



THE NACOLE REVIEW

Summer 2000

In this issue:

- 1 Meeting the Challenge
Brian C. Reeder
- 2 NACOLE history
Board of directors
- 3 In praise of mediation
Barbara Attard
- 4 Peer Support
Pierce Murphy
- 5 NACOLE's Sixth
Annual Conference
- 7 Membership Form
- 9 Conference Agenda
- 11 Denver PSRC
Joseph G. Sandoval
- 12 Employment
opportunities
- 13 Resources for civilian
oversight
Sue Quinn

Meeting the challenge and duty of oversight

Due to my ten-year tenure of service and involvement in the area of citizens' review of police, I feel that the theme of this year's conference is very appropriate for our consideration. This year's theme highlights the important aspect of *cooperation* between community and police, which in my estimation, is the vital link in the success of any citizens' review mechanism. That theme is "**Meeting the Challenge and Duty of Oversight: The Work of Community and Police.**"

Four years ago Mr. Larna Spearman, current NACOLE Secretary, Mr. James Johnson, then Director of the Cincinnati Office of Professional Standards and current Director on the NACOLE Board of Directors, and I participated in a meeting requested by a diverse group of citizens. The group included legislators, police representatives and community activists from Louisville, KY, who were interested in citizens' review.

Mr. Johnson arranged the meeting so the group might examine two very different forms of citizen review processes which exist in the

continued on
page 4 >>

**by Brian C. Reeder
NACOLE President**

A brief history of NACOLE

In 1993, several members of the U.S. delegation to the International Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (IACOLE) conference in Cambridge, Massachusetts met to discuss issues of mutual concern relating to civilian oversight within the United States. The agenda of this meeting was the formation of a national organization to address the specific needs of civilians organized for law enforcement oversight.

At the 1994 IACOLE

conference in Orlando, Florida, U.S. delegates continued to discuss the creation of the new national organization. In April of 1995, a group of individuals met in Landover, Maryland and approved the articles of incorporation and preliminary bylaws. On May 16, 1995, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) began its operations.

As NACOLE continues to grow, the relationship between police and community - particularly

the minority community - continues to be one of the most critical social issues facing this country. The number of civilian oversight agencies in the U.S. has significantly increased. Of the nation's 100 largest cities, 71 have citizen review mechanisms. Since 1996, NACOLE has assisted more than 20 cities in their establishment of systems.

NACOLE recognizes that the majority of law enforcement officers strive, often under

dangerous and demanding circumstances, to carry out their duties in a restrained, lawful and professional manner. Despite this, the United States has a growing crisis of police misconduct. Citizens want to feel secure that police officers are in the community to serve and protect all citizens of that community. We believe that citizens have a right to assurance that adequate mechanisms are available to review and investigate questionable or unacceptable actions of law enforcement officers. ■

Board of Directors

President

Brian C. Reeder, Indianapolis, IN

Vice President

Malvina Monteiro, Cambridge, MA

Secretary

Larna Spearman, Indianapolis, IN

Treasurer

Clyde B. Davis, Lanham, MD

Members-at-Large

Donald Casimere, Richmond, CA
K. Felicia Davis, Syracuse, NY
James L. Johnson, Cincinnati, OH
Joseph Sandoval, Denver, CO
Sue Quinn, San Diego, CA

NACOLE strives to:

- Facilitate and involve the community as a true partner in community policing;
- Provide for establishment, development, education and technical assistance in all phases of civilian oversight;
- Develop a national forum to promote the idea of civilian review;
- Establish a clearinghouse of information;
- Provide technical assistance for emerging organizations;
- Provide continuing education opportunities for practitioners of civilian oversight;
- Develop an extensive library of research materials and publications for use in the field;
- Encourage the highest ethical standards in civilian oversight organizations;
- Educate the public by developing mechanisms to enhance police and community relations;
- Educate law enforcement agencies and encourage them to respond with sensitivity to citizens' complaints;
- Encourage full racial and ethnic representation and participation in NACOLE and the organizations overseen by its members.

In praise of mediation

by Barbara Attard
Berkeley Police Review Commission

Mediation changes lives. A successful mediation causes its participants to view the world from the perspective of the opposing party—a place they would not otherwise venture. As a civilian oversight professional focusing on police accountability, I was skeptical about resolving cases through alternative dispute resolution processes. After seeing mediation produce dramatic results, I have been converted.

