hesitate to reach out should you have any questions or concerns.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

External Administrative Complaints Received as of 7/6/2021 for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

	Oct		Nov		Dec		Jan		Feb		March		April		May		June		July		Aug		Sept	
Total External Complaints by Source	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO
DPD Total	68	0	61	0	67	0	75	0	58	0	76	0	67	0	83	0	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
External Email	38		36		34		44		28		35		46		50		57							
External Fax							1		1				1											
External Letter	7		5		7		4		5		3		4		11		4							
External Telephone	1				1						1		1											
External Online Form	5		11		10		12		16		10		3				3							
External Walk-in DPD	17		9		15		14		8		27		12		22		37							
OCPO Total	21	18	30	28	20	17	23	23	19	18	34	40	27	23	30	31	32	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
External Email OCPO	1	6	2	13	6	7	2		9	8	10	23	6	14	10	19	6	7						
External Fax OCPO								14					1											
External Letter OCPO	2	4	1	2		1					2	2	1	1	1									
External Telephone OCPO		8		13		9		9				14		8		9								
External Online Form OCPO	18		27		13		20		10	10	22		16		19		26	27						
External Walk-in OCPO					1		1					1	3			3	1							
Grand Total	89	18	91	28	87	17	98	23	77	18	110	40	94	23	113	31	133	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
External Complaints Processed by Internal Affairs as of 7/6/2021																								
Divisional Investigations with Category	20	0	12	0	18	0	10	0	12	0	19	0	11	0	17	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discourtesy or Unprofessionalism	15		4		9		4		3		10		6		7		11							
Fail to Complete Reports	1								2		1				3		1							
Improper Action	2		5		3		4				2		1		3		3							
Improper Comments									1						1		2							
Improper or No Investigation	2		3		6		2		6		6		4		3		11							
Internal Affairs Investigations and Category	6	0	10	0	5	0	5	0	6	0	12	0	8	0	9	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Abuse of Authority	1		1		1		1		1						2									
Adverse Conduct	1		3		1		2						3				4							
Dispatch/911 Violation																								
Discourtesy to Other Employees																								
Failed to Complete Report on Time											2				1									
Failed to Secure Property																								
Harassment											2						4							
Improper or False Arrest	1		1												1									
Improper or No Investigation	1		1						1		4		1				1							
Improper Release of Information			1																					
Incomplete or Erroneous Report			1																					
Inquiry																								
Lost/Damaged Citizen Property									1		1													
Mistreatment of Citizen									1				2		1		1							
Placed Citizen in Danger							1																	
Racial Profiling															1									
Use of Force	2		2		2		1		1		3		2											
Improper Action or Comments					1				1						3		2							
Public Integrity Investigation Referral	4		3		3		2		3		2		7		2		3							
No Investigation Conducted and Reason	63	0	69	0	64	0	83	0	59	0	79	0	75	0	87	0	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Did not meet criteria	1																							
Duplicate Complaint	1		3		2		8		1		14		14		7		5							
Fail to Articulate	4		3		1		3		1		5		1		4		9							
Guilt or Innocence	7		5		5		5		3		3		1		9		5							
Information Only	6		8		19		11		12		12		5		17		27							
More Information	5		5		7		3		3		3		5		3		8							
Need Signature									1															
No Violation	24		34		19		23		18		17		25		15		13							
No Violation BWC	6		7		5		15		6		7		6		15		4							
Non Employee	8		3		5		10		5		9		7		11		7							
Other (Outside Agency)					1		2		6		6		1		3		3							
Possible																								
Sixty Day	1		1						1		1													
Third Party							1		2		2		8		1									
Unknown Officer																								
OCPO Investigation							2						1				1							
Recent EC's under review (as of 7/6/2021)													1		2		11							
Grand Totals	89	0	91	0	87	0	98	0	77	0	110	0	94	0	113	0	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Data available in IAPRO as of 7/6/2021. The data for May of 2021 was re-verified.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

June 2021

Enclosed are the complaints received in the Office of Community Police Oversight for the weeks of June 1, 2021 to June 30, 2021.

The office opened in October 2019 and has received 1,237 complaints and inquiries as of June 30, 2021. There were 92 complaints and inquiries received by the office in June of 2021. Below are summaries of those complaints and inquiries.

- Actual complaints against the Dallas Police Department. (35)
- Inquiries from individuals received through the complaint system that are not actually complaints against the Dallas Police Department. In those cases, individuals were directed to the appropriate departments/agencies for services. This section also documents civilians that contacted OCPO to follow-up on a complaint that was already filed against DPD. (57)

Complaints

6/1/2021 EC2021-0517	Complainant stated that a DPD officer made a rude comment and said sexual things under a video of her and her son on social media. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/2/2021 EC2021-0519	Complainant was very upset because she said she called 911 numerous times and did not get an answer. Complainant stated when she finally got someone on the phone, they told her to file a police report online. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral to the Central Division.
6/3/2021 EC2021-0516	Complaint stated she called 911 twice because someone was banging on her door and no one responded to her call. DPD only responded to a call her neighbors put in. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to Communications.
6/6/2021 EC2021-0521	Complainant stated she witnessed two women being mistreated by a DPD officer outside of a club. An officer threw one of the females over his shoulder and held her by her butt. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/9/2021 EC2021-0544	Complainant stated she wanted two people to be arrested for filing a false lawsuit. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This complaint was not against a DPD Officer.
6/9/2021 EC2021-0518	Complainant stated that he felt he was going to be retaliated against this summer. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This complaint was not against DPD officers.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/10/2021 EC2021-0545	Complainant felt he was wrongfully arrested after he ran out of gas and fell asleep on the side of the road. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This incident did not happen in Dallas.
6/11/2021 EC2021-0543	Complainant stated while attending a wedding rehearsal he heard a DPD officer laugh and talk about a case. The officer stated, "it's funny to watch black people run around like ants when the police show up". This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/12/2021 EC2021-0549	Complainant stated he is unhappy with a DPD Sergeant and how he handled his complaint that was sent as a division referral. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to OCPO so they could follow-up with the complainant.
6/14/2021 EC2021-0548	Complainant stated she was robbed at the DART bus stop and DART PD and DPD wouldn't do anything to help. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a NO Investigation. This complaint can't be handled by DPD. Complaint was forwarded to DART.
6/15/2021 EC2021-0560	Complainant stated that DPD did an unwarranted search of his home while he was away on vacation. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/15/2021 EC2021-0561	Complainant stated that his neighbor is causing issues and harassing him by sending electric waves through his home. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as a FYI to the Right Care Team.
6/16/2021 EC2021-0559	Complainant felt a DPD officer was driving by her house and slowing down to peak in her window to see her nude. Complainant feels her neighbor reported her being nude often in front of her window and felt that is the reason the officer is peaking in her windows. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a No Investigation. It will be sent as a FYI to the North West Division.
6/16/2021 EC2021-0558	Complainant stated that DPD officers helped her son's father take her child on a day that wasn't his visitation day. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral to the North East Division.
6/17/2021 EC2021-0574	Complainant stated that his apartment is not up to code. His AC is out, and he has bug issues. He stated the management won't do anything about it. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to the North Central Division and the Code Compliance Department.
6/17/2021 EC2021-0571	Complainant stated that after she ended a "friends with benefits" relationship with a DPD officer he started stalking her and having other officers follow her. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/18/2021 EC2021-0572	Complainant stated that DPD officers harassed her at her place of business over a 5-month time period. They handcuff Hispanics to see if they were US citizens and told the complainant she was not following code regarding her bar. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/18/2021 EC2021-0573	Complainant stated that when he was pulled over by a DPD officer he was being rude and sarcastic. Complainant felt that instead of deescalating the situation the officer made it worse. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was cleared by Body Worn Camera.
6/21/2021 EC2021-0576	Complainant stated that he was pulled over by a DPD officer and accused of having drugs. Complainant stated officer searched his car for drugs and tried to intimidate him. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral to the Southeast Division.
6/23/2021 EC2021-0602	Complainant stated that a DPD sergeant continues to harass him and tries to do electric shock therapy. Complainant stated that this officer is his cousin. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This person is not a DPD Officer.
6/24/2021 EC2021-0593	Complainant stated that he was assaulted in the street because of his sexual orientation and when it was reported to DPD they did not take it seriously and made complainant feel he was unimportant. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and was sent as a Division Referral to the Central Division.
6/25/2021 EC2021-0608	Complainant stated that DPD officers did not take their case seriously and even laughed and made jokes when she called for help. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral.
6/25/2021 EC2021-0605	Complainant stated that officer threatened him and his family's life for trying to help his uncle. The officer told him that he would "F*** him up". This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/25/2021 EC2021-0606	Complainant stated that people are driving in the HOV lane on 30 East that do not meet the qualifications. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. There was no complaint against DPD.
6/25/2021 EC2021-0607	Complainant stated that a little boy was hit by a white man and was only charged with having an expired driver's license. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and was sent as a No Investigation. This case was sent as a FYI to Traffic.
6/27/2021 EC2021-0604	Complainant stated that she was pulled over for not having a front license plate but was scarred when multiple officers were called for backup. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a Division Referral to the North East Division.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/27/2021 EC2021-0605	Complainant stated that DPD officer harassed her, came in to her home and put her in hand cuffs and pulled her daughter out of the room with no shirt on and made her sit on the couch as an intimidation tactic on her child's father who this officer is also mistreating. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/28/2021 EC2021-0601	Complainant called 911 to have officer come out so they can file a report. The DPD officers did not listen to him and even argued with him when he was trying to explain what happened. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a Division Referral to the Central Division.
6/28/2021 EC2021-0632	Complainant is afraid because she is being harassed by a girl whom she has a restraining order against. Complainant believes this young lady is now a DPD officer and is using her job to find out information about her. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. The person does not work for the Dallas Police Department.
6/29/2021 EC2021-0631	Complainant was upset with DPD officers after she filed a restraining order on a guy who brutally beat her and gave him her address. The person did not originally have her address. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to Family Violence. Police Monitor does not agree with this complaint.
6/29/2021 EC2021-0630	Complainant stated that their family member who is a DPD employee withdrew a lot of money out of her account without her permission. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
6/29/2021 EC2021-0628	Complainant was upset because he called 911 numerous times about fireworks being ignited in his apartment complex and DPD did nothing about it. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent a Division Referral to the Northeast Division.
6/29/2021 EC2021-0629	Complainant was very upset because DPD does not acknowledge his paperwork given to him by the government that list he is disabled. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was considered a duplicate case from complaints previously filed by the complainant
6/29/2021 EC2021-0627	Complainant stated that his neighbors are former DPD officers and they constantly harass him. Complainant also stated that the neighbors had fellow officers harass him as well. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and Will be a No Investigation. The neighbors are not currently employed by DPD.
6/30/2021 EC2021-0625	Complainant stated that someone stole patio chairs off his patio. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a No Investigation. There was no complaint articulated against a DPD officer.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/30/2021 EC2021-0626	Complainant stated that DPD officer followed him and tried to use his badge as an intimidation tactic. Officer told complainant “you side swiped me and damaged my motorcycle” but was off duty at the time of the accident. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be staying with the Internal Affairs Division.
--------------------------	---

