

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW BOARD
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2020
Electronic Special Meeting – 6:00 PM
ZOOM MEETING PLATFORM

Electronic Meeting

(Pursuant to Iowa Code section 21.8)

An electronic meeting is being held because a meeting in person is impossible or impractical due to concerns for the health and safety of Commission members, staff and the public presented by COVID-19.

You can participate in the meeting and can comment on an agenda item by going to https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_G8AUqJLFRGKpJDZh_mkPhA via the internet to visit the Zoom meeting's registration page and submit the required information.

Once approved, you will receive an email message with a link to join the meeting. If you are asked for a meeting or webinar ID, enter the ID number found in the email. A meeting password may also be included in the email. Enter the password when prompted.

If you have no computer or smartphone, or a computer without a microphone, you may call in by telephone by dialing (312) 626-6799. When prompted, enter the meeting or webinar ID. The ID number for this meeting is: **944 6892 3315**

Once connected, you may dial *9 to "raise your hand," letting the meeting host know you would like to speak. Providing comments in person is not an option.

ITEM NO. 1 CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

ITEM NO. 2 OLD BUSINESS

- Discussion Item No. 8 of Resolution 20-159 (Resolution of Initial Council Commitments addressing the Black Lives Matter Movement and Systemic Racism in the wake of the murder of George Floyd by Minneapolis Police and calls for action from protesters and residents)

ITEM NO. 3 ADJOURNMENT

If you will need disability-related accommodations in order to participate in this program/event, please contact Chris Olney at 319-356-5043, christine-olney@iowa-city.org. Early requests are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to meet your access needs.

1. "All sustained complaints against officers and all publicly published reports should identify officers involved and be entered into a publicly searchable database that is readily accessible on the city government's website, browsable, and searchable by officer name."

Comments:

2. **All complaints filed directly through the police department should be forwarded to the CPRB within 7 business days of the filing date. CPRB EMPOWERED TO INVESTIGATE ANY OCCURRENCE**

Comments:

3. **CPRB should have the authority to hire an independent auditor to review the police department's internal investigation procedures and make recommendations. Review IA investigations (investigations that were not part of the CPRB complaint process but involved police misconduct).**

Comments:

4. **CPRB should have the authority to require officers to participate in mediation if the complainant desires and the CPRB finds it appropriate to the situation.**

Comments: This could involve consent decrees with the Department of Justice as in Baltimore, Maryland; Ferguson Missouri; and New Orleans, Louisiana

5. **CPRB should have the authority to issue formal reprimands with legal standing for officer misconduct as in Newark, New Jersey. CPRB findings/rulings should be binding --unless disputed by the Chief of Police-- and they should be acted upon within fourteen days. The chief of Police shall, within that time frame, provide the CPRB with a summary of disciplinary actions taken, the history of previous allegations of misconduct against the officer, and any history of found misconduct and/or discipline. This response should be public record. If the Chief of Police disputes the ruling, the dispute should go to the City Council to be settled by a public vote. If the CPRB recommends that an officer is terminated or faces other disciplinary action, it should only be reversible by a council vote. CPRB SHOULD BE GIVEN POWER TO REVIEW AND REPORT ON DISCIPLINE WHEN MISCONDUCT IS FOUND, AND TO APPEAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR A HEARING ON THE DISCIPLINE ISSUED (OR LACKTHEREOF) WHEN THERE IS DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE POLICE CHIEF/CITY MANAGER. CPRB must be able to go beyond recommendations to the Chief and actually be able to enforce**

disciplinary action in cases of police misconduct and systemic issues within the ICPD. Examples: Firing officers with one or more excessive force complaints. Immediate disarm of officers who use weapons in incidents that there was no confirmed armed suspect. The board should have authority to enact and enforce measurable consequences when the board recommendations are not followed or implemented

Comments: Under the current system the Board sends its report to the City Council it never receives any written response concerning any actions taken. This is especially noticeable in situations where the Police Chief reviews the information and finds that the officer did not violate the citizen's rights, but the Board, after viewing the information finds that the citizen's rights were violated. Under the current set up it seems that the CPRB is involved, but has no influence over the outcome.

Comments: The Board doesn't need officers names but in situations where discipline is necessary can actions taken be shared with the Board?

