

# APPENDIX A: PPG Civilian Review Board Subcommittee

---

## Table of Contents

- Overview** \_\_\_\_\_ **19**
- Subcommittee Recommendations** \_\_\_\_\_ **21**
- Materials Reviewed** \_\_\_\_\_ **25**
- Civilian Review Board Models and Related Examples** \_\_\_\_\_ **26**
  - A. Review-focused Models** \_\_\_\_\_ **26**
  - B. Investigation-focused Models** \_\_\_\_\_ **26**
  - C. Auditor/monitor-focused Models** \_\_\_\_\_ **28**
  - D. Hybrid Civilian Oversight Models and Systems** \_\_\_\_\_ **28**
- Virginia Law-enforcement Civilian Oversight Bodies Legislation** \_\_\_\_\_ **30**
- Suggested Pros/Cons for Various Models** \_\_\_\_\_ **31**
- Opportunities Identified** \_\_\_\_\_ **31**
- Presentations & Insights** \_\_\_\_\_ **32**
- Stakeholder Roundtable** \_\_\_\_\_ **33**
- Online Community Feedback** \_\_\_\_\_ **35**
- References** \_\_\_\_\_ **36**

## Overview

The Civilian Review Board (CRB) subcommittee was charged with evaluating what type of civilian oversight of its police department Arlington County should implement. Considering the County Manager's assumption that a Civilian Review Board will be created in the future, the CRB subcommittee focused on reviewing the different models of civilian oversight available as well as what authority and responsibilities the recommended civilian oversight body should possess.

The CRB subcommittee approached their tasks in the following ways:

- **Reviewed Materials:** Through Dec. 17, 2020, the CRB subcommittee has conducted 13 subcommittee meetings and one Community Learning Session. In preparation for and during these meetings, the CRB Subcommittee has reviewed a variety of materials.
- **Review CRB Models:** The committee went to great lengths to review four models and look at related examples.
- **Presentations:** During the 13 subcommittee meetings and one Community Learning Session, the CRB Subcommittee heard presentations from a variety of experts with different experiences and perspectives.
- **Hosted Stakeholder Roundtable:** On October 26, 2020, the CRB hosted a stakeholder roundtable that included 17 community members who represented a cross-section of the Arlington community.
- **Community Feedback:** Members of the community were invited to provide online written feedback that resulted in 55 comments with several key themes.

## Types of Questions Asked:

- *What are the issues/concerns in Arlington that civilian oversight of ACPD needs to address?*
- *What form (or model) of civilian oversight will best address these issues/concerns?*
  - Review-focused?
  - Investigation-focused?
  - Auditor/Monitor-focused?
  - Hybrid?
- *What authority and responsibilities should the civilian oversight body possess?*
  - Review completed police internal investigations, conduct its own investigations, or both?
- *What is the role of CRB in having subpoena power?*
  - Hear appeals from complainants or subject officers?
  - Receive civilian complaints and forward to ACPD for investigation or conduct its own investigations of such complaints?
  - Recommend case dispositions, discipline or revised departmental policies and procedures?
  - Hold public forums?

- Conduct community outreach?
- Focus on broader policy issues for ACPD?
  
- *Who should serve on a civilian review board, and how many members should be considered?*
  - Which communities do the members need to represent?
  - Qualifications to be a member?
  - How should members be selected?
  - What type of training should members receive?

## Subcommittee Recommendations

### Hybrid System of Civilian Oversight

The CRB Subcommittee recommends that Arlington County should adopt a hybrid system of civilian oversight with an auditor/monitor + a civilian-run oversight body (immediate).

- **Majority Recommendation:** The majority of subcommittee members recommend that the auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body should be invested with investigative and subpoena authority, as allowed by Virginia's enabling statute.
- **Minority Recommendation:** A minority of subcommittee members recommend that the auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body should initially be empowered to review completed ACPD investigations with clearly defined jurisdiction for the conduct to be reviewed by the auditor/monitor and the civilian oversight body. Accordingly, the minority recommends that neither the auditor/monitor nor the civilian oversight body be given investigative or subpoena authority at this time.