Inquiries

6/1/2021	Individual saw a man screaming in his car and getting out and yelling at himself and she called to get him help. OCPO informed her to stay away from his car but to call 911 to get him help.
6/1/2021	Individual called OCPO to file a police report. OCPO gave her the non- emergency number and showed her how to file a complaint online
6/1/2021	Sgt. called OCPO to investigate a bomb threat at UT Southwestern. He had the wrong number. OCPO gave him the correct number he was looking for.
6/1/2021	Individual called because she wanted to cancel a noise complaint that she called in because the neighbors left their home. OCPO gave her the non– emergency number so she could cancel the complaint.
6/2/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual was unhappy with how her case was handled and wanted to have the board review it. OCPO sent her a Civilian Review Form but we have not received the form back as of the date of this report.</i>
6/2/2021	Individual sent OCPO videos to help with her complaint against police.
6/2/2021	Individual wanted to file a police report. OCPO gave him the non – emergency number to the police department and showed him how to file a report online.
6/2/2021	Individual said he was a witness in another complainant’s case and DPD refused to take his statement. OCPO is still waiting to receive his complaint.
6/3/2021	Individual stated that DPD and SWAT held him hostage in his home for 3 days and raped him. OCPO is still waiting for him to send in his complaint form.
6/3/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual submitted a complaint and wanted to know the outcome. OCPO informed her that her case was a No Investigation because there were no policy violations during the incident.</i>
6/3/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint against the Sheriff’s Department. OCPO informed her that she had to call the Sheriff’s Department to file that complaint. OCPO gave her their contact number as well.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/3/2021	Individual is upset because he bought a car from the Auto Pound auction and now they aren't releasing his vehicle to him. OCPO informed he we couldn't do anything to help and advised him to go to the Auto Pound location because it is very hard to reach them by phone.
6/4/2021	Detective called OCPO to send his resume to Internal Affairs. OCPO gave him the correct number to IAD.
6/4/2021	Individual called OCPO because he wanted to get a background check done on his employees. OCPO researched the place that could help him get background checks done and gave him the number.
6/4/2021	Individual wanted someone to close the gates to Arcadia Park because drugs are being sold there and a lot of violence is being caused in that area. OCPO forwarded her concerns to the Parks and Recreation Department.
6/6/2021	Individual left her purse in Walmart and someone stole her debit cards and ID, so she wanted to file a police report. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number and informed her she could also file a complaint online.
6/7/2021	Individual said she called the police on a shooting that happened near her and no one came out. This happened in Seagoville, so OCPO gave her the number to Seagoville PD.
6/7/2021	Individual was trying to find information on a relative that was being transferred to Lew Sterrett. OCPO gave her the number to Lew Sterrett.
6/7/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual called to check on her case that will be sent to the CPOB for review. OCPO informed her that her case will be reviewed by the Board in their August meeting.</i>
6/8/2021	OCPO prepped individual on logging in to the board meeting so he can speak and hear his case being briefed by the board.
6/9/2021	Individual called because he is installing an emergency 911 button at his swimming pool and wanted to test it but didn't want 911 thinking it was a real emergency. OCPO gave him the non-emergency number.
6/9/2021	Individual wanted to thank OCPO and CPOB for briefing his case and deciding to take another look into what happened.
6/10/2021	Individual is an insurance agent and wants to speak to the Department of Transportation. OCPO gave her the number to the that department.
6/10/2021	Individual stated DPD wrote him a ticket for a place his car was not parked. OCPO is still waiting for them to send their complaint form in.
6/10/2021	Individual wanted to request her fingerprints and wants a copy of her criminal background. OCPO gave her the number to get her fingerprints done and gave her the number to the police department to get a copy of her criminal background.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/11/2021	Individual wanted to ask an officer questions about a neighbor who keeps harassing her. OCPO gave her the non-emergency number to speak with an officer.
6/11/2021	Individual wanted to file a police report on his car that was broken into. OCPO gave him the number to the police department and also advised him to file the police report online
6/11/2021	Individual stated a DPD officer would not investigate her case because it was a civil matter and she felt that it was not. OCPO is still waiting on her complaint form.
6/11/2021	Individual stated his car was towed and when he called the police, they never showed up to file a report. Complainant didn't want to file a complaint so OCPO gave him the non – emergency number to DPD and also informed him he could file his complaint online.
6/11/2021	Individual stated that when he walked into Fiesta to clock-in, an off-duty police officer pulled his gun on him because he thought he was breaking in. OCPO is still waiting for his complaint form.
6/11/2021	Individual stated that a teenage kid in her apartment complex threatened to rape and kill her daughter and she wanted to file a police report. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number and told her to file a police report online. OCPO also suggested that she called 911.
6/11/2021	Individual stated that she filled a police report and hasn't heard back from anyone regarding it. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number to DPD headquarters.
6/14/2021	Individual stated DPD should create an alert that pings to your phone every hour to remind parents to check the car for their kids during hot summer and cold winters. OCPO thanked them for that idea and forwarded the suggestion to DPD.
6/15/2021	Individual stated DPD wrote him a citation that is on his record and he has proof that he was not there. OCPO suggested that he take his citation and proof to court to try to settle the situation.
6/15/2021	Individual stated she sees an open window in the vacant home across the street from her and thinks homeless people are living in there. OCPO suggested to either call 911 or 311 to report encampment in the home.
6/16/2021	Individual stated that City of Dallas is a scam and DPD put a murder on her. She also stated Kevin Felder and Dwayne Carraway is scamming her and she wants to file a complaint. OCPO is still waiting for her complaint.
6/17/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint against the City of Dallas court system. OCPO informed her that we only took complaints against City of Dallas Police Officers and that they could try to call Dallas County or the Court they want to complain about.
6/17/2021	Individual stated that the Auto Theft Department isn't answering, and she wants to report her stolen car has been recovered. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number to report that to an officer.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/17/2021	Individual stated that he inherited money but the person on his birth certificate is not him. OCPO gave him the number to the Fraud Unit.
6/17/2021	Individual called to get the number to Chief Garcia's Office. OCPO gave him the number to the Chief's office.
6/19/2021	Individual called to report street racing in his area. OCPO informed him that he could report this online or call the non – emergency number.
6/21/2021	Individual stated that her background has an error of being arrested in 2017 and stated that is completely incorrect. OCPO informed her to speak with someone at headquarters to see how she could get this issue resolved.
6/22/2021	Individual called to see how he can handle his citation. OCPO showed him how to pull up his citation online and ways to handle it online at the Dallas City Hall website.
6/24/2021	Individual wanted to sign up to speak for the next CPOB Board meeting. OCPO informed her it won't be until August but assured her that she would be sent the information needed to speak.
6/25/2021	Individual stated that a company in Dallas was scamming him. OCPO gave him the number to the Fraud Unit.
6/27/2021	Individual stated someone is selling stolen goods on the internet and got an attitude when he questioned them about the products. OCPO gave them the number to the Fraud Unit.
6/27/2021	Individual wanted to file a police report on a hotel manager. OCPO informed him that we only took complaints against the City of Dallas Police Department and gave him the non – emergency number to the police department.
6/27/2021	<i>Follow Up: Individual wanted to follow up on a complaint that was sent in August of 2020. OCPO looked up his complaint and informed him of the results.</i>
6/29/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint against DPD because they are not taking her and her complaint serious. OCPO is still waiting for her to send in her complaint.
6/29/2021	Individual stated she couldn't figure out how to file a police report online. OCPO walked her through the process of how to file a police report.
6/29/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint on an officer in the Gang Unit. OCPO is still waiting to receive her complaint.
6/29/2021	Individual stated she doesn't know how to file her police report. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number to ask an officer who she needed to send her police report to.
6/29/2021	Individual called looking for the non – emergency number and said the number she was calling was not in service. OCPO gave her the right non – emergency number.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

6/30/2021	Individual called OCPO because he got stabbed by his girlfriend and didn't want to call the police. OCPO informed him there was nothing we could do to help, and he needed to call 911.
6/30/2021	<i>Follow Up: Individual called to get the status of her complaint she filled with our office. OCPO informed her that the complaint was sent as a Division Referral.</i>

Memorandum 4

July 2021



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT **Office of Community Police Oversight July 2021 Complaint Report**

Attached you will find the July monthly complaint statistical report from the Office of Community Police Oversight (OCPO). This report provides a summation of the total number of external complaints turned into the OCPO and IAD, the source of the complaints, and the disposition of the complaints. Also attached is the external complaint workflow process diagram and general definition document that defines categories for no investigation which are listed as “No Investigation” on the monthly reports.

Attached are also summaries of the complaints and inquiries received by OCPO in July.

The external complaints for August are in the review process and will be provided once this information has been completed.

Please do not hesitate to reach out should you have any questions or concerns.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

External Administrative Complaints Received as of 8/3/2021 for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

	Oct		Nov		Dec		Jan		Feb		March		April		May		June		July		Aug		Sept	
Total External Complaints by Source	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO	DPD	OCPO
DPD Total	68	0	61	0	67	0	75	0	58	0	76	0	67	0	83	0	101	0	94	0	0	0	0	0
External Email	38		36		34		44		28		35		46		50		57		54					
External Fax							1		1				1											
External Letter	7		5		7		4		5		3		4		11		4		8					
External Telephone	1				1						1		1						2					
External Online Form	5		11		10		12		16		10		3				3		2					
External Walk-in DPD	17		9		15		14		8		27		12		22		37		28					
OCPO Total	21	18	30	28	20	17	23	23	19	18	34	40	27	23	30	31	32	35	31	64	0	0	0	0
External Email OCPO	1	6	2	13	6	7	2		9	8	10	23	6	14	10	19	6	7	11	4				
External Fax OCPO							14						1											
External Letter OCPO	2	4	1	2	1						2	2	1	1	1				1					
External Telephone OCPO		8		13		9	9				14		8		9									
External Online Form OCPO	18		27		13		20		10	10	22		16		19		26	27	20	59				
External Walk-in OCPO					1		1					1	3			3		1						
Grand Total	89	18	91	28	87	17	98	23	77	18	110	40	94	23	113	31	133	35	125	64	0	0	0	0
External Complaints Processed by Internal Affairs as of 8/3/2021																								
Divisional Investigations with Category	20	0	12	0	18	0	10	0	12	0	19	0	11	0	17	0	29	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Discourtesy or Unprofessionalism	15		4		9		4		3		10		6		7		10		2					
Fail to Complete Reports	1								2		1				3		1							
Improper Action	2		5		3		4				2		1		3		3		1					
Improper Comments									1						1		2							
Improper or No Investigation	2		3		6		2		6		6		4		3		13		4					
Internal Affairs Investigations and Category	6	0	10	0	5	0	5	0	6	0	12	0	8	0	9	0	14	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Abuse of Authority	1		1		1		1		1						2									
Adverse Conduct	1		3		1		2						3				5		1					
Dispatch/911 Violation																								
Discourtesy to Other Employees											2				1									
Failed to Complete Report on Time																								
Failed to Secure Property																								
Harassment											2						5		1					
Improper or False Arrest	1		1												1									
Improper or No Investigation	1		1						1		4		1				1		1					
Improper Release of Information			1																					
Incomplete or Erroneous Report			1																					
Inquiry																								
Lost/Damaged Citizen Property									1		1													
Mistreatment of Citizen									1				2		1									
Placed Citizen in Danger							1																	
Racial Profiling															1									
Use of Force	2		2		2		1		1		3		2				1		1					
Improper Action or Comments					1				1						3		2		1					
EC's Referred to the Public Integrity Unit	4		3		3		2		3		2		7		2		3		2					
No Investigation Conducted and Reason	63	0	69	0	64	0	83	0	59	0	79	0	75	0	87	0	90	0	113	0	0	0	0	0
Did not meet criteria	1																							
Duplicate Complaint	1		3		2		8		1		14		14		7		7		6					
Fail to Articulate	4		3		1		3		1		5		1		4		9		6					
Guilt or Innocence	7		5		5		5		3		3		2		9		5		2					
Information Only	6		8		19		11		12		12		5		17		28		13					
More Information	5		5		7		3		3		3		5		3		9		4					
Need Signature									1															
No Violation	24		34		19		23		18		17		25		16		13		12					
No Violation BWC	6		7		5		15		6		7		6		15		6		13					
Non Employee	8		3		5		10		5		9		7		12		8		15					
Other (Outside Agency)					1		2		6		6		1		3		3		2					
Possible																								
Sixty Day	1		1						1		1								1					
Third Party							1		2		2		8		1				1					
Unknown Officer																								
OCPO Investigation							2						1				1							
Recent EC's under review (as of 8/3/2021)																	1		38					
Grand Totals	89	0	91	0	87	0	98	0	77	0	110	0	94	0	113	0	133	0	125	0	0	0	0	0

*Data available in IAPRO as of 8/3/2021. The data for May and June of 2021 were re-verified.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

July 2021

Enclosed are the complaints received in the Office of Community Police Oversight for the weeks of July 1, 2021 to July 31, 2021.