Comments: This proposed change addresses a critical part of the oversight function that is missing: accountability/ramifications for instances of misconduct. Presently, the board only reports whether it finds misconduct. The value of this limited review should be restated: in most instances misconduct was not found to be present by the CPRB, and having a panel of impartial community members review cases and report that they concur with the findings of the police has and continues to provide reassurance while saving large expense. However, in complaints where misconduct is found, in order to obtain effective oversight, some authority to weigh in on the discipline of the officer must be provided.

Caution must be taken as CPRB members are not trained in human resources and/or the disciplining of officers. Still, in the least CPRB should be informed of the disciplinary measures that were taken, and the reasonings behind such decision. Such findings should be included in the report from the Chief or City Manager, and should include, among other information, the history of previous allegations of misconduct against the officer and any history of found misconduct and/or discipline.

It is further proposed, in instances where the CPRB found misconduct, they should be able to discuss with the Chief/City Manager the recommended discipline. If the CPRB disagrees with the final finding of discipline by the Chief, it may include such findings in its public report. At discretion of the CPRB, by majority vote, the CPRB should be allowed to appeal the Chief's finding of discipline to the City Council for a hearing in which the City Council would ultimately decide the discipline of the officer. (DS)

- 6. The CPRB should have authority to initiate investigations and reviews at its sole discretion, without the necessity of a filed complaint, and have unfettered access to relevant documents including full direct access to witnesses and police documents as well as mandatory cooperation of police for any instance or occurrence, including for any instances reported in the quarterly data for review. As with others, these investigations should be made public**

Comments: (The purpose of this proposed change is to allow for oversight beyond the narrow confines of the instances where a formal complaint has been raised to the attention of the CPRB. Data records will allow for identification of trends and more knowledge of the policing and how it is being performed on the several important topics. The list of important topics can be altered and expounded upon. Quarterly reports will allow for more timely responses and investigations than annual reports.) (DS)

Comments: This requires that officers keep their body cameras operational at all times and on during all public duties. Officers who fail to do so should face disciplinary action and will be terminated in the event of multiple violations. (LMG)

- 7. The CPRB should have the authority to hire/fire the chief of police as in Oakland, California**

Comments:

- 8. CPRB should conduct quarterly reviews of police stops and arrests with breakdowns of the attending demographic information including stops and arrests by race and ethnicity. These reports should be provided by the Chief of Police. THE ICPD SHOULD PROVIDE THE CPRB WITH QUARTERLY REPORTS INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING DATE FOR REVIEW:**

- i. Total number of detained individuals
- ii. Demographics of the individuals detained

ii. Total number of arrests

iv. Demographics of those arrested

V. Number of occurrences where physical use of force model was used for on an individual to the Use of Force model's level of resistor.

- vi. Number of occurrences where physical use of force was used on a individual to the Use of Force model's level of assailant.
- vii. Number of occurrences when weapons were drawn by police,(DS) (including during precautionary positioning maneuvers AN).

For each occurrence: (DS)

- 1. Number of individuals involved
- 2. Race of non-officer individuals involved
- 3. Whether the weapon was pointed at any civilian
- 4. Whether the weapon was discharged (DS)
- 5. Stated reason for (DS) drawing and/or (AN) discharge of weapon (DS)
- 6. Whether any non-officer individual had a weapon
- 7. Whether the non-officer individual used or tried to use the weapon against any officer

viii. Number of occurrences where an officer or civilian was injured and for each occurrence:

- 1. Who was injured
- 2. Whether professional medical treatment was requested
- 3. Whether professional medical treatment was provided

Comments:

- 9. CPRB should be provided city funding for awareness and accessibility improvements.**

Comments:

- 10. CPRB should be provided funding and authority to hire advocates with trauma awareness training to assist complainants who desire their services with maneuvering the process Advocates would provide**

assistance and support as needed in filling out and submitting paperwork and attending meetings and interviews. They would also be able to file complaints on behalf of the complainant.

