

Comparison of CCL positions on CBAs and those of coalition led by Community Renewal Society

A. Provisions that we agree on.

Unsworn complaints and anonymous complaints should be investigated.

Complaints and or discipline records should not be destroyed after a fixed period of time.

Investigators should be allowed to interview officers within 24 hours after an incident.

The City should be allowed to provide a reward to officers who provide information about misconduct by other officers.

Officers should not automatically be allowed to change their prior statements about an incident once they have seen a video of the incident.

A second investigator should be allowed to ask an officer a question even if the first investigator has not finished questioning.

B. Provisions that we disagree on.

Although unsworn complaints and anonymous complaints should be investigated, we believe that such complaints, standing alone without corroboration, should not be the basis of discipline against an officer. We also believe that before an adverse finding is entered against an officer, he must be told the name of the complainant, so that he or she may challenge the complainant's credibility. By comparison, CRS argues that a complainant's name need not be disclosed to an officer until after he has been interrogated.

C. Provisions that CCL has not taken a position on.

Paragraph 2 of Section 8 of the FOP CBA 2 provides:

Any information of an adverse employment nature which may be contained in any unfounded, exonerated, or otherwise not sustained file, shall not be used against the Officer in any future proceedings. Information contained in files alleging excessive force or criminal conduct which are not sustained may be used in future disciplinary proceedings to determine credibility and notice.

CRS recommends that the above paragraph be worded as follows

Any information of an adverse employment nature which may be contained in any unfounded, or exonerated file shall not be used against the Officer in any future proceedings. Information contained in files which are not sustained may be used in future disciplinary proceedings to determine credibility, notice, motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, lack of accident, and to identify potential patterns of misconduct for the purposes of determining appropriate discipline.

(I like the CRS proposed revised language.)

CRS urges that officers be provided only the general allegations against them before being required to respond to a complaint. It contends that officers are currently provided overly detailed allegations.

CRS urges that IPRA/COPA/BIA be allowed to investigate complaints that are over 5 years old without seeking permission from the Superintendent of Police.

CRS urges that officers be required to disclose to the public their secondary employment.

CRS wants to delete the requirement that IPRA/IAD (or COPA) try to obtain an affidavit from a complainant.

CRS wants to delete the provision allowing the head of IPRA/IAD (or COPA) to sign an affidavit based on "objective verifiable evidence."

CRS wants to require officers who witness or use force to immediately provide a detailed report of the incident to his/her supervisor.

CRS wants to require officers on the scene of an event to be separated until interviewed.

CRS wants officers to lose some degree of seniority when they are recommended for suspension.