The office opened in October 2019 and has received 1,352 complaints and inquiries as of July 31, 2021. There were 115 complaints and inquiries received by the office in July of 2021. Below are summaries of those complaints and inquiries.

- Actual complaints against the Dallas Police Department. (64)
- Inquiries from individuals received through the complaint system that are not actually complaints against the Dallas Police Department. In those cases, individuals were directed to the appropriate departments/agencies for services. This section also documents civilians that contacted OCPO to follow-up on a complaint that was already filed against DPD. (51)

Complaints

7/5/2021 EC2021-0642	Complainant stated that DPD detective gave out the wrong information on ex-DPD officer Bryan Riser's case on purpose. <i>This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to the Public Integrity Unit.</i>
7/6/2021 EC2021-0655	Complainant stated DPD officers came in his home and disrespected and tased his mom. He stated in the process DPD officer knocked his body camera off. <i>This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was cleared by Body Worn Camera. Police Monitor McClary disagrees with this decision.</i>
7/6/2021 EC2021-0655	Complainant stated she was illegally tased in her home and disrespected by police officers after calling them to her help. <i>This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was cleared by Body Worn Camera. Police Monitor McClary disagrees with this decision.</i>
7/6/2021 EC2021-0656	Complainant stated that Amazon truck is parked in the way and other community members can't get pass. <i>This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This was not a DPD issue.</i>
7/9/2021 EC2021-0668	Complainant state DPD told her grandchild's mother where she was located. This resulted in the mother showing up at a park to take the child away from the complainant. <i>This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. There was no Policy Violation. Police Monitor McClary Disagrees with this decision.</i>



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/11/2021 EC2021-0666	Complainant resubmitted his complaint because he did not have the officers name right in the first complaint when he was harassed by DPD officers. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This complaint is a duplicate of the original complaint filed.
7/12/2021 EC2021-0697	Complainant stated that DPD closed a ticket he opened regarding an illegally parked vehicle but did nothing to resolve the ticket and is very disappointed. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to Central Division.
7/15/2021 EC2021-0654	Complainant stated DPD was not helpful and continued to give him false information when he tried to file a police report on a woman that attacked him in on 7/11. Complainant also stated DPD officer said he was lying about the incident. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. There was no Policy Violation.
7/18/2021 EC2021-0700	Complainant reached out to OCPO because the music at the bar down the street from her is too loud and it affects her and the other neighbors at night. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This Case was sent as an FYI to the North Central Division.
7/18/2021 EC2021- 0702	Complainant stated she is a person of interest in a DPD case and she wanted to clear her name so DPD could stop following her. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation.
7/19/2021 EC2021-0701	Complainant stated DPD tried to intimidate her African American son and didn't believe him when he said he was hit by a Hispanic man driving in his apartment complex. Complainant's son was arrested by DPD because she felt DPD took the Hispanic drivers' side. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case is considered Guilt or Innocence and must be settled in court.
7/19/2021 EC2021-0702	Complainant said she saw a DPD officer arrest a Hispanic male for selling apparel and threw the Mexican Flag to the ground and stated, "we live in America". This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. IAD needs more information to thoroughly review the complaint.
7/19/2021 EC2021-0709	Complainant stated that DPD officers come to his city every year and party for days causing problems in their community and are very disruptive. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral to the Narcotics Division.
7/19/2021 EC2021-0720	Complainant felt DPD officer were rude to him because of the conversation that officer had with another citizen before him. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as Division Referral to the Financial Crimes Division.
7/20/2021 EC2021-0724	Complainant stated DPD sergeant put people in his assistant living home to harass him. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. There was no Policy Violation.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/20/2021 x20 EC2021-0698	Complainant stated that DPD constantly harasses him while he while is at the VA Hospital. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. There was no Policy Violation.
7/20/2021 EC2021-0726	Complainant felt DPD did not properly investigate her case. She stated she had to call numerous times to get someone out to help her and when DPD did arrive they passed her vehicle where she was taking refuge. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was cleared by Body Worn Camera.
7/21/2021 EC2021-0722	Complainant stated Hispanic DPD officer did not believe him when he was telling the officer about his accident. Complainant also stated that the officer started speaking Spanish to the other party in the accident and feels the officer shouldn't have done that "because we are in America". This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. The case was cleared by Body Worn Camera.
7/21/2021 EC2021-0723	Complainant stated her coin purse and ID were stolen while she was in her car. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case is not against DPD.
7/21/2021 EC2021- 0719	Complainant stated that the construction crew in his neighborhood is breaking the noise ordinance. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case will be sent as an FYI to the Code Compliance Department.
7/22/2021 EC2021-0725	Complainant wanted to file a noise complaint against her dad. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was sent as an FYI to the Southwest Division.
7/24/2021 EC2021-0727	Complainant stated there is speed racing on Forest Lane. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This complaint is not against DPD.
7/26/2021 x16 EC2021-0750	Complainant sent multiple complaints on how DPD was harassing him while he was in the VA Hospital. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. DPD was not present during the incidents.
7/27/2021	Complainant stated her and her husband where involved in a high-speed chase and were struck by officer when they finally stopped. Complainant also stated that DPD allowed her vehicle to be sold in a car auction. This Case is still currently being reviewed by IAD and OCPO.
7/29/2021 EC2021-0760	Complainant stated DPD officer harasses him every time he sees him. Complainant also stated that he even witnessed the officer turn is body camera off before approaching the complainant. This case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. More info is needed for this case.
7/29/2021 EC2021-0756	Complainant stated DPD started harassing him after he started a petition about the police department. This Case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be sent as a Division Referral to Facility Management.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/30/2021 EC2021- 0757	Complainant stated DPD officers did not arrest the person who physically abused him after getting in a car accident. <i>This Case was reviewed by IAD and OCPO and will be a No Investigation. This case was cleared by Body Worn Camera. Police Monitor McClary disagrees with this decision.</i>
---------------------------	--

Inquiries

7/1/2021	<i>Follow Up: Individual called OCPO to check on the status of her complaint that was previously submitted. OCPO informed her that her case was sent as a Division Referral to the South East Division.</i>
7/5/2021	Individual emailed OCPO and stated that they found bullets at their front door. OCPO informed him to call and report this to 911 and to not touch the bullets.
7/5/2021	Individual called OCPO to get information on an expungement expo that was supposed to be taking place in Dallas. OCPO informed he we didn't have any information about this event and gave him the number to the police department.
7/6/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual stated he was unhappy with how his case was handled and wants OCPO to do an independent investigation. OCPO sends the individual a Complaint Review Form.</i>
7/6/2021	<i>Follow Up: Individual called about a complaint he previously submitted. OCPO informed him of how his open cases where being handled that he recently submitted.</i>
7/6/2021	Individual stated while in the hospital a police officer told him that he would shoot him between the eyes. Individual is scared to file a complaint because he is on probation and fears retaliation.
7/7/2021	Individual stated that during a traffic stop an officer tried to intimidate him and he wanted to file a complaint. OCPO is still waiting for this complaint.
7/7/2021	Individual called OCPO because a sanitation truck has been abandoned and is blocking the alley. OCPO gave them the number to the Sanitation Department to call the driver of that truck.
7/7/2021	Individual wants to file a complaint against an officer but only wants to speak to a Spanish speaker. OCPO gave her the number to Internal Affairs to speak to someone in Spanish.
7/7/2021	Individual called OCPO and asked for the number to the Mayor's Office. OCPO looked up the number and gave it to her.
7/8/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual needed help submitting his review form to OCPO. OCPO tried to find ways for him to submit his Complaint Review Form.</i>
7/8/2021	Individual called OCPO and stated Parking Enforcement wrote his mother a parking ticket and wrote on her car with chalk. OCPO reached out to Parking Enforcement and gave them the individuals complaint.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/12/2021	Individual wanted to file a noise complaint. OCPO gave her the non - emergency number and showed her how to file a complaint online.
7/12/2021	Individual wanted OCPO to send her a complaint form because she felt she was done wrong by DPD. OCPO sent her a complaint form and we are still waiting for her to return it.
7/12/2021	Individual called and wanted to know if its legal to play an instrument on the street. OCPO did not know the answer and gave him the non-emergency the number to DPD to ask an officer.
7/13/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual emailed OPCO to inform the office about why they submitted a new complaint form. OCPO thanked him and informed him his cases would be vetted soon.</i>
7/13/2021	Individual wanted to know who he could talk to about his case and wanted to know who the detective is over his case. OCPO gave him the non – emergency number to find the detective over his case.
7/14/2021	Individual wanted to know where to register as a sex offender. OCPO looked up the correct number he was supposed to call.
7/14/2021	Individual called to send a letter to the Chief of Police. OCPO gave him the number to the Chiefs Office.
7/15/2021	Individual wanted a copy of the complaint she filled out a couple months back. OCPO informed her she sent the complaint through email and told her the date to go back to so she could find the complaint.
7/15/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint and stated her child's father is running a sweat shop in another country and that he is a police officer. OCPO sent her a complaint form but never received it back.
7/15/2021	Individual called from another state saying they have a young teen threatening to commit suicide and discovered that he was reported missing in Dallas. OCPO tried to reach out to the Missing Persons & Youth Division and tried to help as much as possible.
7/15/2021	Individual wants to file a theft report. OCPO gave him the non – emergency number to the police department and told him how to file a complaint online.
7/1/2021	Individual called the police on her neighbor who used to be former police officers. The police told the individual that she better not call back unless someone is dead or there is an emergency. OCPO sent her a complaint form and hasn't received it a back.
7/15/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint against 3 officers. OCPO sent her a complaint form and never received it back.
7/15/2021	Individual wanted to file a complaint and wanted to remain anonymous. OCPO told him where the complaint form could be found because he didn't want one to be sent to him. We never received the form back.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/16/2021	Individual has a video of the car accident that has been on the news. OCPO informed her to call the police and let them know what she has.
7/19/2021	Individual said a young man hit her while she was walking to work, and she wants to file a police report. OCPO told her how to file a police report online.
7/19/2021	<i>Commendation: Individual wanted to thank a DPD Sergeant for helping him and his wife get their COVID shot. OCPO sent this commendation to the Chief of Police Office.</i>
7/19/2021	Individual wanted to find the detective over his case. OCPO gave him the non- emergency number to the police department.
7/19/2021	Individual sent OCPO an email about an idea he had to have an alert in everyone's phone to remind them to check their car for their kids. OCPO thanked them for this idea and sent it to DPD.
7/20/2021	Individual was told by DPD to file a police report online and she doesn't know how to find it. OCPO walked her through how to file a police report online.
7/20/2021	Individual stated he wanted to talk to someone from the police department and argued that OCPO staff were police officers and that OCPO was pointless. He hung up after that.
7/20/2021	Individual called OCPO from 311 to see if we had a 24-hour line and if not, how long we stayed open. OCPO answered the questions he had.
7/20/2021	Individual called to see if it was ok for an officer to say that he didn't need to speak Spanish because we were in America. OCPO asked if he wanted to file a complaint against the officer but the individual said no.
7/20/2021	Individual called to see who she could talk to about being scammed. OCPO gave her the number to the Fraud Unit.
7/21/2021	Individual called to check on the 36 complaints he sent to OCPO about DPD officers putting cameras in his underwear drawer. OCPO informed him that there were no DPD police stationed to work at the VA. Hospital.
7/22/2021	<i>Follow-up: Individual wanted to check on his complaint where he got pulled over at gun point because he license plate came back stolen. Individual wanted to make sure it never happened again. OCPO worked with IAD and gave him information on how to fix the situation so it never happens again.</i>
7/22/2021	Individual came to Dallas and got in an incident and is trying to find the police report but doesn't know any information about her police report. OCPO gave her the non – emergency number so she could find her police report.
7/22/2021	Individual wanted to find the officer that helped him fill out his police report. OCPO gave him the number to the substation he was at when he filled out the police report.