#### *Elements of the Hybrid System of Civilian Oversight:*

##### A. Civilian Oversight Body: Composition, Selection & Term, Training, and Staff

1. Composition:
  - a. Comprised of an odd number of members totaling 7 to 15 members from the Arlington community.
  - b. Members must be diverse and reflective of the diversity of the Arlington community.
  - c. No current or former ACPD officers or employees may serve, but former officers (or members of law enforcement) from other jurisdictions are eligible to serve as a non-voting member.
  - d. Current Arlington County gov't. employees eligible but must be cleared for potential conflicts of interest.
  - e. Members must be residents of Arlington County.
2. Selection & Term:
  - a. Members selected by County Manager and County Board by alternate selection
  - b. Members will serve 4-year terms and may serve a total of two terms (or eight years).
    - (i) For initial oversight body, the terms for the members will be staggered. Some members will be appointed for full 4-year terms and others will be appointed for 2-year terms.
    - (ii) The members appointed for 2-year terms will be eligible to serve two full 4-year terms in addition to their initial 2-year term. Thus, they will be eligible to serve for a total of 10 years on the oversight body.

3. Training:
  - a. Specialized version of ACPD's Citizen Police Academy.
  - b. Use of force.
  - c. Mental health.
  - d. Substance abuse.
  - e. Privacy/confidentiality training re: ACPD records.
  - f. Parliamentary procedure (*i.e.*, Robert's Rules of Order) or similar rules for conducting meetings.
4. Staff:
  - a. Civilian oversight body must have, at least, one person to serve as support staff.

B. Auditor/Monitor

1. Start with a contracted consultant who reports to County Manager.
2. Must have prior experience auditing/monitoring/investigating law enforcement agencies.
3. Auditor/Monitor must have, at least, one person to serve as support staff who is not shared with the civilian oversight body.

C. Majority Recommendation: {Four votes in support}

(Per the charge, this recommendation is focused on civilian oversight of ACPD. If, however, the General Assembly authorizes civilian oversight of sheriff offices, this recommendation applies to the Arlington County Sheriff's Office as well.)

1. **Investigative & Subpoena Authority** – Auditor monitor + civilian oversight body. In addition, other methods of compelling or obtaining production of information/records (*e.g.*, local ordinance, voluntary agreement with ACPD, etc.) should be adopted.
  - a. Investigative authority to be exercised on a limited basis for those matters for which the auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body determine that an independent investigation is needed.
  - b. Investigations to be conducted by the auditor/monitor.
  - c. Subpoena authority exercised only after efforts to obtain information/records voluntarily from ACPD have been exhausted.
  - d. Before applying for a subpoena, the civil oversight body will escalate its request up to the County Manager. If escalation is unsuccessful, the civil oversight body may apply for a subpoena.
2. **Review Authority** – Auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body will have authority to review completed ACPD investigations.
  - a. Auditor/monitor will receive ACPD internal investigation reports before they are issued to assess thoroughness and sufficiency and be given the

authority to recommend changes to a report before it is issued, including a recommendation that additional investigative steps be taken.

3. **Make Binding Disciplinary Determinations** – Civilian oversight body will have authority, in consultation with the ACPD Police Chief, to make binding disciplinary determinations for ACPD officers who have been found to have committed serious breaches of ACPD procedures or professional standards.
4. **Receive Complaints** – Auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body will have authority to receive complaints from the public against ACPD and the discretion to determine whether the complaints should be passed on to ACPD for investigation or should be investigated by the auditor/monitor.
5. **Advise on Policies and Procedures** – Auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body will have authority to review and make recommendations regarding ACPD on policies and procedures.
6. **Issue Public Reports** – The auditor/monitor will have the authority to issue public reports to County Manager and County Board regarding its review of internal investigations and ACPD's policies and procedures.
7. **Engage with Community** – Civilian oversight body will have the authority to hold public meetings and share information with the public to promote transparency.

*Advantages/Disadvantages of Majority and Minority Recommendation:*

- Advantages:
  - An independent civilian oversight body with sufficient authority, resources, and capabilities to perform effective oversight of ACPD will promote transparency and build trust between ACPD and those parts of the Arlington community that currently have a challenging relationship with the department.
  - A civilian oversight body with the recommended authority and responsibilities can provide a fresh perspective to ACPD regarding its existing policies and procedures and can partner with ACPD to provide insights on how to improve those policies and procedures.
  - A civilian oversight body with the recommended authority and responsibilities will be viewed as a credible agency to which the community can bring its complaints and be assured that those complaints will be taken seriously and treated fairly.
- Disadvantages:
  - An auditor/monitor + civilian oversight body with the recommended authority and resources will be more expensive than a purely volunteer civilian review board.

