Discipline Matrix Ad Hoc Meeting Minutes (1/29/2025)

Meeting Minutes

Time: 6:05 PM - 7:40 PM

Attendees:

- **Chair:** Ricardo Garcia-Acosta
- **Acting Captain:** Bryan Hubbard
- **Deacon:** Reginald Lyles
- **Chief of Staff:** Mykah Montgomery
- **Community Ad Hoc Member:** Chair Emeritus Marsha Carpenter Peterson
- **Community Ad Hoc Member:** Cathy Leonard
- **Community Participant:** Reisa

Main Topics Discussed:

1. **Defining and Addressing Patterns of Conduct**
   - Developing a comprehensive policy to identify patterns of Class 2 violations.
   - Establishing criteria for patterns (2 years with 3 or more incidents).
   - Expanding and standardizing supervisory note files for consistent reporting.

2. **Supervisory Accountability**
   - Assigning responsibility to supervisors for documenting and reviewing incidents.
   - Ensuring supervisory note files accurately reflect corrective actions taken.

3. **Bias in Supervisory Notes**

- Addressing inconsistencies and implicit bias in supervisory note files.
  - Strategies for standardizing corrective and training actions to avoid hidden bias.

4. **Vision System Improvements**
  - Current capabilities and limitations of the Vision system in tracking violations.
  - Future improvements, including potential notifications to higher ranks.

5. **Policy Review**
  - Reviewing critical manual rules such as prohibited activities, notification requirements, privileged information misuse, and reporting misconduct.

6. **Public and Committee Input**
  - Discussion of definitions, including "notification" and "patterns of misconduct," and potential amendments to existing policies.
  - Exploring how supervisory note files align with the discipline matrix.

Questions and Concerns Raised:

- **Cathy Leonard:** Questioned the rationale behind the 2-year timeframe for identifying patterns. Suggested it may be too short in cases of severe misconduct.
- **Ricardo Garcia-Acosta:** Raised concerns about subjectivity in supervisory note files and suggested the use of structured dropdown menus to standardize reporting.
- **Reginald Lyles:** Highlighted the need for clear accountability at every level—supervisors, lieutenants, and captains—to ensure proper evaluations and prevent bias.
- **Marsha Carpenter Peterson:** Emphasized the importance of wordsmithing policy terms, including "notification" to clarify serious notifications versus general ones.

Suggestions and Recommendations:

- **Standardized Reporting Format:** Adopt a structured template for supervisory note files to include employee details, incident summary, and corrective actions.

- **Dropdown Menus:** Expand and refine dropdown options within the Vision system to promote consistent data entry and analysis.
- **Policy Revisions:** Adjust the definition of "patterns" to consider longer timeframes for chronic issues, as well as more severe actions for specific violations.
- **Training Programs:** Develop enhanced mid-level training programs for supervisors on recognizing patterns and preventing bias in reporting.
- **Accountability Measures:** Incorporate evaluations of supervisors' handling of patterns as part of their annual reviews.

Next Steps:

1. **Policy Draft:** Bryan Hubbard to finalize the draft policy update and incorporate feedback regarding patterns, notification requirements, and supervisory accountability.
2. **Follow-Up Presentation:** Schedule a presentation to share finalized updates with the Oakland Police Commission.
3. **Vision System Improvements:** Collaborate with the Vision team to implement enhanced reporting capabilities and automatic notifications.
4. **Juvenile Interactions:** Bryan Hubbard to clean up the standalone section on juvenile interactions and present updates at the next meeting.
5. **Class 1 and Class 2 Violation Reviews:** Continue addressing and reviewing remaining manual rules, starting with the highlighted sections at the next meeting.

Adjournment:

00:55:40

Reisa:

Thank you, Deacon Lyles, for addressing intent!

01:07:37

Oakland Police Commission (COS Montgomery):

2. Supervisor File Reviews and Audits

Several departments mandate regular supervisor audits of officer files to check for patterns of misconduct over a specific timeframe (e.g., 2 years). Departments with stricter accountability systems (such as Boston PD) may extend this review to 5 years for certain types of violations, while others may have shorter periods for minor infractions.

Supervisors review records such as:

- **Prior internal investigations**
- **Disciplinary actions**
- **Use of force reports**

These reviews are key to detecting trends that might otherwise go unnoticed, such as repeated minor violations that may escalate over time.

01:10:14

Oakland Police Commission (COS Montgomery):

1. Early Intervention Systems (EIS) or Early Warning Systems (EWS)

Many departments, including large agencies like the NYPD, LAPD, and Chicago PD, utilize EIS or EWS programs to detect patterns of officer misconduct or problematic behavior. These systems typically track incidents such as:

- **Use of force complaints**
- **Citizen complaints**
- **Internal affairs investigations**
- **Vehicle pursuits or accidents**
- **Arrest-related incidents**

Once a pattern is identified, supervisors may be required to initiate early intervention measures, such as:

- **Counseling sessions**
- **Training and remediation programs**
- **Temporary reassignment or increased supervision**

Some systems, like that of the Miami Police Department, trigger alerts after a threshold of incidents (e.g., 3 or more complaints within 12 months).

01:11:16

Ricardo Garcia-Acosta:

Thank you, Mykah!

01:11:16

Oakland Police Commission (COS Montgomery):

7. Variations in Timeframes Across Departments

Different departments enforce varying periods for reviewing an officer's past conduct when assessing patterns:

- **2-Year Review: Common for moderate violations (e.g., tardiness, minor use of force complaints)**
- **3- to 5-Year Review: Common for severe incidents, including complaints of excessive force, dishonesty, or criminal activity**
- **No Time Limit (Lifetime Review): In certain high-profile cases, patterns of misconduct spanning an officer's entire career may be considered (e.g., for officers being reviewed for promotions or when investigating severe misconduct).**

01:11:26

Oakland Police Commission:

Department Review Periods and Descriptions

Department	Review Period	Description
LAPD	2 Years	Supervisors review officers' history to check for repeated violations before issuing new discipline.
Chicago Police Department	5 Years (Major Offenses)	Disciplinary panels review serious offenses (e.g., use of force) within a 5-year window.
Seattle Police Department	Ongoing (with annual reviews)	Early intervention triggers apply continuously, monitored by supervisors and analysts.