Office of Community Police Oversight Complaints

Item 4

7/23/2021	Individual wanted the number to the City Manager's Office. OCPO gave him the number to the City Manager's Office.
7/23/2021	Individual said he is 82 years old and wants the number to the Sex Offender Unit because no one has come to check on him. OCPO looked up the number and gave it to him.
7/24/2021	Individual said someone is using her social security number without her permission. OCPO gave her the number to the Fraud Unit.
7/27/2021	Individual wanted to file a report regarding his car accident. OCPO showed him how to file a complaint online.
7/27/2021	Individual wanted to follow up on a complaint she sent back in 2018. OCPO gave her the number to call IAD because it was so long ago.
7/28/2021	Individual called asking for help filing a police report. OCPO gave him the non – emergency number so he could file a police report. Also showed him how he could file it online.
7/28/2021	Individual called asking for help filing a police report. OCPO gave him the non – emergency number so he could file a police report. Also showed him how he could file it online.
7/29/2021	Individual called to say that OCPO is moving society in the wrong direction.

Memorandum Item 5



DATE August 10, 2021

CITY OF DALLAS

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT *"The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight: Key Principles and Practices for Effectiveness and Sustainability"*, NACOLE Report

Board Chairman Enobakhare, Jr. has asked Director McClary to develop a series of "mini trainings" for the Board that can be a segment of the Board's monthly meeting agenda.

For the month of August, Director McClary will lead the Board through the findings of a report issued by NACOLE on July 13, 2021 detailing a set of evidence-based practices to ensure oversight of law enforcement is effective and sustainable.

Below are excerpts from the NACOLE press release describing the report:

Today, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) released a first-of-its-kind report detailing a set of evidence-based practices to ensure oversight of law enforcement is effective and sustainable. In the midst of a national movement for police accountability, transparency, and systemic reform, NACOLE's report, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Report on the State of the Field and Effective Oversight Practices*, will serve as a critical resource for communities across the nation considering establishing or strengthening civilian oversight of police, jails, and prisons.

Funded by a 2016 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, NACOLE's groundbreaking study examines the history and evolution of civilian oversight in the United States, describes different models of oversight agencies, focusing in particular on agencies in nine cities (Atlanta, GA; Cambridge, MA; Denver, CO; Indianapolis, IN; Los Angeles, CA; Miami, FL; New Orleans, LA; Philadelphia, PA; and Washington, DC), and provides recommendations for developing, implementing, and improving civilian oversight entities. Access to all associated reports can be found at www.NACOLE.org/recent_reports. The grant also funded the creation of a comprehensive database of United States civilian oversight agencies, available online at www.NACOLE.org/COAD.

NACOLE President Susan Hutson said, "By detailing what works and what does not, this report will lead to development of more effective civilian oversight agencies. It provides guidance to community members, law enforcement, elected officials, and others seeking to establish or strengthen civilian oversight mechanisms, which are essential to the task of building public trust in law enforcement."

Key recommendations for effective oversight agencies include:

- Political independence
- Clearly defined and sufficient authority and jurisdiction
- Adequate funding, staffing, and operational resources
- Unfettered access to law enforcement records
- Mandated cooperation of law enforcement personnel
- Required reporting to bring transparency to complaint, investigative, and disciplinary processes and operations of both civilian oversight and law enforcement agencies
- Inclusion of diverse stakeholders throughout the process of creating or strengthening civilian oversight agencies

Attached is a copy of the Executive Summary of the report.

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight

Key Principles and Practices for Effectiveness and Sustainability

Michael Vitoroulis
Cameron McElhiney
Liana Perez




COPS
Community Oriented Policing Services
U.S. Department of Justice



The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight

**Key Principles and Practices for
Effectiveness and Sustainability**



This project was supported, in whole or in part, by grant number 2016-CK-WX-K017 awarded to the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. The opinions contained herein are those of the author(s) or contributor(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific individuals, agencies, companies, products, or services should not be considered an endorsement by the author(s), the contributor(s), or the U.S. Department of Justice. Rather, the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.

The internet references cited in this publication were valid as of the date of publication. Given that URLs and websites are in constant flux, neither the author(s), the contributor(s), nor the COPS Office can vouch for their current validity.

This resource was developed under a federal award and may be subject to copyright. The U.S. Department of Justice reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use and to authorize others to use this resource for Federal Government purposes. This resource may be freely distributed and used for noncommercial and educational purposes only.

Recommended citation:

Vitoroulis, Michael, Cameron McElhiney, and Liana Perez. 2021. *The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight: Key Principles and Practices for Effectiveness and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Published 2021

Contents

Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Research methodology	1
Data collection and analysis	1
Nine case studies of civilian oversight agencies	2
Report on the State of the Field and Effective Practices	4
Brief history of civilian oversight	4
Models of civilian oversight	6
Trends in contemporary civilian oversight of law enforcement	7
Effective Practices in Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement	11
The “Effective Practices” framework	11
Recommended Effective Practices	17
References	19
About the COPS Office	23

Executive Summary

In the 2010s, viral videos of seemingly routine police encounters depicting tragedy have sent shockwaves through both communities and law enforcement agencies across the country, setting off a national conversation on the relationship communities have with law enforcement. At the national level, these encounters have coincided with reduced public confidence in American policing,¹ particularly among youth and minority populations.² While low levels of trust have existed in certain communities throughout history, the most recent wave of high-profile incidents has prompted widespread calls to meaningfully address issues of community concern, such as officer-involved shootings and excessive force, discriminatory policing, aggressive crime fighting strategies, and accountability for misconduct. Across the nation, law enforcement leaders, academics, and government officials have seemingly reached a consensus that addressing such issues with a focus on public trust and legitimacy are integral to fair and effective public safety in an increasingly diverse nation.

The response by governments, law enforcement executives, community groups, and technical advisors to the challenge of mending police-community relations has been significant. In the aftermath of unrest in Ferguson, Missouri, and elsewhere, then President Barack Obama established the Task Force on 21st Century Policing to identify policing practices that promote public safety and build community trust in law enforcement.³ The *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*, published in May 2015, offered several recommendations, including many relating to public trust, procedural justice, and legitimacy; accountability and transparency; community policing efforts; and the inclusion of community members in policy development, training programs, and review of force incidents.

In addition, the task force's report recommended that civilian oversight of law enforcement be established in accordance with the needs of the community and with input from local law enforcement stakeholders.⁴ Civilian oversight of law enforcement can contribute significantly to the implementation and institutionalization of many of the task force's recommendations and further the development of public trust, legitimacy, cooperation, and collaboration necessary to improve police-community relations and enhance public safety.

At its core, civilian oversight can be broadly defined as the independent, external, and ongoing review of a law enforcement agency and its operations by individuals outside of the law enforcement agency being overseen. Civilian oversight may entail, but is not limited to, the independent investigation of

1. Gallup, "In U.S., Confidence in Police Lowest in 22 Years."

2. Gallup, "Confidence in Police Back at Historical Average."

3. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report*, 1.

4. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report*, 26.

complaints alleging officer misconduct, auditing or monitoring various aspects of the overseen law enforcement agency, analyzing patterns or trends in activity, issuing public reports, and issuing recommendations on discipline, training, policies, and procedures. Taken together, these functions can promote greater law enforcement accountability, increased transparency, positive organizational change, and improved responsiveness to community needs and concerns.

By acting as an independent and neutral body reviewing the work of the law enforcement agency and its sworn staff, civilian oversight of law enforcement offers a unique element of legitimacy that internal accountability and review mechanisms simply cannot. Similarly, a civilian oversight agency's impartiality, neutrality, and adherence to findings of fact can alleviate officer skepticism in internal systems and bolster procedural fairness within the law enforcement agency as a whole.

The organizational structure and authority of civilian oversight agencies in the United States varies widely. While civilian oversight agencies can be broadly categorized into *review-focused*, *investigation-focused*, or *auditor/monitor-focused models*, no two oversight agencies are identical. Effective civilian oversight systems will reflect the particular needs of their local partners and incorporate feedback from community members, law enforcement and their unions, and government stakeholders in order to achieve the most sustainable and appropriate structure. As the field of civilian oversight grows in sophistication, cities are frequently combining various aspects of traditional oversight models to produce hybrid forms best suited for their local context.

As a whole, this report, the nine case studies, and the online toolkit are part of NACOLE's work to expand, improve, and assist civilian oversight of law enforcement efforts throughout the country. This work provides comprehensive guidance for oversight practitioners, law enforcement, community organizations, and local officials to further develop effective civilian oversight. Additional research, guidance, and understanding will be necessary as the field of oversight continues to evolve and grow.

Introduction

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) awarded a Community Policing Development (CPD) grant to the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE). NACOLE sought to provide comprehensive guidance on civilian oversight for oversight practitioners, law enforcement, community organizations, and local officials in order to further develop effective civilian oversight throughout the United States. With support and funding from the COPS Office, NACOLE has developed nine in-depth case studies of civilian oversight agencies throughout the United States; a searchable, online database of civilian oversight agencies and their characteristics; and a report on the state of the field and effective practices.

Research methodology

In determining the most relevant trends and developments in contemporary civilian oversight, the authors considered the history of civilian oversight, the evolution of oversight models in the United States, and several other primary and secondary sources, including the following:

- Academic articles, books, and industry publications
- NACOLE's nine case studies of civilian oversight agencies
- NACOLE's report *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, published in 2016 with support from the DOJ Office of Justice Programs (OJP)⁵
- Newspaper and periodical articles pertaining to civilian oversight of law enforcement, law enforcement and criminal justice reform, and law enforcement accountability
- Oversight agency reports, data, and other materials
- Discussions with oversight practitioners and stakeholders in various jurisdictions

Data collection and analysis

Researchers have documented the absence of comprehensive and systematic data on civilian oversight of law enforcement.⁶ Such data could produce insight regarding how civilian oversight functions and lay the groundwork for developing a robust framework for evaluating its impact and performance. With this

5. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*.

6. Prenzler and Lewis, "Performance Indicators for Police Oversight Agencies;" Alpert et al., "Citizen Oversight in the United States and Canada;" De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*.

in mind, NACOLE has embarked on two attempts to gather comprehensive data on civilian oversight in the United States. This work draws heavily from two initiatives: the NACOLE/OJP survey of 2016 and the COAD survey beginning in 2017.

NACOLE/OJP survey (2016)

NACOLE's report *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence* drew insights from data gathered by an electronic survey completed by 97 civilian oversight agencies.⁷ This survey captured agency organizational information as well as information pertaining oversight directors' attitudes toward and perceptions of their agencies.

Civilian Oversight Agency Directory (COAD) survey (2017–present)

NACOLE's *Civilian Oversight Agency Directory* survey was developed, with support from the COPS Office as part of this research grant, to provide oversight practitioners, researchers, and community members with a comprehensive and up-to-date database of civilian oversight agencies. Since 2017, NACOLE has issued survey questions to capture additional information on oversight agency authority, functions, processes, resources, and enabling legislation.

The COAD is an ongoing survey that will be updated regularly. The database includes a front-end interface that permits users to filter, search, and sort through the 69 organizational variables the survey captures. The web application, survey, and database can be accessed at <http://directory.nacole.org>.

Throughout this report, data from each survey will refer to the "NACOLE/OJP" survey and "COAD," respectively.

Nine case studies of civilian oversight agencies

As part of this research project, NACOLE, with assistance from the Police Foundation, conducted nine site visits to various jurisdictions throughout the United States with established civilian oversight agencies. The purpose of these site visits was to hold semi-structured interviews with oversight agency staff, local law enforcement representatives, community groups interested in law enforcement accountability, government officials, and union representatives; collect written information and data; and to understand how each oversight agency operates on a day-to-day basis.

These site visits resulted in nine in-depth case studies, detailing the history and evolution of each oversight agency; their organizational structure and interface with both local government and the overseen law enforcement agencies; the scope of their authority and jurisdiction; their resources and staffing; and their procedures for undertaking the various oversight responsibilities.

7. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 18.