- ACPD considers the establishment of a civilian oversight body with the recommended authority and responsibilities in the majority recommendation will be interpreted as an indication of a lack of trust in ACPD.

#### *Operating the Hybrid Civilian Oversight System*

After hiring an independent auditor/monitor and the selection of Arlington residents to serve on the civilian oversight body, Arlington's hybrid civilian oversight system will operate in accordance with the rules and parameters established in Phase 1 (short term).

#### *Evaluating and Modifying the Hybrid Civilian Oversight System*

After a few years of operation, the County Manager and/or the County Board, with input from the civilian oversight body, will evaluate the effectiveness of the existing civilian oversight system. If warranted, modifications to the system will be proposed and, if agreed upon, implemented (long term).

## Materials Reviewed

Through Dec. 17, 2020, the CRB subcommittee has conducted 13 subcommittee meetings, one Community Learning Session, and one Stakeholder Roundtable Session. In preparation for and during these meetings, the CRB subcommittee has reviewed a variety of materials including the following:

- The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (“NACOLE”) materials regarding civilian oversight
- FAQs – National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement
- Models of Oversight (NACOLE Pre-publication Summary, June 1, 2020)
- Recommendations for Effective Practices (NACOLE Pre-publication Summary, June 1, 2020).
- Thirteen Principles for Effective Oversight (NACOLE Pre-publication Summary, June 1, 2020)
- Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: A Review of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Various Models (September 2016)
- Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence (September 2016)

### *Materials regarding civilian oversight in other jurisdictions:*

- Initial Police Civilian Review Board Report for Charlottesville, VA
- Virginia Beach, VA Investigation Review Panel
- Nashville, TN Community Oversight Board
- Houston, TX Independent Police Oversight Board
- Fairfax County, VA Police Civilian Review Panel & Fairfax County, VA Independent Police Auditor

### *Bills/Legislation regarding law-enforcement civilian oversight bodies:*

- SB 5035 – Law-enforcement civilian oversight bodies; localities may establish, duties, effective date
- HB 5055 – Law-enforcement civilian oversight bodies; localities may establish, duties, effective date

### *Other sources:*

- Citizen Review of Police: Approaches & Implementation
- Civilian Oversight of the Police in Major Cities

## Civilian Review Board Models and Related Examples

### A. Review-focused Models

- Represent the earliest and most common form of civilian oversight in the U.S., accounting for nearly 62% of civilian oversight agencies in the U.S.
- In most basic form, review-focused agencies provide community members outside of and unaffiliated with the law enforcement agency with an opportunity to review the quality of misconduct complaint investigations performed by the overseen department.
- Have varying levels of authority.
- Can review completed internal investigations.
- Are often permitted to receive civilian complaints and forward them to the department for investigation, and can:
  - remand cases back to the department's internal affairs unit for further investigation;
  - hear appeals from complainants or subject officers;
  - recommend case dispositions, discipline or revised departmental policies and procedures;
  - hold public forums; and
  - conduct community outreach.

*Example:*

#### **Virginia Beach Investigative Review Panel (IRP) (Population: 449,974)**

- IRP ensures that reports and conclusions of the Police Department's Internal Affairs Office investigations involving abuse of authority or other serious misconduct are complete, accurate, and factually supported;
- An IRP review of a police dept. internal affairs investigation of alleged abuse of authority or other serious misconduct is initiated after receiving a request from a complainant; and
- The IRP may:
  - concur with the findings of the police department investigation;
  - advise the City Manager that the findings are not supported by information reasonably available to the police is not appropriate for review by the IRP; and/or
  - recommend to the City Manager that a specific Police Dept. policy or procedure be revised or amended.
- Composition:
  - Five-member panel, volunteer panel w/ two alternates appointed by City Council;
  - Serve three-year terms; and
  - Cannot be an officer or employee of the city.

### B. Investigation-focused Models

- Are the second most common form of civilian oversight in the U.S.
- Employ professionally trained investigative staff to conduct investigations of allegations of misconduct independently of the overseen department's internal affairs unit or replace critical functions of a standard internal affairs unit altogether.
- Can vary greatly both in terms of authority and organizational structure **but tend to be the most cost- and resource-intensive forms of oversight given their staffing needs.**

- Typically have greater access to law enforcement records and databases than review-focused agencies, particularly with regards to body-worn camera and in-car video.
- **Are more likely to have the ability to subpoena documents and witnesses than either review-focused or auditor/monitor-focused models in order to expedite the collection of evidence.**
- Some include a volunteer board or commission.
  - The roles of these boards or commissions can vary greatly.
  - In some cases, the board or commission acts in an advisory capacity or a leadership capacity.
  - Some may conduct votes to initiate investigations, issue subpoenas, and determine the dispositions of misconduct allegations based on staff investigations.
  - Other boards or commissions hold public hearings, conduct community outreach, determine policy-related matters the agency should investigate further, or make specific policy recommendations.