Comments:

11. Require reporting and CPRB review for all incidences where an officer draws a gun on a subject or uses their firearm during precautionary positioning maneuvers, regardless of whether or not the gun is discharged. Add these actions to the definition of Use of Force (Look up current policy to see if reporting is already required in these incidents)

Comments:

12. THE BOARD SHALL BE COMPRISED OF SEVEN MEMBERS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON REPRESENTING MINORITY GROUPS, “including a minimum of three members who identify as a minority.”

Comments: The purpose would be to allow larger gathering of members without formulating a quorum, allow for more discussion and representation of the community, and help share the responsibilities of the volunteer board members among more of its members.

The call for reform to the CPRB stems from an agenda to achieve racial equality in the justice system. Objective data points to clear racial disparities in policing on a statewide and national level. Having a minimum composition of members from minority groups for overseeing the police would help protect minority interests in the CPRB's carrying out its police oversight responsibilities and garner more trust in the CPRB from minority groups (DS)

13. THE CPRB SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOMINATION OF SOME OF ITS MEMBERS Two of the Seven members should be nominated by current Board members. Five of the Seven members will be nominated by City Council or the Mayor. City Council should confirm all nominated members. (DS)

Comments: The purpose would allow for the CPRB to have some input in its own makeup and composition, This would allow for the CPRB to nominate candidates that

may have qualifications, skills, or character that the CPRB members believe would compliment the current composition of the CPRB so as to allow them to be more informed, capable, and effective in carrying out its duties and/or representative of interests in the community. Some example qualifications include report writing, community activism, data analysis, and/or auditing. Again, deference to minority composition is recommended.)

(DS)

15. Complaints should be able to be received from a wide variety of sources—including in-person, telephonically, electronically, anonymously and through third persons with sufficient knowledge of the underlying circumstances. Complainants are not to be discouraged from filing a report and the ability to file anonymously should free them from risk of retaliation.

Comments: Is citizen status protected when reporting police misconduct ie rights of undocumented people?

16. The complaint system should be accessible through a variety of means (including in person, telephone, electronically)

Comments:

17. There should be an annual review/audit of complaint process .

Comments:

18. CPRB should have access to individual officer records in order to study patterns of police misconduct of specific officers.

Comments:

19. CPRB Public forums should be held more than once a year- biannually or quarterly

Comments:

20. Lengthen or get rid of the deadline for filing of CPRB complaints.

Comments:

21. CPRB email and the website for filing a complaint should be printed on the back of every ICPD officer business card.

Comments:

Information Sources:

<https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1829&context=jdr>

<https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jdr/vo/2019/iss1/15/>

https://littlevillagemag.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/CRB_Research-Brief-ASJ_FINAL-CM.pdf?fbclid=IWARZoakTzyDJbLY9My13VJURINŞ_QJFzVxUrXÇNd6N0_7TYSXeigl5pWPnnM

[https://www.unodc.org/documents/ungas\\$2016/Contributions/Civil/DrugPolicyAlliance/DPA_Fact_Sheet_Approaches_to_Decriminalization_Feb2015_1.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/ungas$2016/Contributions/Civil/DrugPolicyAlliance/DPA_Fact_Sheet_Approaches_to_Decriminalization_Feb2015_1.pdf)

<https://www.drugpolicy.org/issues/drug-decriminalization>

DRAFT

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:

Comments:

Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

SUGGESTION:

COMMENTS:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

CPRB Member Name:
Comments:
Resources:

Potential Proposed Changes for the Community Police Review Board

DRAFT

I. PROPOSED CHANGE 1 – THAT IN INSTANCES OF A SUSTAINED MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT, THE CPRB BE GIVEN INFORMATION ON THE DISCIPLINING OF THE OFFICER AND BE AUTHORIZED TO INCLUDE IN ITS REPORT ITS FINDING ON THE SAME.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

The most critical role of the Community Police Review Board (the “CPRB”) is to provide an independent review, on behalf of the community, over conduct of the Iowa City Police Department. When a complaint of misconduct is filed, presently, the CPRB only has the authority to agree or disagree with the findings of the Chief of Police and/or City Manager as to whether misconduct occurred. In instances where misconduct is found, either by the Chief of Police and/or City Manager, there is no information provided to the CPRB of what, if any, discipline will result to the officer who committed the misconduct. The Board believes this to be an integral piece of information related to the complaint review process and would like to have it included, so that the CPRB may investigate, debate, and include in their report findings on whether the CPRB believes the discipline to be fair given the circumstances.