Investigations of police misconduct complaints have limited efficacy in cases concerning discourtesy and attitude. These cases are notoriously hard to prove and the majority result in findings of “not sustained.” Because there is no definitive finding, both civilians and officers feel that they have not been heard and that the process did not work for them.

Mediation is different. Through the process of mediation, both the complainant and the officer can gain an understanding of why the other person acted as he or she did. When the parties gain this knowledge, they are able to place each other’s behavior into a new and comprehensible context. A successful mediation brings the parties to a new level of understanding, where forgiveness and healing can begin.

It is difficult to convince the parties in police misconduct cases to participate in mediation because they do not have an ongoing relationship with each other. Because they are not part of the same family or neighborhood, they do not have a

vested interest in fixing the relationship. The civilian oversight practitioner almost always must convince the parties to participate in mediation, but when the parties do agree, the results are often remarkable.

“ [M]ediation is a... powerful tool in bringing about real change. Because there is no losing side... both parties can come away with genuine understanding and good feelings toward each other and the civilian oversight process.”

The goal in police misconduct investigations is determining and correcting *errant* behavior. While traditional discipline is an important tool in the process, mediation is a much more powerful tool in bringing about real change. Because there is no losing side in a successful mediation, both parties can come away with genuine understanding and good feelings toward each other and the civilian oversight process.

When developing a mediation program, it is important to employ impartial mediators who can be trusted by both parties. Although some systems use staff, commissioners or ranking officers to conduct mediations, most agencies choose to go outside to find

mediators. The Berkeley Police Review Commission (PRC) mediation program utilizes the services of Berkeley Dispute Resolution Service (BDRS) to conduct its mediations. BDRS handles the case completely upon referral, assigning its own experienced mediators to each case. Sarah Calderon, a BDRS staff member, says that mediation “levels the playing field, allowing people to get out of the power imbalance of their normal roles to discuss what happened as people. When people are willing to talk and communicate, it can be transformation—a big success.” Although the PRC mediation program is in its infancy, it has already proven itself to be an important vehicle for complaint resolution.

There are conflicting opinions on what types of cases should be addressed in mediation. Some jurisdictions have strict rules preventing cases involving excessive force and racial or sexual slurs to be addressed outside of traditional disciplinary procedures. Restrictions are sometimes set to prevent officers from using mediation repeatedly within a given period of time, because in many systems, mediated cases are removed from the officer’s personnel file. The rationale for these restrictions on the use of mediation is that some cases are deemed too serious not to be handled as misconduct cases and registered in the officer’s record. Critics of these restrictions argue that mediation can be the more successful means of changing behavior, for these types of cases in particular, the option should be available. ■

Questions? You can reach Barbara Attard at (510) 644-6716, or via e-mail at BAttard@ci.berkeley.ca.us.

Praise for peer support

In the course of looking into a complaint about the excessive use of force by police, it became apparent that a contributing factor in the case was the physical and mental disability of the complainant. The actions and decisions of the complainant, which looked

like aggression to the police, were likely no threat to the officers. They were caused by a combination of mental illness and a seizure-like syndrome. Unfortunately, the situation escalated, force was used, the complainant was injured by the police, and he was charged with resisting and obstructing an officer.

My research into this case pointed out that our Police Department has no policy or special training to help officers distinguish between real threats of violence and the actions of a mentally ill

and/or physically disabled person. In preparing a recommendation that such a policy and training be developed, I accessed several sources of information. One source was the NACOLE e-mail list maintained by Sue Quinn. I sent out the following request: "I would appreciate any information on model policies, procedures, and/or training that will help police to handle encounters with people with disabilities that my look like aggression or resistance." I received six replies, five of which came back within 48 hours. Two of the responders sent me

hard copies of their policies. Two others referred me to resources on the Internet that might be of help.

As a result of the request, I have made a formal recommendation to the Chief of Police and can offer him some concrete ideas for addressing this issue. It is good to know that my NACOLE peers are there to help me and provide support when needed. ■

byPierce Murphy
Community Ombudsman
Boise, Idaho
LPMurphy@pobox.ci.boise.id.us

A Message from the President

continued from front page

cities of Indianapolis, IN, and Cincinnati, OH. The meeting was arranged and there was a very interesting discussion regarding the salient points of each type of review as they explored the possibility of initiating their own citizens' review process in Louisville, KY.