*Example:*

### **Memphis Civilian Law Enforcement Review Board (CLERB) (Population: 1,150,000)**

- CLERB is an independent agency with the authority **to investigate** allegations of misconduct filed by citizens of the public against the Memphis Police Department (MPD).
- CLERB has the power to:
  - receive,
  - investigate,
  - hear cases,
  - make findings, and
  - recommend action on complaints regarding:
    - excessive and deadly force,
    - injuries occurred while in police custody,
    - harassment by police,
    - improper arrests,
    - inadequate investigations,
    - or any other improper conduct by a member of MPD.
- CLERB reports its findings to the Memphis Police Department.
- Composition:
  - Consists of no more than 13 members (currently eight members) appointed by the Mayor (with City Council approval) and comprised as follows:
    - A law enforcement official or person with a background in criminal justice;
    - A member of the clergy;
    - A medical official;
    - One attorney; and
    - Citizens at-large.
  - Members serve four-year terms or until their successors are appointed and qualified.
  - CLERB is authorized to have a staff of, at least, three members (an administrator and a minimum of two support persons, including an investigator).
  - Current staff composition:

- Admin.;
- Investigator; and
- Sr. Asst. City Atty. & CLERB Liaison

### C. Auditor/monitor-focused Models

Relatively recent innovation spurred by a desire to promote systemic change in law enforcement agencies through policy and trend analysis.

- This model has emerged as a result of political compromises between community activists pushing for civilian oversight and law enforcement agencies opposed to civilian review boards or independent investigative agencies.
- **This model is typically less expensive than investigation-focused models, but more expensive than review-focused models.**
- Sometimes referred to as inspectors general or police monitors, these types of oversight agencies tend to vary more in terms of authority than organizational structure.
- Generally created to promote broad organizational change by addressing systemic issues, analyzing patterns and trends, and addressing deficiencies in policies and procedures.
- Their work may cover virtually any aspect of the overseen law enforcement agency such as complaints, discipline, training, staffing and recruitment, use of force, and crime prevention strategies.
- Typically issue recommendations regarding any aspects of the law enforcement agency that are in their purview.

*Example:*

#### **The Office of Independent Police Auditor (IPA), San Jose, CA (Population: 1,033,670)**

The IPA is a government agency separate and independent of the San Jose Police Department that was created to increase confidence in the police department by listening to the community, by suggesting good policy changes, and by making sure that the department addresses officer misconduct. The IPA is staffed by six employees, including the Independent Police Auditor, an Assistant Independent Police Auditor, two senior analysts, one analyst, and an office specialist.

### D. Hybrid Civilian Oversight Models and Systems

Civilian oversight agencies – particularly newly established ones – are increasingly adopting forms of oversight that go beyond the traditional *review-focused*, *investigation-focused*, and *auditor/monitor-focused* delineations by combining functions of several models.

Hybrid civilian oversight exists in two ways:

1. *Hybrid Agencies* - an agency may primarily focus on one oversight function while also performing other functions, such as reviewing internal investigations and auditing policy compliance.
2. *Hybrid Systems* – 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 and/or other civilian oversight agency.

- Hybrid forms of civilian oversight are increasingly common, but several jurisdictions have also created multiple agencies responsible for performing different oversight functions of the same law enforcement department.

*Examples:*

**Fairfax County, VA** (Population: 1,158,620)

#### **Fairfax County Police Civilian Review Panel**

- Reviews completed Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) investigations into complaints it receives regarding allegations of abuse of authority or serious misconduct to ensure 1) accuracy, 2) completeness, 3) thoroughness, 4) objectivity, and 5) impartiality.
- Composition:
  - Nine-member (seven citizens and two alternatives), volunteer panel appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors w/ the approval of the Board;
  - Should have expertise and experience relevant to the Panel's responsibilities;
  - One member is required to have prior law enforcement experience (outside of FCPD);
  - Serve a term of three years with a maximum of two terms.