Relatedly, in order to make an informed recommendation on whether the discipline of the officer found to have committed misconduct is fair, additional information should be provided to the CPRB, including the officer’s training record, prior complaints (both sustained and unsustained) against the officer, and the officer’s disciplinary record.

The CPRB further proposes that in cases where the Chief and/or City Manager disagree with the CPRB’s recommendation on discipline, that there be a meeting with between the CPRB and the Chief and/or City Manager to discuss the disagreements. This is much the same as the recent amendments for when there is a disagreement on whether or not a complaint should be sustained. Such a meeting may result in consensus. In cases where no consensus can be reached, the CPRB is asking for the additional authority to recommend a disciplinary hearing to the City Council. The City Council will have discretion on whether or not to conduct the hearing, and shall inform the CPRB of its decision. In the event of a hearing, the CPRB shall be informed of, allowed to attend, and to present its findings and reasoning at the hearing. The CPRB shall be informed of all outcomes related to the hearing and/or disciplining of the officer.

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

The current CPRB is split on whether the CPRB should be given authority to issue formal discipline with legal standing for officer misconduct.

Some members are of the opinion that the CPRB should be an advisory board that makes recommendations only. These members voice concerns include the following.

- i. The CPRB is not trained in employment law or matters of disciplining officers.
- ii. The CPRB should not over compromise the Chief of Police from carrying out its own administrative functions.
- iii. Privacy laws that protect dissemination of sensitive employment information.

- iv. Liability for recommendations of discipline made by members of the CPRB.
- v. The CPRB should not usurp the administrative powers of the City Manager or City Council. The CPRB members are appointed, and not elected as officials to make such a decision for the community.

Other members of the current CPRB are of the opinion that the CPRB should be given the power to discipline officers, to have authority to require an officer to participate in mediation with a complainant, and also to hire/fire the Chief of Police. In support of this opinion they state (INCLUDE HERE)

II. PROPOSED CHANGE 2 – THAT AN ACCUSED OFFICER BE REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH AN INTERVIEW BY THE CPRB ABOUT ANY COMPLAINTS OR FINDINGS OR BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

As part of the CPRB investigation, the CPRB has the authority to interview witnesses. Presently, there there is no duty or repercussion to the officer provided in the code in the event the Officer elects not to participate. Without such a duty or repercussion, it is likely that in many cases an Officer will not participate in the interview or name-clearing hearing. Indeed, the collective experience of the CPRB over the years has proven this to be true. With such repercussions, it is much more likely the Officer's participation can be secured, greatly enhancing the CPRB's investigation and ensuring more accuracy of its findings and reporting. Further, a mandatory interview should be made under oath.

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

At least some members of the current CPRB have concerns over the legality of compelling an officer to testify in instances of alleged misconduct, especially when the officer may be asked to provide self-incriminating information.

Also, and relatedly, officers may want or need to be represented by legal counsel to protect their interests. The CPRB, in kind, will likely also need an attorney present for consultation. This has the potential to add a large amount of taxpayer expense to the review process.

Further, in the interests of fairness, an Officer would reasonably want the Complainant to be required to be interviewed as well. This will likely require legal representation as well, and begs the question of whether a Complainant should be afforded legal representation at the taxpayer's expense, and how to appoint such legal representation.

An additional consideration concerns the admissibility of any statements made in any interview in any subsequent legal proceedings. Such consideration must be given to statements made by both the officers and the Complainant.

III. PROPOSED CHANGE 3 - A COMPLAINANT SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO RESPOND TO THE CHIEF'S FINDINGS IN THE CHIEF'S REPORT BEFORE THE CPRB SHALL CONDUCT ITS INVESTIGATION.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

Presently, the CPRB conducts its investigation after receiving a copy of the Chief's report. While the CPRB has the capacity in setting its level of review to interview a complainant, this is not required. Further, there may be an unintended deterrent on the filing of complaints if a complainant is required to be interviewed. Many people would be uncomfortable about speaking to a panel of persons investigating a sensitive matter, and there may be a chilling effect. In any event, there is not any opportunity, otherwise, for a complainant to provide additional information after the Chief's report and findings. There is the potential that the Chief's Report and/or the CPRB characterization of allegations is wrong or that critical information not previously provide by a complainant be missed. If a complainant were given an automatic opportunity to review the Chief's report and respond to the CPRB in a timely fashion, the CPRB report can be more accurate.

a. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

One can conceive that the response may provide a complainant with a vehicle to keep tacking on complaints and having "additional bites at the apple." Too, in the interests of equity, the Chief and/or City Manager may want or need to have an opportunity to respond to any additional report of misconduct or clarification on the complaint. At some point the process must stop and run its course. Still, it is believed that with careful procedural guidelines, a response could be incorporated that would benefit the CPRB's review.

IV. PROPOSED CHANGE 4 - All CPRB Reports about an Officer's Misconduct shall identify the officers involved by name and badge number.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

At least some members of the CPRB would like to consider the ramifications for an officer being named in complaint publicly, even when there is no finding of any misconduct. Further, there is an inherent inequity when a Complainant may remain anonymous, but the Officer will have a public record by the mere filing of a complaint. The process must be fair both in its appearance as well as its application. Relatedly, there is the potential for the Complaint process to be abused by a surge of anonymous complaints in an effort to besmirch an officer's reputation that only exists if the non-sustained complaints publicly name the officer. Last, there is concern as to the legality of sharing employment information such as discipline records publicly.

V. PROPOSED CHANGE 5 – All CPRB Reports, both in cases where a complaint is sustained and when a complaint is not sustained, should be made easily accessible through a publicly searchable database online. I think we already have this.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

VI. PROPOSED CHANGE 6 – All complaints of misconduct filed directly with the Police Department, and not filed with the CPRB, shall be forewrded to the CPRB within seven days of its filing with the Police Department.

a. Reasoning for the proposal

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

- VII. **PROPOSED CHANGE 7 - The CPRB shall have authority to initiate investigations and review at its sole discretion and without the necessity of a filed complaint. I think we already have this capacity?**
- VIII. **PROPOSED CHANGE 8 - CPRB SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT QUARTERLY REPORTS TO REVIEW FOR CERTAIN TRENDS**

a. Reasoning for the proposal

Perhaps as important as providing an independent examination and report of individual claims, is to provide such oversight for trends and larger ways in which the Iowa City Police are executing its duties on a day to day basis. While the CPRB is provided with some information already to assist with such larger oversight, some additional information would be useful to help protect against intentional or unintentional racist bias or racially disproportionate outcomes. This information includes:

- i. Total number of detained individuals;
- ii. Demographics of the individuals detained;
- iii. Total number of arrested individuals;
- iv. Demographics of those arrested;
- v. Instances where an officer draws a firearm, regardless of whether or not it was discharged, and for each instance:
 1. Stated reason of the officer for drawing the firearm;
 2. Whether a non-officer was believed to have a weapon and the reason for the belief;
 3. Whether a weapon was found on non-officer, and if so, the type, when it was found, and how it was secured;
 4. Whether the firearm was discharged, and if so, the purported reason;
 5. A general description of any injuries or damages related to the discharging of the firearm; and
 6. Any status changes in the officer's employment from the incident until the time of the report.
- vi. Number of instances where an officer or civilian was injured, and for each occurrence:
 1. Who was injured;
 2. General nature of the injuries;
 3. Whether medical treatment was requested, and by whom;
 4. Whether professional medical treatment was provided, and by whom.

b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration

- IX. **PROPOSED CHANGE 9 – CPRB SHOULD HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO HIRE AN INDEPENDENT AUDITOR TO REVIEW THE POLICE DEPARTMENT'S INTERNAL INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES.**
- a. Reasoning for the proposal**
- b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
- X. **PROPOSED CHANGE 10 – CPRB SHALL BE PROVIDED CITY FUNDING TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF THE CPRB AND ENHANCE ACCESSIBILITY TO ITS SERVICES.**