In selecting the nine oversight agencies to be studied, NACOLE sought a diverse cross-section of oversight agencies representing various oversight models, geographies, populations, law enforcement department sizes, and histories. The resulting case studies offer practical insights that can be useful to oversight practitioners, community groups, law enforcement members, and other stakeholders in different contexts throughout the country. The cities visited for these case studies are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of case study organizations

City	Agency Name	Oversight Model	Year Created	Population
Atlanta, GA	Atlanta Citizen Review Board	Investigation-focused	2007	472,522
Cambridge, MA	Police Review & Advisory Board	Review-focused	1984	113,000
Denver, CO	Office of the Independent Monitor	Auditor/monitor-focused	2004	693,060
Indianapolis, IN	Citizens' Police Complaint Office	Review-focused	1989	864,771
Los Angeles, CA	LAPD Office of the Inspector General	Auditor/monitor-focused	1995	3,976,000
Miami, FL	Civilian Investigative Panel	Investigation-focused	2001	453,579
New Orleans, LA	Independent Police Monitor	Auditor/monitor-focused	2008	391,495
Philadelphia, PA	Police Advisory Commission	Review-focused	1993	1,568,000
Washington, DC	Office of Police Complaints	Investigation-focused	1998	693,972

Report on the State of the Field and Effective Practices

The first half of the *Report on the State of the Field and Effective Practices* provides a brief overview of the history of civilian oversight, the features of traditional oversight models, and original insights on trends and developments on the current state of the field. It includes information on the geography of civilian oversight; patterns in oversight agency functions, authority, staffing, and resources; oversight agency access to department records and information; and developments in community outreach functions performed by oversight agencies across the country. This information is intended to fill existing gaps in the literature on civilian oversight and provide stakeholders with a broader understanding of the contemporary civilian oversight landscape.

Brief history of civilian oversight

Early forms of civilian oversight of law enforcement emerged during the Progressive Era amid calls for eliminating municipal corruption and disentangling the police from such corruption. In some cities, volunteer civilian police commissions were appointed by the mayor or city council to act as the board of directors for the police department, often with the authority to hire and fire the police chief and set department policy.⁸ Ultimately, however, these early police commissions proved ineffective due to the political entrenchment of the appointed commissioners⁹ and their frequent deference to the police chief.¹⁰

A more formalized concept of civilian oversight emerged amid tensions between police and minority communities in the late 1920s. In 1928, the Los Angeles Bar Association established a Committee on Constitutional Rights to record complaints of police misconduct.¹¹ As a nongovernmental body, the commission had no authority to act on complaints received.¹²

From the 1930s to 1950s, riots over race relations and police violence in urban areas gave way to strengthened movements for police accountability and improved civilian complaint processes.¹³ A breakthrough came about in Washington, D.C., in 1948, when the nation's first civilian review board (CRB) was established in response to community concerns over police using excessive force against African Americans and

8. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 18; Police Assessment Resource Center, "Review of National Police Oversight Models for the Eugene Police Commission," 7.

9. Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 1–2.

10. Police Assessment Resource Center, "Review of National Police Oversight Models for the Eugene Police Commission," 8.

11. Alpert et al., "Citizen Oversight in the United States and Canada," 181.

12. Walker, "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight," 3.

13. Walker, "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight," 3; Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*, 21.

to lobbying efforts by the Urban League and National Conference of Christians and Jews.¹⁴ This first CRB had limited visibility and effectiveness, reviewing just 54 cases in its first 16 years.¹⁵ The board was eventually abolished in 1995 amid a fiscal crisis and an unmanageable backlog of cases.¹⁶

In 1973, a group of community organizations in Berkeley, California, mounted a successful campaign prompting the city council to pass an ordinance establishing the Police Review Commission—the first civilian oversight agency specifically authorized to independently investigate police complaints.¹⁷ That same year, voters in Detroit approved a city charter amendment creating the all-civilian Detroit Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC), authorized to set department policy and independently investigate and resolve complaints.¹⁸

Less than a decade later, the San Francisco Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), now known as the Department of Police Accountability, was incorporated into the city's charter in 1982. The OCC signaled a unique development, in that the agency replaced the civilian complaint investigation functions of the San Francisco Police Department.¹⁹

The 1990s brought about significant changes to American policing, reform efforts, and civilian oversight of law enforcement. This decade experienced sharp increases in police recruitment and resources,²⁰ as well as a 41 percent spike in drug-related arrests²¹ and a focus on quality-of-life policing that contributed to the dramatic expansion of practices such as stop-and-frisk.²² Racial disparities in such enforcement,²³ as well as national media coverage of police misconduct and corruption, markedly increased unfavorable public perceptions of police, particularly within minority communities.²⁴ Concurrently, a new wave of civilian oversight agencies with expanded powers emerged, as did new efforts by the DOJ to reform police departments engaging in patterns of unconstitutional policing.

During this period, a new model of civilian oversight focused on systemic issues in law enforcement policies and procedures began to take shape. In 1991, the Seattle city council passed an ordinance establishing an independent civilian auditor to audit and review civilian complaint investigations completed by the Seat-

14. Miller, *Civilian Oversight of Policing: Lessons from the Literature*, 36; De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 19.
15. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 19; Miller, *Civilian Oversight of Policing: Lessons from the Literature*, 10.
16. The Office of Police Complaints (OPC) now provides civilian oversight in Washington, D.C. For more on the history and evolution of civilian oversight in Washington, D.C., see NACOLE's case study on the Office of Police Complaints.
17. Andi, "Berkeley's Establishment of a Police Review Commission;" Walker, "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight," 4.
18. City of Detroit, "Police Commissioners History;" Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*, 34.
19. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 20.
20. Koper, Moore, and Roth, *Putting 100,000 Officers on the Street: A Survey-Based Assessment of the Federal COPS Program*.
21. King and Maurer, "The War on Marijuana: The Transformation of the War on Drugs in the 1990s," 3.
22. Fagan and Davies, "Street Stops and Broken Windows;" Fagan et al., "Street Stops and Broken Windows Revisited: The Demography and Logic of Proactive Policing in a Safe and Changing City."
23. King and Maurer, "The War on Marijuana: The Transformation of the War on Drugs in the 1990s," 3; Fagan et al., "Street Stops and Broken Windows Revisited: The Demography and Logic of Proactive Policing in a Safe and Changing City," 2–3; Mitchell and Caudy, "Examining Racial Disparities in Drug Arrests."
24. Lasley, "The Impact of the Rodney King Incident on Citizen Attitudes toward Police;" Tuch and Weitzer, "Trends: Racial Differences in Attitudes Toward the Police;" Weitzer, "Incidents of Police Misconduct and Public Opinion;" Tyler and Fagan, "The Impact of Stop and Frisk Policies."

the Police Department's Internal Investigations Section.²⁵ Two years later, city councilmembers in San Jose, California, proactively approved an ordinance creating an Independent Police Auditor (IPA). While modeled after Seattle's civilian auditor,²⁶ the San Jose IPA was given a broader mandate and was authorized to review the complaint investigations completed by the San Jose Police Department (SJPd), analyze complaint trends and statistics, and review and recommend improvements to SJPd policies and procedures.²⁷

The turn of the century has brought renewed attention to issues surrounding law enforcement misconduct. Several violent and sometimes fatal encounters captured on video and widely circulated through social media have yielded coalitions of community groups and campaigns organizing for police accountability and racial justice nationwide.²⁸ In addition, the growing sophistication of data-based, investigative journalism has brought attention to these issues in many local contexts.²⁹

One of the most notable expansions of civilian oversight has been in the field of corrections. While NACOLE has been able to identify at least two agencies that were performing correctional oversight before 1990,³⁰ there are currently an estimated 15 oversight agencies with jurisdiction over the county sheriff, which in most jurisdictions is responsible for managing local jails.³¹

Models of civilian oversight

There is a general consensus that American civilian oversight agencies broadly follow the three models of review-focused, investigation-focused, or auditor/monitor-focused oversight, with relatively minor organizational differences distinguishing each model type.³² The review-focused model is the most prevalent form of civilian oversight in the United States, while the auditor/monitor-focused model has become increasingly common over the since 2000.

25. ACLU of Washington, "Seattle: A Call for an Independent Office for Police Accountability."

26. ACLU of Washington, "Seattle: A Call for an Independent Office for Police Accountability."

27. Walker, "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight," 5; Ferdik, Rojek, and Alpert, "Citizen Oversight in the United States and Canada," 112–13.

28. For an overview of some of the organizing work sparked by these events, see Lowery, *They Can't Kill Us All*.

29. See, for example, Kelly, Lower, and Rich, "Fired/Rehired: Police Chiefs Are Often Forced to Put Officers Fired for Misconduct Back on the Streets;" NJ Advance Media, "The Force Report;" Taggart, Hayes, and Pham, "Here are the Secret Records on Thousands of New York Police Misconduct Cases."

30. This includes the New York City Board of Correction, incorporated in the New York City charter in 1977 to perform oversight of the city's Department of Correction, and the San Diego Citizen's Law Enforcement Review Board, established in 1990.

31. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 64. Note: This number assumes that civilian oversight agencies with jurisdiction over the county sheriff perform correctional oversight. This is because sheriffs in the United States typically manage jails within the county or municipality in the majority of jurisdictions. This number does not include correctional oversight where county or municipal jails are managed by a law enforcement agency other than the sheriff, such as a Department of Corrections or similar. Similarly, it is possible that some of the agencies in this figure oversee a sheriff's department's patrol function and are thus not involved in overseeing activities and conditions within county jails.

32. Police Assessment Resource Center, "Review of National Police Oversight Models for the Eugene Police Commission;" Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*; De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*; Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*.

An emerging trend in contemporary civilian oversight is hybrid models of oversight. Many newer civilian oversight agencies perform functions or are organized in ways that go beyond the traditional definitions of the review-focused, investigation-focused, or auditor/monitor-focused models, combining several oversight functions in an effort to create an oversight system that is both proactive and reactive.³³

1. **Review-focused models** typically assess the quality of finalized complaint investigations undertaken by the police or sheriff department's internal affairs unit or conduct reviews of the overseen law enforcement agency's policies, procedures, and disciplinary activities. Review-focused models typically consist of volunteer boards and commissions and may be involved in hearing appeals, holding public forums, and making recommendations for further investigation of complaints.
2. **Investigation-focused models** employ professionally trained staff to investigate complaints of alleged misconduct independently and separately from the police or sheriff's department they are responsible for overseeing. Investigation-focused agencies are typically authorized to receive complaints. These agencies are increasingly being endowed with the authority to mediate complaints, analyze department policies and procedures, and issue recommendations to the overseen department.
3. **Auditor/monitor-focused models** take a variety of organizational forms, yet are all focused on large-scale, systemic law enforcement reform. Auditor/monitor agencies may review internal complaint investigation processes, evaluate police policies, practices, and training, actively participate in open investigations, and conduct wide-scale analyses of patterns in complaints and communicate their findings to the public.
4. **Hybrid civilian oversight exists in two ways:** hybrid agencies and hybrid systems. In the first case, an agency may primarily focus on one oversight function while also performing other functions (such as reviewing internal investigations and auditing policy compliance). In the latter case, a single jurisdiction may have multiple agencies overseeing the same department, such as an independent investigative agency and an inspector general, or a monitor agency and a civilian board acting in an advisory capacity to the law enforcement agency or other civilian oversight agency. Individual agencies assuming hybrid forms are increasingly common, but several jurisdictions have also created multiple agencies responsible for performing different oversight functions of the same law enforcement department.

Trends in contemporary civilian oversight of law enforcement

NACOLE drew from the COAD survey, NACOLE/OJP survey, oversight agency reports and written materials, and conversations with oversight practitioners to understand trends in oversight models, authority, organizational structure, resources, and functions. The most significant findings are presented here.

33. Harris, "Holding Police Accountability Theory to Account."

Growth and geography of civilian oversight in the United States

The NACOLE/OJP report found that civilian oversight is now more stable than it was in its earlier stages. While early resistance from politicians and law enforcement unions resulted in the failure and elimination of many of the nation's early civilian oversight agencies, those established more recently have been more likely to survive. Over half of the oversight agencies that responded to the NACOLE/OJP survey indicated that their agency has been in existence for over 16 years.³⁴

In mid-2005, an estimated 100 civilian oversight agencies were in existence.³⁵ By 2010, this had only increased to 102. After 2010, however, the rate of civilian oversight growth began to increase significantly; by 2016, NACOLE was able to identify 144 civilian oversight agencies.³⁶ As of late 2019, researchers had identified approximately 166 civilian oversight agencies operating in 140 jurisdictions: a 39 percent increase in the total number of civilian oversight agencies in just nine years.