#### **Fairfax County Office of Independent Police Auditor (OIPA)**

- OIPA reviews police investigations involving use of force and serves as an independent intake venue for complaints against the Fairfax County Police Dept.
- OIPA provides an accessible, safe, impartial, and responsive intake venue for complaints against the Fairfax County Police Department and its employees.

**Denver, CO** (Population: 727,211)

**The Office of Independent Monitor (OIM)** is the civilian oversight agency for the City and County of Denver Police and Sheriff Departments. The OIM is staffed by 15 employees, including 6 monitors, primarily attorneys: The Monitor, a Senior Deputy Monitor, and four Deputy Monitors.

**Civilian Oversight Board (COB)** consists of 9 citizens appointed alternatively by the Mayor and City Council with one joint appointee to:

- Assess the effectiveness of the Monitor's Office;
- Make policy-level recommendations regarding discipline, use of force and other policies, rules, hiring, training, community relations and the complaint process;
- Address any other issues of concern to the community, the COB, the Monitor, the Executive Director of Safety, the Chief of Police, the Sheriff or the Fire Chief; and to review and make recommendations as to closed Internal Affairs cases where the findings were not sustained, as appropriate

- Composition:
  - Nine members comprised of citizens appointed by the Mayor (4 appointees), the City Council (4 appointees), and jointly (1 appointee);
  - Members serve 4-year terms;
  - No officers or employees of the City or County are eligible to serve;
  - Members nor their immediate family members cannot be former employees of the Denver police, sheriff, or fire departments; and
  - Members compensated ( $\leq$  \$1,200 per year) for their service; and
  - Training required.

#### Virginia Law-enforcement Civilian Oversight Bodies Legislation

On October 28, 2020, the Governor signed VA Senate (SB 5035) and House of Delegates (HB 5055), effective 7/1/21, which authorizes localities to create civilian law enforcement review boards that may

- Receive, investigate, and issue findings on complaints from civilians regarding conduct of law-enforcement officers and civilian employees;
- Investigate and issue findings on incidents, including the use of force by a law enforcement officer, death or serious injury to any person held in custody, serious abuse of authority or misconduct, allegedly discriminatory stops, and other incidents regarding the conduct of law-enforcement officers or civilian employees;
- After consultation with the officer's/employee's direct supervisor or commander, make binding disciplinary determinations (*i.e., letters of reprimand, suspension with or w/o pay, demotion, reassignment, termination, involuntary restitution, or mediation*) in cases that involve serious breaches of departmental and professional standards;
- Investigate policies, practices, and procedures of law-enforcement agencies and make recommendations regarding changes to such policies, practices, and procedures;
- Review all investigations conducted internally by law enforcement agencies and issue findings regarding the accuracy, completeness, and impartiality of such investigations and the sufficiency of any discipline resulting from such investigations;
- Request reports of the annual expenditures of law-enforcement agencies and make budgetary recommendations;
- Make public reports on the activities of the law-enforcement civilian oversight body; and
- Undertake any other duties as reasonably necessary for the board to effectuate its lawful purpose to effectively oversee the law-enforcement agencies as authorized by the locality. Such oversight bodies would not be authorized to oversee sheriff's departments.
- The law provides that a law-enforcement officer who is subject to a binding disciplinary determination may file a grievance requesting a final hearing pursuant to the locality's local grievance procedures. It also provides that a retired law-enforcement officer may serve on a law-enforcement civilian oversight body as an advisory, nonvoting ex officio member.

## Suggested Pros/Cons for Various Models

### A. Review-focused model:

- Advantage – Typically, representative of the community and reflect community sentiment.
- Disadvantages – Don't have access to necessary information;
- Lack transparency because don't have access to information; and
- Typically, does not possess sufficient expertise to conduct thorough reviews.

### B. Investigative-focused model:

- Advantage – Appealing because they are civilian-based and designed to have civilian control over an independent investigation.
- Disadvantage – Often under resourced to perform their investigative functions adequately;
- Several large cities (*e.g.*, Oakland, CA; San Francisco, CA; Chicago, Ill; and New York, NY) employ this model to varying degrees of success.

### C. Independent Auditor/Monitor model:

- Advantages – Employs individuals with some expertise/knowledge about law enforcement matters, including some with law enforcement experience; and Typically possess the four essential elements (mentioned above); and Contractual relationship with jurisdiction.
- Disadvantages – None provided.

