



City of Dayton

Police Oversight Reform

Working Group Charter

Working Group Name:	Police Oversight Reform Working Group
Section I: Working Group (WG) Identification	
WG Chartering Organization:	City of Dayton, Ohio
WG Charter Approval Date:	July 17, 2020
WG Co-Chairs:	Co-Chairs: Recorder Brandon McClain, Commissioner Matt Joseph
WG Assigned Staff	Mediation Center: Lydia VanderKaay, Department of Law: Amy Blankenship, City Commission Office: Maggie Schaller, Human Relations Council: Jacob Davis, University of Dayton Law School: Carly Suierveld
WG Members	Sheena Avery Paul Bradley, HRC Board Branford Brown, CPC Mike Deffet, Public Defender Daj'za Demmings, HRC Board Mark Ecton Dr. Derrick L. Foward, President, NAACP Pastor Terrilynn Griffith, PACT Mike King Carla Maragaño, Public Defender Derric McDonald Rev. Ken Moss Anne Pfeiffer, CPC Ricky Robinson Paul Saunders Dorian Vauls Dr. Robert Walker Tom Wahlrab Jonathan White
Background Documents:	https://www.daytonohio.gov/891/Police-Reform

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

The mission of the Police Oversight Reform Working Group is to identify and discuss alternatives and recommend practical ways to improve the transparency and effectiveness of City of Dayton Police processes in two specific areas.

The scope of this Working Group is limited to consideration of issues and solutions relevant to the operations of the Dayton Police Department, and directly related to the two processes in our portfolio; the police misconduct complaint process, and the citizens' appeal process for police misconduct cases.

Objectives:

The objectives of the Police Oversight Reform Working Group are:

1. To research and recommend changes that increase transparency and effectiveness in the police misconduct reporting process.
2. To research and recommend changes that strengthen the citizens' appeal process for police misconduct cases.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

The WG, through Commissioner Joseph, will provide final recommendations to the Dayton City Commission by **March** 15, 2021, describing its recommendations for process changes in the two areas in its portfolio. One potential approach is for the WG to research, review and rank multiple options. After recommendations are submitted, the City Commission will report back within 30 days to the Working Group on the status of the recommendations, i.e., they will be accepted as written, accepted with amendments, or why the recommendations cannot be acted on. The WG will also provide regular status updates as described later in this document.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

Members of Working Group One have been invited to participate by the Working Group co-chairs and were chosen due to their familiarity with and interest in reform of the processes being considered. The co-chairs intended to keep the number of members at or below 20 for practical reasons, and selection preference was given to members who live or work in the City of Dayton. After the Working Group has the opportunity to review and modify this Charter, Members will abide by the rules of this Charter as they carry out their work.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

The Police Oversight Reform Working Group is one of five ad-hoc working groups empowered by the Dayton City Commission to formulate recommendations for police reform in the City of Dayton. The City of Dayton is providing staff to assist in the work of the WG. The WG will meet on a schedule to be determined by the co-chairs, with the initial target being two meetings per month, with each meeting lasting no longer than 90 minutes. Due to the pandemic, at least the first meeting will be held remotely.

The WG will be dissolved when its final recommendations have been provided to the City

Commission, unless otherwise directed by the Commission.

Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:

The co-chairs of the Working Group will plan the work of the WG, set the agenda, call meetings to order, recognize speakers, keep order in meetings, keep the WG on task, assign and follow-up on tasks, and work to guide members towards practical solutions. Because this is a large WG, with an impressive diversity of thought, the co-chairs will work to allow members to express their thoughts. However, in order to make sure all are heard, they do reserve the ability to limit to 90 seconds, or shorter, the amount of time each member is recognized to speak at a time. In the absence of both co-chairs, they can name a temporary chair from the membership of the WG to preside until one or both co-chairs returns.

Members of the Working Group will prepare for and attend meetings, will participate in the discussions and other work of the WG, will speak and listen with consideration to other group members, and will follow-up on assigned tasks.

The Mediator will act as an impartial party, and will specifically work to ensure that members’ voices are heard, both inside and outside of regular meetings, and to support members thinking and decision-making through any interpersonal difficulties as they proceed with the work of the WG.

Assigned Staff supporting the work of the WG will keep the minutes of the meetings, will provide research and expertise as needed, and will assist in other ways at the direction of the co-chairs. They are not voting members of the WG.

For all virtual meetings, all participants will utilize a laptop or desktop computer, with a camera and sound capability. If the participant does not have one available, the co-chairs will arrange for a device to be loaned to them. Due to the sensitive nature of the discussions, cameras must be on and showing faces during meetings.

This Charter may be amended by approval of a majority of the Working Group.

All meetings will be streamed live for public viewing.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making:

The co-chairs of this Working Group intend to make decisions by consensus; full consensus when possible, and near consensus (when 25% or less of overall members disagree, but most agree) when required. If full consensus on final recommendations is not possible, the co-chairs will encourage the dissenting members to produce an Alternate Solutions document outlining their preferred solutions, which will be submitted to the City Commission along with the full body’s recommendations.

Additional meeting guidelines will be determined by the co-chairs and the Working Group and adjusted as needed.

Status Reporting:

As the Working Group goes about its deliberations, the co-chairs will from time to time request that the City Staff assisting the WG compose a one-page status memo. This memo should describe the number of meetings held, who was in attendance, and contain a brief description of the activities of the WG since the previous report was submitted. When complete, and approved by the co-chairs, the memo should be submitted to the Clerk of Commission for distribution to the City Commission and City Manager. At a minimum, a memo should be submitted every 60 days during the work of the committee.

Issue Resolution Processes:

When discussing crucial matters such as the ones that this Working Group will be working on, there is the potential that a Member of the WG might feel that their point of view has not been heard, or that a decision made by the co-chair was not correct, and is in fact harmful to the work of the WG. In these cases, the Member has a number of methods of recourse, including:

1. The Member can request a conversation with an impartial Mediator to discuss the situation and ask for their help in resolving it. The Mediator is empowered to approach anyone on the WG, including the co-chairs and City Staff, in order to resolve an issue.
2. If the impartial Mediator is unable to support the member in resolving the issue to the satisfaction of the Member, the Member can address their complaint to Ms. Michelle Zaremba, the Manager of the Dayton Mediation Center, who supervises the Mediator. She will review the issue and reply to the Member promptly.
3. If the Manager of the Dayton Mediation Center is unable to support the member in resolving the issue to the satisfaction of the Member, the Member can address their complaint in the form of a letter to the City Commission, addressed to the Clerk of Commission. As the **empanelling** body, the City Commission will review the issue, and reply to the Member promptly.

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:

After the Working Group completes its work and is dissolved, the City Staff supporting the WG will write a brief assessment of the WG process, focusing on what worked and what did not, and other lessons learned. This will include soliciting written feedback from Members describing their assessment of the WG. This feedback will be added to any impressions of the co-chairs and the City Staff themselves, and will be submitted to the City Commission 45 days after the dissolution of the WG.

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0	June 29, 2020	First draft
2.0	July 7, 2020	Updates from Working Group city staff
3.0	July 11, 2020	Updates from city staff and WG members
4.0	July 17, 2020	As unanimously adopted by the Working Group
5.0	December 11, 2020	As amended by the Working Group, Sections II and IV were amended