The compiled data similarly show that the auditor/monitor-focused model of oversight has expanded rapidly over the past decade. While review-focused models of oversight remain by far the most common, the auditor/monitor-focused model has recently surpassed the investigation-focused model as the second most common form of oversight. From 2010 to 2019, the auditor/monitor-focused model grew 42 percent, compared to the investigation-focused model's 38 percent growth during the same period.

Although the geography of civilian oversight remains uneven, municipalities with oversight have become increasingly diverse in size. Among the 140 jurisdictions identified to have some form of civilian oversight, a large share of them are concentrated on the western and eastern coasts of the United States. A handful of states, largely in the Midwest, do not have any form of civilian oversight.

Law enforcement agencies subject to civilian oversight

Responses to the NACOLE/OJP survey revealed that municipal police departments account for 82 percent of the law enforcement agencies subject to civilian oversight; county sheriffs constitute 15 percent. Other types of law enforcement agencies are gradually being subjected to civilian oversight as well. Beginning in 2011, the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Police Department was subject to oversight from the BART Office of the Independent Police Auditor (OIPA) and the BART Police Citizen Review Board (PCRB) created in 2011. Oversight agencies are also being established for university police, such as the University of California, Davis Police Accountability Board (PAB) which oversees the university's police force.

34. Harris, "Holding Police Accountability Theory to Account," 35.

35. Walker, "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight," 1.

36. Compilation of civilian oversight agencies produced by Jillian Aldebron, JD, Howard University, for the National Institute of Justice W.E.B. DuBois Program of Research on Race and Crime, Grant No. 2016-R2-CX-0055, "Do DOJ Intervention and Citizen Oversight Improve Police Accountability."

Civilian oversight in federal- and state-level consent decrees

Federal pattern-or-practice investigations into the constitutionality of local police practices by the Civil Rights Division (CRD) of the DOJ, under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994,³⁷ have been strong impetuses for reform, including establishing or strengthening pre-existing civilian oversight systems.³⁸ Jurisdictions where federal intervention has led to the development or strengthening of civilian oversight include Albuquerque, New Mexico; Baltimore, Maryland; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Ferguson, Missouri; New Orleans, Louisiana; Newark, New Jersey; Portland, Oregon; and Washington, D.C. In Chicago, Illinois, and Riverside, California, state attorneys general have initiated pattern-or-practice investigations and the jurisdiction entered a consent decree at the state level.

Recommendation authority

A core function of civilian oversight includes the issuance of recommendations to the overseen law enforcement agency. These recommendations may concern findings on individual misconduct investigations, discipline for sustained misconduct, training, and department policies and procedures.

The COAD survey revealed that policy and procedure recommendations are the most common form of recommendation that oversight agencies are authorized to issue: nearly all survey respondents indicated such authority. Less than half—44.5 percent—of the COAD respondents reported having the authority to recommend discipline on misconduct cases.

Legislation establishing civilian oversight is increasingly adopting language requiring that the overseen law enforcement agency issue a written response to all recommendations made by the oversight agency.

Oversight budgets

The type of oversight model appears to be a strong determinant of oversight agency budgets. As noted in the NACOLE/OJP report, investigation-focused models are generally the most expensive forms of oversight because they are staffed by full-time professional investigators.³⁹ Conversely, review-focused models tend to be the least expensive because they rely on volunteer civilian boards or commissions to review completed internal investigations.⁴⁰

One trait shared by a majority of oversight agencies is that their budgets rarely exceed 0.5 percent of the budget of the law enforcement agencies they oversee. Nearly 70 percent of COAD respondents reported budgets less than or equal to 0.5 percent of the subject law enforcement agency. Nine percent of agencies reported budgets exceeding 1 percent of the overseen law enforcement agency's budget, most of which are investigation-focused models.

37. Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 42 U.S.C. § 14141(a).

38. For an overview of the Civil Rights Division's work on police reform, see: Civil Rights Division, *The Civil Rights Division's Pattern and Practice Police Reform Work: 1994–Present*.

39. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 24–26.

40. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 28.

Access to law enforcement records and information

There is significant variation in the types of law enforcement records and information that oversight agencies can access and the methods in which they are made accessible to the agency. These variations are typically associated with the agency's oversight model, with review-focused models having the least comprehensive level of access and, consistent with their broad mandates, auditor/monitor-focused models generally having the most.

Across all model types, COAD respondents reported having high levels of access to closed internal investigations and body-worn camera or in-car video. Less than half of the responding agencies reported the authority to subpoena records or officers. Access to officer or deputy personnel records was similarly low. Additionally, few oversight agencies reported having direct, back-end access to the overseen department's internal affairs databases. Auditor/monitor-focused oversight agencies in the COAD survey were most likely to have some form of direct access to this department database.

Mediation

Mediation has become an increasingly popular means of resolving civilian complaints that allege low-level forms of misconduct. The COAD data revealed that roughly 45 percent of responding agencies offered some form of mediation for complainants. Investigation-focused models, in particular, are more likely to mediate complaints. In nearly all instances where mediation is an option, officer participation is voluntary. In just one jurisdiction, Washington, D.C., is mediation compulsory for subject officers.

Agency evaluation by oversight stakeholders

The practice of ongoing evaluation of a civilian oversight agency is an emerging phenomenon. In a handful of jurisdictions, legislation establishing the oversight agency includes a requirement that one or more stakeholders outside the oversight agency periodically evaluate its work. These periodic evaluations present local stakeholders with an opportunity to identify an agency's strengths and weaknesses. Similarly, they may offer an avenue for continuous improvement of the oversight agency by proposing changes to the agency's authority, organization, jurisdiction, and resources that may be necessary to ensure the agency's effectiveness and ability to meet the needs of the community.

Given the inherent complexities of civilian oversight, there is no single approach or set of qualitative or quantitative criteria best suited for agency evaluation. The most common approach is a civilian-led entity such as an advisory board or panel. Elsewhere, the municipal auditor, controller, or similar governmental official is required to conduct the periodic evaluation. In a small number of jurisdictions, the oversight is evaluated by a consultant or through peer review.

Effective Practices in Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement

The second half of the *Report on the State of the Field and Effective Practices* focuses on the principles that underlie effective civilian oversight and recommended practices that bolster an oversight agency's ability to adhere to these principles. In total, this report offers 73 recommendations across 16 core areas of civilian oversight, such as independence, access to information, processing and managing complaints, analyzing law enforcement policies and data, issuing public reports, evaluating a civilian oversight agency, and performing community outreach. These recommendations have been developed with input from oversight professionals throughout the country and include commentary as well as additional references to assist in their implementation. While these recommendations do not cover all aspects of civilian oversight, they should be taken into consideration to determine their propriety in local contexts.

The “Effective Practices” framework

The surging growth and expansion of civilian oversight over the past decade has spurred conversations among practitioners, government officials, law enforcement, and other stakeholders regarding the application of “best practices” in the field. As part of its recommendations on policy and oversight, the *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* included an action item directing the COPS Office to “provide technical assistance and collect best practices from existing civilian oversight efforts.”⁴¹

Stakeholders seek information on practices proven to work, methods to strengthen or improve civilian oversight, and ways that desired outcomes can be achieved most effectively and efficiently. In the field of civilian oversight, however, there are important limitations that must be taken into consideration regarding the propriety and applicability of what are commonly understood as “best practice” approaches. As such, NACOLE proposes an “effective practices” framework that takes into consideration the core values and the thirteen principles that are the foundation for successful and effective oversight.

These effective practices value the diverse perspectives and wisdom of experienced practitioners while acknowledging that, within the field of civilian oversight, there are several possible paths to success. Furthermore, they are consistent with the “best fit” approach to structuring civilian oversight and prioritizing stakeholder input and dialogue, rather than merely prescribing the “best” in all contexts.

41. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report*, 26.

Thirteen principles for effective civilian oversight of law enforcement

Based largely on NACOLE's "Core Elements of Successful Oversight,"⁴² the following set of 13 principles takes into consideration findings that have emerged from the research undertaken for this project. They reflect information gleaned from scholars and oversight professionals, who have worked to identify the most important aspects of effective civilian oversight,⁴³ as well as conversations this report's authors have had with experienced oversight practitioners. Together, these 13 principles form the preconditions for effective civilian oversight of law enforcement.

In many ways, these principles are interrelated. An oversight agency cannot be successful by emphasizing one principle while de-emphasizing another. Building effective oversight requires balancing and prioritizing these principles, based on what stakeholders determine to be most important for the community the agency serves.

1. Independence

In its broadest sense, independence refers to an absence of real or perceived influence from law enforcement, political actors, and other special interests looking to affect the operations of the civilian oversight. Independence is widely understood to be imperative to an oversight agency's success and legitimacy.⁴⁴ An oversight agency must be able to act impartially, fairly, and in a manner that maintains community and stakeholder trust. In order to maintain legitimacy, an agency must be able to demonstrate the extent and impact of its independence from the overseen law enforcement agency—especially in the face of high-profile issues or incidents.

2. Clearly defined and adequate jurisdiction and authority

An oversight agency's jurisdiction and scope of authority are crucial to its success and effectiveness. While expectations regarding civilian oversight can vary significantly, having adequate jurisdiction and authority are fundamental in achieving organizational goals and ensuring the oversight agency can be responsive to communities.⁴⁵ To be effective, an agency's jurisdiction and authority must be both adequate and clearly defined in order to prevent confusion and differing interpretations of the oversight agency's authority.

42. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 36–44.

43. Perez, Common Sense About Police Review; Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*; Walker, "Core Principles for an Effective Police Auditor's Office;" Bobb, "Civilian Oversight of the Police in the United States;" Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*; King, "Effectively Implementing Civilian Oversight Boards to Ensure Police Accountability and Strengthen Police-Community Relations;" De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*.

44. Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*; Walker, "Core Principles for an Effective Police Auditor's Office;" Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*; Anderson et al., *Law Enforcement Oversight: Limited Independence, Authority & Access to Information Impede Effectiveness*.

45. De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 37; Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 7.

3. Unfettered access to records and facilities

The ability to review all records relevant to an investigation or other matters within the scope of a civilian oversight agency's authority in a timely manner is essential to providing effective, informed, and fact-driven oversight. Similarly, agencies performing correctional oversight must have unfettered access to facilities and staff. Without timely and reliable access to department records, information, and facilities, oversight practitioners and volunteers cannot make decisions that meaningfully address areas of concern.

4. Access to law enforcement executives and internal affairs staff

The effectiveness of civilian oversight can hinge on an agency's ability to effectively communicate with law enforcement officials regarding matters of concern identified throughout the course of the oversight agency's work. Whether to discuss policy, discipline, an individual misconduct investigation, or any other matter within the agency's purview, oversight must be structured so that the appropriate law enforcement officials are directly accessible and responsive to issues raised by the civilian oversight agency.⁴⁶ This sustained dialogue and communication between law enforcement and oversight stakeholders promotes cooperation and ensures that those involved can develop mutual understanding and support for each other's role in promoting greater accountability.

5. Full cooperation

In addition to having access to relevant records and department executives, effective civilian oversight requires the full cooperation of all officers and department staff throughout the course of its work.⁴⁷ Full cooperation is necessary for conducting thorough investigations and obtaining sufficient information for any work performed by the civilian oversight agency. The conditions of such cooperation must respect due process rights and an individual's constitutional right against self-incrimination.

6. Sustained stakeholder support

An otherwise well-designed civilian oversight mechanism can be undermined over time by a lack of meaningful and sustained support from those who can contribute to an agency's success.⁴⁸ This lack of support can take many forms, such as failing to provide the agency with adequate authority or resources, selecting ineffective managers or leaving board appointments vacant for prolonged periods of time, disregarding recommendations or findings, or remaining unwilling to address outstanding issues relating to the effective functioning of the civilian oversight agency. While establishing and supporting civilian oversight may be politically expedient in times of crisis, successful oversight requires the sustained support and interest of stakeholders who value independence, accountability, and transparency.⁴⁹

46. Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 7.