## Opportunities Identified

- Virginia's law on civilian oversight provides a broad array of tools that can be used establish a civilian oversight body that can be tailored to address Arlington's challenges.
- A civilian oversight body with sufficient authority and responsibilities can help address concerns regarding transparency and accountability in connection with ACPD.
- Although members of the Arlington community may have different perspectives on the need for civilian oversight of ACPD, they generally agree that a civilian oversight body can facilitate better communication between ACPD and the community.

## Presentations & Insights

During the 13 subcommittee meetings and one Stakeholder Roundtable Session, the CRB subcommittee heard presentations from experts with varying perspectives and experiences to provide insights:

September 10, 2020: Arlington County Attorney, Stephen A. MacIsaac, Esq and ACPD team members provided information about current protocols to handle civilian complaints and disciplinary matters for police officers. During the meeting, they also discussed the limitations on civilian oversight in Virginia.

September 17, 2020: Brian Corr, Immediate Past President of NACOLE; and Chief Kenton W Rainey, Chief of the University of Chicago Police Dept., provided his perspective on civilian oversight based upon his experience at multiple police agencies that have worked with different types of civilian oversight.

October 8, 2020: Bradley Haywood /Parisa Dehghani-Tafti offered perspectives from Arlington County Public Defender, and the Arlington County Commonwealth Attorney's Office on perspectives on a civilian oversight body.

December 3, 2020: The subcommittee heard from other communities that have implemented different models of civilian review. Nick Mitchell, the Monitor with the Office of Independent Monitor ("OIM") for Denver, CO, explained his office's role in civilian oversight of Denver's police and sheriff departments; and **Shirley Norman-Taylor & Rhonda VanLowe** members of Fairfax County, VA's Civilian Review Panel, shared their perspectives on civilian oversight based upon their experiences serving on a civilian oversight body.

December 10, 2020: Michael Gennaco Project Manager, Office of Correction and Law Enforcement Monitoring for Santa Clara County, CA and Principal of OIR Group. He served as Chief Atty. of the Office of Independent Review for Los Angeles, CA, and he has served as an independent auditor for the cities of Burbank, Anaheim, Palo Alto, and Davis in California. Mr. Gennaco highlighted his perspectives on key elements and based on his experience offered pros and cons to various models:

### Suggested Elements

- **Access:** Needs some level of access to documents, case records, etc., as well as to individuals so they can be interviewed;
- **Independence (Unbiased):** Needs to have sufficient independence from the law enforcement agency it is charged with overseeing. Related to this, however, the oversight body should appear—and in fact, should be—unbiased in the performance of its work;
- **Engagement w/ the Community:** Needs to be proactive in engaging with the community so it can listen to the community member's concerns and share information with them; and
- **Transparent:** Related to the engagement prong, the oversight body should have the ability to provide unvarnished and effective reports of its findings, concerns, etc.

## Stakeholder Roundtable

On October 26, 2020, the CRB hosted an invitational roundtable that included 17 community members who represented a cross-section of the Arlington community. In addition to providing information to the stakeholders during this session, the CRB subcommittee requested feedback from the stakeholders in response to three questions:

- *What type of authority/responsibility should the Arlington civilian oversight body have?*
- *Who should be eligible to serve on the civilian oversight body?*
- *What type of training should members of the civilian oversight body receive?*

### **Authority/Responsibility**

Among the stakeholders, there were varying opinions regarding the type of authority/responsibility the oversight body should have. For example, some stakeholders recommended that the civilian oversight body should have full investigative authority with subpoena power so it can conduct its own investigations. In support of this position, one stakeholder argued that a powerful civilian oversight body would maximize transparency and accountability and would foster confidence in ACPD.

In contrast, other stakeholders suggested that the civilian oversight body should not be given investigative authority at the start but could obtain that authority later, if necessary. This individual expressed skepticism over endowing the civilian oversight body with too much power and warned that the oversight body should not be a populist organization set up to serve as an advocate against ACPD. In support of this position, the individual expressed a desire to foster a closer relationship with ACPD and did not want to upset that goal by antagonizing the department.

Significantly, the stakeholders generally agreed that the civilian oversight body should “give voice to the community, where the relationship between the police and the community is based on trust and new stakeholders are being brought to the table.”