On November 9, 1999, I attended a town forum in Louisville, KY, hosted by the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. With me was another NACOLE member Carol Scott, Executive Director from Knoxville, TN. We discussed the merits of creating a citizens' review panel with several members of the community and afterward had meaningful discussions with several aldermen who stated that

they had changed their position on viable independent review of police in Louisville. After four years of debate, persuasion and citizens' support for the idea, a police review enabling ordinance was passed by the Louisville Board of Aldermen and approved on May 9, 2000 by a vote of 6 to 5 to adopt the measure. Before we celebrate too much, let me inform you of the fact that the Mayor, Mr. Dave Armstrong, vetoed the measure on May 19, 2000. In his veto he stated, "***In organizations like police and fire, chains of command are critical, accountability is vital. The ordinance [would] blur the lines of authority.... Public employees must be***

responsible and accountable to an ultimate boss... Police officers are accountable to the Mayor, not a citizens' panel created by the aldermen." (Quoted from: *The Louisville Courier-Journal, Saturday, May 20, 2000*) It seems to be impossible for accountability to be tied to the community unless it is from the Mayor's office.

The Mayor of Louisville's misconception demonstrates the tremendous need for there to be more meaningful and persuasive discussion and additional compelling evidence catalogued to validate the fact that the partnership between citizens' review and police can be one that is neither destructive nor intrusive.

Instead, it should be perceived as a relationship which builds the credibility of the department and leads to the strengthening of the integrity of each officer, without blurring the lines of authority.

I believe that there will be citizens' review in Louisville, KY. However, this pervasive attitude demonstrates the need for NACOLE to continue to speak to this vital issue and for each of you to participate in these important discussions. NACOLE's desire is to see each of you at this year's conference and for all of our membership to participate in the elections and strategic planning sessions as we continue to promote civilian review in the United States. ■

NACOLE's Sixth Annual Conference:

Meeting the challenge and duty of oversight: the work of community and police

The Board of Directors is pleased to announce NACOLE's sixth annual conference, September 26-29, 2000 in Kauai, Hawaii. The conference theme this year is **"Meeting the Challenge and Duty of Oversight: The work of Community and Police."** NACOLE is honored to accept the Kauai Police Commission's offer to host the 2000 conference. NACOLE is grateful to all its Hawaiian members for their support and participation in the organization's mission and operation.

After receiving invitations from a number of cities including Houston TX, Denver CO, Cambridge MA and Kauai HI, NACOLE selected Kauai for the most reasonable hotel rates and comparable airfares from most points in the U.S. This choice of location gives NACOLE an opportunity to cooperate with an innovative and highly effective police review commissions and view their successful police community relations with oversight systems first hand.

The conference will be held at the Kauai Beach Resort, centrally located with convenient access to the Lihue County Airport, shopping areas and a recently redeveloped town center. Because the conference takes place in the off-season for tourism to Hawaii, the Kauai Beach Resort is able to offer very reasonable rates to our conference attendees.

Hawaii is unique for its cultural diversity and positive recent history of police-community relations. The goal of the conference is to maximize participation from all the Islands and the West, Mid West, and East Coast of the U.S. where the majority of NACOLE's members hail from. NACOLE wishes to recognize the enormous contributions of its members from throughout the United States.

NACOLE consistently attracts high-caliber speakers for its conference panels, including members of the U.S. Justice Department, U.S. House of Representatives, the American Civil Liberties Union, members of civilian review boards, civil rights advocates, community activists, police department managers and union officials. We are confident that this year's speakers will carry on the thought-provoking dialogues NACOLE has made possible in previous years.

We hope that you and your agency will be present at this year's conference to contribute your ideas on the issues that we all face together.

If you have specific ideas on how your agency would like to contribute to the conference agenda, whether by recommending a speaker, presenting a panel or sponsoring an event please contact any NACOLE board member.

ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) was established in 1995 and became a non-profit, tax-exempt professional organization in 1999. NACOLE provides practitioners of civilian oversight with the opportunity to dialogue and exchange information on patterns and practices of unacceptable actions of law enforcement personnel. NACOLE is recognized by many leading organizations and endorsed by the International Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (IACOPE) and the Canadian Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (CACOLE).

The relationship between police and persons of color, homeless, and the mentally ill continues to be one of the most critical social issues in the United States. The number of civilian oversight agencies in this country has increased significantly in recent years. About 71 of the nation's 100 largest cities have citizen review mechanisms. In 1996 and 1999, NACOLE assisted over 20 cities that were interested in establishing civilian oversight systems, most recently Riverside CA.