47. Walker, "Core Principles for an Effective Police Auditor's Office."

48. Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 7.

49. Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 6.

7. Adequate funding and operational resources

To ensure that work performed is thorough, timely, and skillful, adequate resources are necessary. In several jurisdictions, budgetary and staffing constraints have presented significant barriers to the civilian oversight agency's ability to perform critical oversight functions in a manner that is adequate, efficient, and meets the needs and expectations of community stakeholders.⁵⁰ Political stakeholders must ensure that their support for civilian oversight includes a sustained commitment to providing adequate and necessary resources.

8. Public reporting and transparency

Law enforcement agencies and their internal investigations have typically been shrouded in secrecy and public suspicion.⁵¹ The fundamental goal of civilian oversight is to have an independent entity bring transparency to this historically opaque process. Civilian oversight provides a unique opportunity for the public to learn about misconduct complaints and other areas of the law enforcement agency that serves the community. As such, issuing regular public reports is critical to an agency's credibility.⁵² Public reports should in no way be censored or modified by law enforcement or political stakeholders.⁵³ Such a practice may undermine public confidence in the agency's independence and ability to meaningfully address matters of interest to the community.

9. Policy patterns in practice analysis

Performing analyses of law enforcement policies and patterns in practice may be among the most critical functions a civilian oversight agency can perform.⁵⁴ Such analyses have great potential to advance the goals of effective civilian oversight by addressing systemic problems of law enforcement agencies and by formulating recommendations that will improve relations with communities. By performing data-driven and evidence-based analyses of specific issues, oversight agencies can pinpoint areas of concern and formulate recommendations for improvement. To hold the overseen law enforcement agency's executives accountable, timely written responses to the oversight agency's recommendations should be required and made public.

10. Community outreach

A civilian oversight body is an institution representing the interests of the local community; conducting outreach to the community and local stakeholders is essential to its effectiveness.⁵⁵ Outreach enables an oversight agency to build awareness of its existence, share reports and findings with the public, build relationships with stakeholders, recruit volunteers, solicit community input and involvement, facilitate

50. King, "Effectively Implementing Civilian Oversight Boards to Ensure Police Accountability and Strengthen Police-Community Relations," 118; Olson, *Citizens Advisory/Review Board Spokane County Sheriff's Office Oversight Review*, 6.

51. Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*, 10.

52. Jerome, "Chapter 3. Credibility, Impartiality, and Independence in Citizen Oversight," 38.

53. Walker, "Core Principles for an Effective Police Auditor's Office," 6.

54. Walker and Archbold, *The New World of Police Accountability*.

55. Walker, *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*; De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 42–43.

learning and greater understanding, broker improved relationships, build coalitions, and develop a greater capacity for problem-solving.⁵⁶ These functions are crucial to an agency's overall transparency, credibility, responsiveness, accountability, accessibility, and overall ability to successfully maintain public support and legitimacy.⁵⁷

11. Community involvement

Community and stakeholder input regarding how civilian oversight should function and which accountability issues it should address will result in the creation of a "best fit" oversight system that can meet community needs and expectations. Without sufficient involvement of those most interested in and impacted by local issues regarding law enforcement, it is unlikely that civilian oversight will be able to successfully accomplish its goals.⁵⁸

12. Confidentiality, anonymity, and protection from retaliation

Civilian oversight must function with the same integrity, professionalism, and ethical standards it expects from and promotes for law enforcement. Stakeholders and the community must remain confident that civilian oversight will protect sensitive information as well as those who disclose it. An oversight agency cannot maintain credibility, legitimacy, and public trust if it does not or cannot respect confidentiality agreements, maintain the anonymity of those who wish to share information anonymously, and work towards creating an environment where those involved with or contacting the oversight agency can do so without fear of retaliation or retribution.

13. Procedural justice and legitimacy

Rooted in behavioral psychology, procedural justice typically centers on *how* authority is exercised. For entities whose authority is established by law, the recognition of their right to that authority and perceptions of how fairly that authority is exercised are crucial components of legitimacy.⁵⁹

Research has shown that procedurally just interactions between law enforcement and the community positively impact the public's compliance with laws⁶⁰ and willingness to assist in crime control efforts.⁶¹ The literature has also shown that officer perceptions of a procedurally just work environment are associated with reduced misconduct and corruption,⁶² as well as greater endorsement of policing reforms, reduced mistrust of and cynicism about the community, willingness to obey supervisors, and increased officer well-being.⁶³

56. Stewart, "Chapter 11. Community Outreach and Public Education in Citizen Oversight," 149–51.

57. Stewart, "Chapter 11. Community Outreach and Public Education in Citizen Oversight;" Attard and Olson, *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*.

58. McDevitt, Farrell, and Andresen, *Enhancing Citizen Participation in the Review of Complaints and Use of Force in the Boston Police Department*, 7–8; De Angelis, Rosenthal, and Buchner, *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*, 43–44.

59. Sunshine and Tyler, "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing;" Jackson et al., "Why Do People Comply with the Law?;" Mazerolle et al., *Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Policing*.

60. Sunshine and Tyler, "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing."

61. Murphy, Hinds, and Fleming, "Encouraging Public Cooperation and Support for Police."

62. Wolfe and Piquero, "Organizational Justice and Police Misconduct."

63. Trinkner, Tyler, and Goff, "Justice from Within."

Successful civilian oversight leverages the principles of procedural justice to bolster legitimacy with the all members of the community. There is research supporting the notion that a procedurally just complaint processes—where complainants report being satisfied with the quality of communication and the process⁶⁴—increases complainant satisfaction.⁶⁵ It is equally important that civilian oversight establish legitimacy with law enforcement and law enforcement unions by operating in accordance with the principles of procedural justice. Effective civilian oversight must work to overcome an “us versus them” mindset by proceeding with respect, trustworthy and unbiased motives, genuine interest in the concerns of law enforcement, and clear communication of the processes and decisions pursuant to the oversight agency’s official duties.

64. De Angelis, “Assessing the Impact of Oversight and Procedural Justice on the Attitudes of Individuals Who File Police Complaints.”

65. Worden, Bonner, and McLean, “Procedural Justice and Citizen Review of Complaints Against the Police.”

Recommended Effective Practices

The remainder of the report focuses on certain key areas in civilian oversight and presents recommendations for practitioners to consider in their own work. Each recommendation focuses on strengthening an agency's practices in relation to the thirteen principles for effective civilian oversight and includes a brief commentary with additional information, resources, and examples from the field. While the authors of this report have attempted to develop an extensive list of effective practices, it should not be considered exhaustive. This report focuses largely on addressing recurring themes or concerns identified by practitioners and stakeholders throughout the course of this research.

The recommendations for effective practices, described in this section, are meant to offer guidance, not concrete solutions. As discussed earlier, the challenges associated with civilian oversight can rarely be boiled down to technical problems with technical solutions. When considering a particular practice, oversight practitioners should ensure that the new practice can be implemented sustainably, with the resources, staff, cooperation, and political support necessary to continue a practice into the future. An agency unable to deliver a level or type of service that it once did risks losing public confidence and legitimacy.

Oversight practitioners must consider each recommendation with a mindset oriented towards a "best fit" approach, and consider the following questions with all relevant stakeholders prior to implementing a particular practice:

- 1. Is this practice an appropriate fit for our local context?**

Not all recommended practices will be appropriate for every jurisdiction or oversight system. Oversight practitioners must carefully discuss recommendations under consideration with local stakeholders and gather feedback concerning each recommendation. It is important for stakeholders and community members to fully understand what a particular recommendation seeks to accomplish and how it can be implemented within their local context.

- 2. How will this practice strengthen civilian oversight in relation to the thirteen principles for effective oversight?**

Before establishing or revising an existing civilian oversight system, stakeholders must evaluate its strengths and weaknesses in relation to the 13 principles of effectiveness. While each recommendation is framed in a way that focuses on satisfying or maximizing a particular principle, stakeholders

should consider whether adopting a particular recommendation will achieve its intended outcome in their jurisdiction. Implementing one recommendation that strengthens a principle may not sufficiently address a particular weakness or other related shortcomings of the agency. Additional changes may be necessary to achieve the civilian oversight agency's goals.

3. What are the potential unintended consequences of implementing this practice?

Stakeholders should consider and discuss the potential unintended consequences associated with a particular practice. While a practice may strengthen the oversight system in one area, it may have the unintended consequence of undermining the oversight system in another. For example, the implementation of certain practices could have significant impacts on the existing or proposed resources of the agency.

References

- ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) of Washington. "Seattle: A Call for an Independent Office for Police Accountability." American Civil Liberties Union of Washington. Last modified June 11, 1999. <https://www.aclu-wa.org/news/seattle-call-independent-office-police-accountability>.
- Alpert, Geoffrey P., Tyler Cawthray, Jeff Rojek, and Frank Ferdik. "Citizen Oversight in the United States and Canada: Applying Outcome Measures and Evidence-Based Concepts." In *Civilian Oversight of Police: Advancing Accountability in Law Enforcement*, edited by Tim Prenzler and Garth den Heyer, 179–204. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2016.
- Anderson, Justin, Larry Brubaker, Sean DeBlieck, Brooke Leary, and David Dean. *Law Enforcement Oversight: Limited Independence, Authority & Access to Information Impede Effectiveness*. Seattle: King County Auditor's Office, 2015. <https://kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/auditor/new-web-docs/2015/kcso-oleo-2015/kcso-oleo-2015.ashx?la=en>.
- Andi, Jennifer. "Berkeley's Establishment of a Police Review Commission." Accessed December 3, 2018. [https://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Berkeley%E2%80%99s Establishment of a Police Review Commission](https://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Berkeley%E2%80%99s%20Establishment%20of%20a%20Police%20Review%20Commission).
- Attard, Barbara, and Kathryn Olson. *Overview of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in the United States*. San Francisco: Accountability Associates, 2013. <https://accountabilityassociates.org/wp-content/uploads/Oversight-in-the-US-%E2%80%A6FINAL.pdf>.
- Bobb, Merrick J. "Civilian Oversight of the Police in the United States." *Saint Louis University Public Law Review* 22, no. 1 (2003), 151–166. <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1360&context=plr>.
- City of Detroit. "Police Commissioners History." Accessed December 3, 2018. <https://detroitmi.gov/government/boards/board-police-commissioners/police-commissioners-history>.
- Civil Rights Division. *The Civil Rights Division's Pattern and Practice Police Reform Work: 1994–Present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2017. <https://www.justice.gov/crt/file/922421/download>.
- De Angelis, Joseph, Richard Rosenthal, and Brian Buchner. *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, 2016. https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/nacole/pages/159/attachments/original/1476745119/NACOLE_AssessingtheEvidence_Final.pdf?1476745119.
- De Angelis, Joseph. "Assessing the Impact of Oversight and Procedural Justice on the Attitudes of Individuals Who File Police Complaints." *Police Quarterly* 12, no. 2 (2009), 214–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109332425>.