### **Eligibility to Serve**

Regarding who should be eligible to serve on the civilian oversight body, there was general agreement that it should be comprised of a broad cross section of the Arlington County community. While some stakeholders suggested that there should be “balanced” representation from the community, others recommended that membership should be weighted in favor of those communities that have more frequent contacts with ACPD. On the issue of whether current Arlington County employees or members of ACPD should be eligible to serve on the oversight body, the stakeholders generally were more open to allowing county employees who are not affiliated with ACPD to serve on the oversight body. And the stakeholders who were fine with ACPD officers serving, they suggested that ACPD officers could serve as non-voting and/or advisory members on the oversight body.

In sum, the stakeholders stated that they wanted the civilian oversight body to be broadly representative of the diversity in Arlington community and that it should act “as a connective link between the sub-communities within the community.”

## **Training**

The stakeholders generally agreed that civilian oversight body members needed to receive as much training as possible from organizations that could provide a variety of perspectives (*i.e.*, government {multiple agencies}, police, nationally accredited organizations, civil rights organizations, etc.).

## Online Community Feedback

The portion of the engagement related to the civilian review board asked members of the community to share thoughts on areas of focus for a civilian review board (CRB) in Arlington and types of models or approaches for Arlington County. Community members were also asked to provide any additional comments they have on a civilian review board. There was a total of *sixty-one (61) unique responses* to this prompt.

Of the 61 responses submitted, over 55% of them were related to four (4) major emerging themes which included: A CRB Independent of Law Enforcement/Police Department, Diverse and Inclusive Representation on the CRB, Does Not Support a CRB, and CRB Must Include Police Experience/Expertise.

- **CRB Independent of Law Enforcement/Police Department:** Approximately 20% of all responses related to the civilian review board call for a civilian review board to be independent of law enforcement or the police department, specifically citing that in order for the civilian review board to be effective, it must be independent of the police department and able to make appropriate recommendations when necessary.
- **Diverse and Inclusive Representation on CRB:** Approximately 13% of responses ask for a diverse and inclusive civilian review board, specifically asking for representation from Arlington Public Schools (APS) as well as members of the community who are ethnically, socioeconomically, professionally and educationally diverse.
- **Does Not Support a CRB:** Approximately 13% of responses do not support the civilian review board, specifically asking for no funds to be allocated for the CRB and instead be utilized for transit, housing and the Arlington Police Department's Citizens Academy.
- **CRB Must Include Police Experience/Expertise:** Approximately 11% of responses called for the inclusion of law enforcement/people with police knowledge and expertise to serve on the civilian review board in order to be evidence based. Specifically, there are requests for individuals who have knowledge of best police practices, use of force, and the criminal justice system along with mandatory training for all CRB members on the use of force policy in Arlington County.
- A matrix of all the responses can be found [here](#).

## References

- Community Oversight Board. (n.d.).  
<https://www.nashville.gov/Government/Boards-and-Committees/Committee-Information/ID/132/Community-Oversight-Board.aspx>
- Fairfax County, Virginia. [Independent Police Auditor](#). (n.d.)
- Fairfax County, Virginia. [Police Civilian Review Panel](#). (n.d.).
- Finn, P. (2001, March). [Citizen Review of Police: Approaches & Implementation](#). U.S. Dept. of Justice.
- Houston, Texas. [Independent Police Oversight Board](#). (n.d.).
- Charlottesville, Virginia. [Initial Police Civilian Review Board](#) (2019, July). [National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement](#). (2016).
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (2016, September). [Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Assessing the Evidence](#).
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (2016, September). [Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: A Review of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Various Models](#).
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (2016). [FAQs](#)
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (n.d.). *Models of Oversight*. Pre-publication copy provided by Brian Corr
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (n.d.). *Recommendations for Effective Practices*. Pre- publication copy provided by Brian Corr
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. (n.d.). *Thirteen Principles for Effective Oversight*. Pre- publication copy provide by Brian Corr
- SB 5035, 1<sup>st</sup> Spec. Sess. (Va. 2020)
- SB 5055, 1<sup>st</sup>. Spec. Sess. (Va. 2020)
- Stephens, D.W., Scrivner, E., & Cambareri, J.F. (2018). *Civilian Oversight of the Police in Major Cities*. U.S. Dept. of Justice. <https://cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/Publications/cops-w0861-pub.pdf> (copy saved in MS Teams folder).
- Virginia Beach, Virginia. [Investigation Review Panel](#). (n.d.).