

I. INVESTIGATIONS AND DECISIONS FOR DISPOSITION

1. [DD40](#), Section 1, Subsections B, C, D, F, and G describes the process by how allegations of violations of Department Rules or Regulations are initiated from within or outside of the Department.

Does the Committee wish to make any changes to how internal or community complaints are initiated?

2. [DD40](#), Section 1, Subsections A and E vests the authority to investigate all internal and community complaints regarding Department personnel with the Chief who determines whether an investigation is necessary or not. The [2021 Mayoral Executive Directive](#), requires that all use of force incidents that result in injury be reported to the Police Commission after investigation, but only after the Chief confers with the Mayor and receives the Mayor's approval with any recommendation from the Chief.

The overarching question is: Does the Committee wish to make any changes to this authority?

The following specific questions are raised by this broader question:

Should internal complaints be treated differently than community complaints?

Should conduct other than just use of force incidents that result in injury be reported to an oversight body?

Should reports to an oversight body only be reported after the Mayor has reviewed the Chief's recommendation?

Should an oversight body have a role in deciding who investigates internal or community complaints?

Are there distinctions based on the severity of the allegation ("categorization") that would change who is the investigator and decisionmaker on the disposition of the complaint?

Article XV of the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#) defines the continuum of lower-, mid-, and higher-level infractions. Should there be a modified process for categorizing complaints (e.g., should the process be authorized by charter?, etc.) and, if so, how does that intersect with collective bargaining rights?

Who decides on the categorization of the allegation?

Is the categorization reviewable?

3. If the Committee believes an oversight body should have a role in deciding who investigates internal or community complaints, who other than the Chief and their designee should conduct the investigation?

The following options are raised by this question: the oversight body itself, an independent investigator selected by the oversight body for a particular investigation, an independent monitor selected by the oversight body to conduct all investigations, etc..

4. For an explanation of the current investigatory framework, see [DD40](#), Section 3.

The broader question is: Should the current investigatory framework be changed?

More specific questions are:

Should this framework apply equally to all complaints?

What authority should an independent body other than the Department have in the course of their investigation (e.g., right to review documents, subpoena testimony, review any Department investigation, make recommendations, etc.)?

5. If the Committee believes the Chief should retain some or all authority to investigate internal or community complaints, what role should the independent body have during that investigation process?

More specific questions that arise from this broader question are:

Must the Department inform an oversight body upon the filing of a complaint and, if so, when must this notification take place?

Is the Department required to provide regular updates during the investigation?

Must the Department report back to an oversight body at the conclusion of all investigations?

Must the Chief's recommendation be approved by anyone—the Mayor, the Commission, an independent body—prior to the decision being finalized?

6. [DD40](#), Section 2, outlines rights and obligations of employees during an investigation process, cross-referencing due process considerations in the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#).

Does the Committee wish to explore any changes to these due process considerations and, if the Committee supports different processes to investigate complaints, should the same due process considerations apply to each process?

7. If the Chief retains some or all authority (and responsibility) to investigate internal or community complaints, what occurs after the Chief issues their conclusions on how a complaint should be disposed?

Does an independent body have any role if the Chief retains the authority and responsibility to conduct the investigation and make recommendations on the disposition of the complaint (e.g., review the investigation and make recommendations, etc.)?

If an independent body makes recommendations on the disposition of the complaint and the recommendation is not followed, does the decider have to explain why the recommendation was not followed?

8. If an independent body obtains some or all of the authority to investigate internal or community complaints, what happens after it reaches its conclusions on how the complaint should be disposed?

What rights do the other parties (accused, complainant, Department) have upon receipt of the conclusions of the investigation?

9. Should there be a process by which disagreements over the recommended action are resolved and by what authority is the process codified (e.g., charter change by which entity other than the Chief is resolving disputes)? What changes if a complaint is about the Chief?
10. After a complaint is investigated and a recommendation is made, what is the process going forward, including the individual employee's hearing and appeal process?

Should there be any changes to the requirements of the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#)?

Should the complainant have any rights to appeal if they disagree with the final disposition?

Should anybody else (e.g., other community members) who is aggrieved by a decision have the right to appeal or to raise objections?