- Fagan, Jeffrey, Amanda Geller, Garth Davies, and Valerie West. "Street Stops and Broken Windows Revisited: The Demography and Logic of Proactive Policing in a Safe and Changing City." In *Race, Ethnicity, and Policing: New and Essential Readings*, edited by Stephen Rice K. and Michael D. White, 59. New York: New York University Press, 2010.
- Fagan, Jeffrey, and Garth Davies. "Street Stops and Broken Windows: Terry, Race and Disorder in New York City." *Fordham Urban Law Review Journal* XXVIII (2001), 458–504. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.257813>.
- Ferdik, Frank V., Jeff Rojek, and Geoffrey P. Alpert. "Citizen Oversight in the United States and Canada: An Overview." *Police Practice and Research* 14, no. 2 (2013), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2013.767089>.
- Harris, F. "Holding Police Accountability Theory to Account." *Policing* 6, no. 3 (2012), 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pas003>.
- Jackson, Jonathan, Ben Bradford, Mike Hough, Andy Myhill, Paul Quinton, and Tom Tyler. "Why Do People Comply with the Law? Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions." *British Journal of Criminology* 52, no. 6 (2012), 1051–1071. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1994490>.
- Jerome, Richard. "Chapter 3. Credibility, Impartiality, and Independence in Citizen Oversight." In *Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement*, edited by Justina Cintrón Perino, 21–45. Chicago: ABA Publishing, 2006.
- Jones, Jeffrey M. "In U.S., Confidence in Police Lowest in 22 Years." Gallup.com, June 19, 2015. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/183704/confidence-police-lowest-years.aspx>.
- Kelly, Kimbriell, Wesley Lower, and Steven Rich. "Fired/Rehired: Police Chiefs Are Often Forced to Put Officers Fired for Misconduct Back on the Streets." *Washington Post*, August 3, 2017. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/investigations/police-fired-rehired/>.
- King, Kevin. "Effectively Implementing Civilian Oversight Boards to Ensure Police Accountability and Strengthen Police-Community Relations." *Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal* 12, no. 1 (2015), 91–120. https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1121&context=hastings_race_poverty_law_journal.
- King, Ryan S, and Marc Mauer. "The War on Marijuana: The Transformation of the War on Drugs in the 1990s." *Harm Reduction Journal* 3, no. 1 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7517-3-6>.
- Koper, Christopher K., Gretchen E. Moore, and Jeffrey A. Roth. *Putting 100,000 Officers on the Street: A Survey-Based Assessment of the Federal COPS Program*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2003. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/200521.pdf>.
- Lasley, J. R. "The Impact of the Rodney King Incident on Citizen Attitudes toward Police." *Policing and Society* 3, no. 4 (1994), 245–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.1994.9964673>.
- Lowery, Wesley. *They Can't Kill Us All: Ferguson, Baltimore, and a New Era in America's Racial Justice Movement*. First edition. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2016.

- Mazerolle, Lorraine Green, Elise Sargeant, Adrian Cherney, Sarah Bennett, Kristina Murphy, Emma Antrobus, and Peter Martin. *Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Policing*. SpringerBriefs in Criminology. New York: Springer, 2014.
- McDevitt, Dean Jack, Amy Farrell, and W. Carsten Andresen. *Enhancing Citizen Participation in the Review of Complaints and Use of Force in the Boston Police Department*. Boston: Northeastern University Institute on Race and Justice, 2005.
- Miller, Joel. *Civilian Oversight of Policing: Lessons from the Literature*. Report from the Global Meeting on Civilian Oversight of Police, 2001. <https://www.vera.org/publications/civilian-oversight-of-policing-lessons-from-the-literature>.
- Mitchell, Ojmarrh, and Michael S. Caudy. "Examining Racial Disparities in Drug Arrests." *Justice Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2015), 288–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2012.761721>.
- Murphy, Kristina, Lyn Hinds, and Jenny Fleming. "Encouraging Public Cooperation and Support for Police." *Policing and Society* 18, no. 2 (2008), 136–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460802008660>.
- NJ Advance Media. "The Force Report." NJ.com. Accessed June 21, 2021. <https://force.nj.com/>.
- Norman, Jim. "Confidence in Police Back at Historical Average." Gallup.com, July 10, 2017. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/213869/confidence-police-back-historical-average.aspx>.
- Olson, Kathryn. *Citizens Advisory/Review Board Spokane County Sheriff's Office: Oversight Review*. Gig Harbor, WA: Change Integration Consulting, 2016. https://media.spokesman.com/documents/2016/05/Spokane_Citizens_Advisory_Board_report_Kathryn_Olson_May_5_2016.pdf.
- Perez, Douglas W. *Common Sense About Police Review*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Police Assessment Resource Center. *Review of National Police Oversight Models for the Eugene Police Commission*. Los Angeles: Police Assessment Resource Center, 2005. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5498b74ce4b01fe317ef2575/t/54caf3abe4b04c8e2a3b6691/1422586795583/Review+of+National+Police+Oversight+Models+%20Feb.+2005%20.pdf>.
- Prenzler, Tim, and Colleen Lewis. "Performance Indicators for Police Oversight Agencies." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64, no. 2 (2005), 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2005.00443.x>.
- President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, May 2015. https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf.
- Stewart, Lauri K. "Chapter 11. Community Outreach and Public Education in Citizen Oversight." In *Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement*, edited by Justina Cintrón Perino, 147–167. Chicago: ABA Publishing, 2006.
- Sunshine, Jason, and Tom R. Tyler. "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing." *Law & Society Review* 37, no. 3 (2003), 513–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002>.

- Taggart, Kendall, Mike Hayes, and Scott Pham. "Here are the Secret Records on Thousands of New York Police Misconduct Cases." BuzzFeed News. Last modified April 16, 2018. <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/kendalltaggart/nypd-police-misconduct-database>.
- Trinkner, Rick, Tom R. Tyler, and Phillip Atiba Goff. "Justice from Within: The Relations Between a Procedurally Just Organizational Climate and Police Organizational Efficiency, Endorsement of Democratic Policing, and Officer Well-Being." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 22, no. 2 (2016), 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000085>.
- Tuch, Steven A., and Ronald Weitzer. "Trends: Racial Differences in Attitudes Toward the Police." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (1997), 642–663.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Jeffrey Fagan. "The Impact of Stop and Frisk Policies Upon Police Legitimacy." *Key Issues in the Police Use of Pedestrian Stops and Searches: Discussion Papers from an Urban Institute Roundtable*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e527872013-001>.
- Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 42 U.S.C. § 14141 § (1994). <https://legcounsel.house.gov/Comps/103-322.pdf>.
- Walker, Samuel, and Carol Archbold. *The New World of Police Accountability*. Second edition. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2014.
- Walker, Samuel. "Chapter 1. The History of Citizen Oversight." In *Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement*, edited by Justina Cintrón Perino, 1–10. Chicago: ABA Publishing, 2006.
- . "Core Principles for an Effective Police Auditor's Office." Omaha, NE: Report of the First National Police Auditors Conference, March 2003. <https://samuelwalker.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/core-principles.pdf>.
- . *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*. Houston: Wadsworth Thompson Learning, 2001.
- Weitzer, Ronald. "Incidents of Police Misconduct and Public Opinion." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30, no. 5 (2002), 397–408. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(02\)00150-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(02)00150-2).
- Wolfe, Scott E., and Alex R. Piquero. "Organizational Justice and Police Misconduct." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 38, no. 4 (2011), 332–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810397739>.
- Worden, Robert E., Heidi S. Bonner, and Sarah J. McLean. "Procedural Justice and Citizen Review of Complaints Against the Police: Structure, Outcomes, and Complainants' Subjective Experiences." *Police Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (2018), 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611117739812>.

About the COPS Office

The **Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office)** is the component of the U.S. Department of Justice responsible for advancing the practice of community policing by the nation's state, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources.

Community policing begins with a commitment to building trust and mutual respect between police and communities. It supports public safety by encouraging all stakeholders to work together to address our nation's crime challenges. When police and communities collaborate, they more effectively address underlying issues, change negative behavioral patterns, and allocate resources.

Rather than simply responding to crime, community policing focuses on preventing it through strategic problem-solving approaches based on collaboration. The COPS Office awards grants to hire community policing officers and support the development and testing of innovative policing strategies. COPS Office funding also provides training and technical assistance to community members and local government leaders, as well as all levels of law enforcement.

Since 1994, the COPS Office has invested more than \$14 billion to add community policing officers to the nation's streets, enhance crime fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to help advance community policing. Other achievements include the following:

- To date, the COPS Office has funded the hiring of approximately 130,000 additional officers by more than 13,000 of the nation's 18,000 law enforcement agencies in both small and large jurisdictions.
- Nearly 700,000 law enforcement personnel, community members, and government leaders have been trained through COPS Office-funded training organizations.
- Almost 500 agencies have received customized advice and peer-led technical assistance through the COPS Office Collaborative Reform Initiative Technical Assistance Center.
- To date, the COPS Office has distributed more than eight million topic-specific publications, training curricula, white papers, and resource CDs and flash drives.
- The COPS Office also sponsors conferences, round tables, and other forums focused on issues critical to law enforcement.

COPS Office information resources, covering a wide range of community policing topics such as school and campus safety, violent crime, and officer safety and wellness, can be downloaded via the COPS Office's home page, <https://cops.usdoj.gov>.

The wave of high-profile incidents in 2020 between police and community members has prompted widespread calls for greater community oversight of law enforcement agencies. This is an executive summary of *Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Report on the State of the Field and Effective Oversight Practices*, a white paper by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) that combines survey data, case studies of oversight bodies nationwide, and a literature review to outline the history of civilian oversight and its spread; define three standard oversight models and discuss their implementation; propose 13 principles for effective oversight; and provide recommendations for each within an effective practices framework.



COPS
Community Oriented Policing Services
U.S. Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
145 N Street NE
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details about COPS Office programs,
call the COPS Office Response Center at 800-421-6770.

Visit the COPS Office online at cops.usdoj.gov.



National Association for Civilian
Oversight of Law Enforcement

P.O. Box 20851
Indianapolis, IN 46220-0851

Memorandum Item 6



DATE August 10, 2021

CITY OF DALLAS

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT 2021 Training Schedule for the Board

The CPOB is not only committed to community engagement, it is also committed to continued learning in the areas of oversight, policing, criminal justice and any other topics the Board deems relevant to its work.

Below is the CPOB Training Schedule for 2021.

2021 CPOB Training Calendar

January

- 27th = NACOLE Analyzing and Reporting Use of Force Statistics (1 ½ hours)

February

- 23rd = NACOLE Civilian Oversight of police Surveillance Technology (1 ½ hours)

March

- 3rd = NACOLE Death Anxiety and Police Culture (1 ½ hours)

April

- 6th = NACOLE Investigation and Systemic Review of Police Responses to Large-scale Protests (1 ½ hours)
- 13th = OCPO Board training: “How Can Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement Help You?” (45 minutes)

May

- 11th = OCPO Board Training: “When Communities Try to hold Police Accountable, Law Enforcement Fights Back” (45 minutes)
- 18th = NACOLE National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice (1 ½ hours)

June

- 8th = OCPO Board Training: Community-Police engagement: *“Improved Outcomes in Racially Charged Police Encounters: Making the Case for Decision-Based Training”* (30 minutes)
- 9th = NACOLE Role of the First-Line Supervisor in Facilitating Change in Law Enforcement Organizations (1 ½ hours)

July

- No Board Trainings Scheduled

August

- 4th = Cognificant Learning & Toby Groves Productions: Accountability and Transparency in Law Enforcement: After Action Review (4 hours)
- 10th = OCPO Board Training: NACOLE Report *“The Evolution and Growth of Civilian Oversight: Key Principles and Practices for Effectiveness and Sustainability”* (45 minutes)

Tonya McClary
OCPO Director

cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Memorandum Item 7



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE August 10, 2021

TO Members of the Community Police Oversight Board

SUBJECT Board Member Update on Scheduling Town Hall Meetings

Board members will provide an update on their efforts to schedule a town hall meeting in their district.

The following CPOB town hall meetings have already been held:

1. Districts 9, 13 and 14 (Joint town hall meeting) = June 1, 2021
2. District 10 = July 1, 2021
3. District 3 = July 27, 2021

Cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager



City of Dallas

**Community Police Oversight
Board (CPOB) 2021 Schedule**

City Hall
1500 Marilla Street
City Council Chambers, 6EN
Dallas, Texas 75201

Item 8

Community Police Oversight Board meetings are held every 2nd Tuesday of each month, unless noted otherwise. Meetings are held at Dallas City Hall, 1500 Marilla, City Council Chambers, 6EN or virtually. Meetings normally begin at 5:30p.m. unless noted otherwise.

January 12, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

February 9, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

March 9, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

April 13, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

May 11, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

June 8, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30 p.m.

July 13, 2021 – Board Recess

August 10, 2021 – Video Conference at 5:30p.m.

September 14, 2021 – City Council Chambers, 6EN

October 12, 2021 – City Council Chambers, 6EN

November 9, 2021 – City Council Chambers, 6EN

December 14, 2021 – City Council Chambers, 6EN