- a. Reasoning for the proposal
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration
- XI. **PROPOSED CHANGE 11 - CPRB SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH FUNDING AND AUTHORITY TO ALLOW COMPLAINANTS TO MAKE USE OF A SOCIAL WORKER OR MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL WITH TRAUMA AWARENESS TRAINING FOR ASSISTING COMPLAINANTS THROUGHOUT THE COMPLAINT PROCESS.**
- a. Reasoning for the proposal
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration
- XII. **PROPOSED CHANGE 12 - Require reporting and CPRB review for all incidents where an officer draws a gun on a subject or uses their firearm during precautionary positioning maneuvers, regardless of whether or not the gun is discharged. Add these actions to the definition of Use of Force (Look up current policy to see if reporting is already required in these incidents)**
This would be covered by proposal VII for reporting, an VI for capacity to investigate any incident.
- XIII. **PROPOSED CHANGE 13 – EXPAND THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE CPRB FROM FIVE TO NINE MEMBERS, WITH AN EMPHASIS ON MINORITY REPRESENTATION AND REPRESENTATION FROM A CURRENT OR FORMER MEMBER OF THE POLICE OR POLICE POLICY EXPERT.**
- a. Reasoning for the proposal

Having additional members helps disperse some of the workload for the volunteer position. As is, the current members are volunteering time to review individual complaints. This almost always entails watching hours of video footage, in addition to possible additional investigations, and the procedural discussions, voting, report writing, and review of report before its filing. Members also review various police ordinances and policies and quarterly reports from the police. Besides this, members are tasked with writing public forum reports, and, from time to time, having various subcommittees for purposes of completing tasks. Presently, subcommittees can only be comprised of two members as more would entail a forum requiring a public meeting.

The proposals outlined in this document would only increase, in some cases dramatically, the amount of work being carried by a five-member volunteer board. With the additional two or four members, the individual burden would be lessened.

With regard to the composition being favorable to minority groups, this stems from an agenda to help achieve racial equality in the justice system. Objective data points to clear racial disparities in policing on a statewide and national level. Having a minimum composition of members from minority groups for overseeing the police would help protect minority interests in the carrying out of CPRB reviews. The Board feels there should be no less than three members who are from a minority race for its composition.

To help ensure fairness and equity in the review process, the recommendation that one member of the board have a police background shall become mandatory. It is important that, when reviewing police conduct, someone with police experience and training be consulted. If there were concerns over objectivity, perhaps the residency requirements for this member should be waived,

and/or a police procedure expert be retained for the CPRB to consult with regularly during the closed sessions.

- b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
- XIV. PROPOSED CHANGE 14 - Complaints should be permitted to be filed through any of the following means: telephonically, electronically, or by document either through the mail, or hand delivery.**
 - a. Reasoning for the proposal**
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
 - I THINK WE ALREADY HAVE THIS**
- XV. PROPOSED CHANGE 15 - CPRB complaints should be permitted whether filed anonymously or through third persons so long as there is sufficient knowledge of the underlying circumstances.**
 - a. Reasoning for the proposal**
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
 - I THINK WE ALREADY HAVE THIS**
- XVI. PROPOSED CHANGE 16 - There should be an annual review/audit of the CPRB complaint process.**
 - I THINK WE ALREADY HAVE THIS OR CAN DO IT WHENEVER WE WANT**
- XVII. PROPOSED CHANGE 17 - CPRB should have access to individual office records in order to study a pattern of police misconduct of specific officers.**
 - THIS SHOULD BE COVERED BY I and VI**
- XVIII. PROPOSED CHANGE 18 - CPRB PUBLIC FORUMS SHALL BE HELD TWICE A YEAR.**
 - a. Reason for the proposal**
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
- XIX. PROPOSED CHANGE 19 – THE STATUTE OF LIMITATION FOR FILING A CPRB COMPLAINT SHALL BE LENGTHENED FROM 90 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THE ALLEGED MISCONDUCT, TO 180 DAYS AFTER THE ALLEGED MISCONDUCT.**
 - a. Reason for the proposal**
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**
- XX. PROPOSED CHANGE 20 – INFORMATION FOR FILING A COMPLAINT WITH THE CPRB SHALL BE PRINTED ON THE BACK OF EVERY IOWA CITY POLICE OFFICER’S BUSINESS CARD.**
 - a. Reason for the proposal**
 - b. Voiced concerns for additional consideration**