NACOLE recognizes that the majority of law enforcement officers strive, often under dangerous and demanding circumstances, to carry out their duties in a restrained, lawful and professional manner. However, the growing numbers of force incidents resulting in death or serious injuries in the past several years have continued to polarize communities of color. For instance, men of color interviewed recently in the press and television said they no longer feel safe and free on the streets because they fear the police.

Simple citizen-police contacts escalate into violence and preventable deaths and injuries. These instances deepen community mistrust of the police—the very people we bestow with the responsibility to enforce the laws and protect individuals and property. These events demonstrate the urgent need for law enforcement leadership to make serious effort as a willing, sincere, and open minded partner, to recognize concerns and ideas that are different then theirs in order to improve police-community relations.

The US Justice Department has investigated or is considering investigating police misconduct and failures of accountability in many cities and states in the past years to determine pattern and practice of poliece misconduct. They include New York City, NY, Pittsburg, PA, Providence, RI, Prince George’s County, MD, Montgomery County, MD, Los Angeles, CA, and the states of New Jersey and Ohio.

NACOLE STRIVES TO:

- Facilitate and involve the community as a true partner in community policing.
- Provide educational opportunities and technical assistance to existing and emerging organizations that perform civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- Encourage and promote the highest ethical and professional standards in organizations providing civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- Provide a national forum for exchange of information for agencies that provide civilian oversight of law enforcement.

WHO SHOULD ATTEND?

Participants in this conference may be: Civilian Oversight Agency personnel; Police Commissioners/Chiefs; Law Enforcement Agency personnel (sworn and non-sworn); Police Union Representatives; Internal Affairs Staff; Social Service Agencies; Federal, State, and Local Officials; Special Interest Groups; Communities interested in creating civilian review boards; Volunteers; and Colleges, Universities and students. The general public is also invited.

BENEFITS OF THE CONFERENCE

- ❖ Exposure to critical law enforcement issues shaping our future.
- ❖ Opportunities to undertake new roles in civilian oversight nationally and locally.
- ❖ Opportunities to meet and share ideas with leaders in the civilian oversight field.
- ❖ Membership in a fast-growing national network of civilian oversight and law enforcement leaders across the United States.
- ❖ Development of essential skills to involve the community as a partner in community policing.
- ❖ Extensive national dialogue between law enforcement personnel, citizens and civilian oversight practitioners.
- ❖ Define what communities need to know when establishing a civilian oversight system, changing existing review mechanisms and what accomplishments can be expected in the short and long term in any jurisdiction.
- ❖ Network with city and state agencies to promote civilian oversight and police accountability reform processes.
- ❖ Explain types of resistance used to derail or co-opt any form of civilian oversight system and effective strategies of countering that resistance.
- ❖ Discuss what a community can expect to gain from a functioning civilian review process, and how citizen review agencies are effective in reductions of municipal liability suits.

Membership information

Select a membership category:

Sustaining Members

Sustaining members are organizations and individuals who wish to make tax deductible contributions to the further the goals and principles of NACOLE. *Donations begin at \$500.*

Organizational Members

Organizational members are agencies of board who provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. These agencies will receive one transferable regular membership and associate memberships for the remaining members of their boards. *Annual dues: \$300*

Regular Members

Regular members are individuals who are not sworn law enforcement officers but who work or have worked for agencies that are mandated by legislative or executive authority to investigate and review complaints against law enforcement officers. *Annual dues: \$150.*

Associate Members

Associate members are individuals concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. The members shall be able to participate in all NACOLE activities, including serving on committees, but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. *Annual dues: \$100.*

Student Members

Student members are individuals who are full-time students and are concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. Student members will be able to serve on committees but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. *Annual dues: \$25.*

All memberships include a one-year subscription to the NACOLE Review.

(over)

Member information

Please fill in the following:

Name

Organization or company

Title

Organization telephone (with area code)

Organization address

City, State, Zip

Home address

City, State, Zip

Home telephone (with area code)

Organization fax

Home e-mail

Organization e-mail

Home fax

Make checks payable to NACOLE

Mail form and payment to:

NACOLE
P.O. Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703

Conference Agenda

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2000

6:00 PM TO 9:00 PM
Pre-Registration and Reception
 Plumeira Room or outdoors

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27

8:00 AM TO 8:30 AM
Registration
 and Continental Breakfast

8:30 AM TO 10:00 AM
Opening
 Hawaiian Blessing Chant
 Kumu Hula, Pohaku Mighimitsu
Honor Guards
President's Remarks
City Officials - Welcome

10:AM TO 10:45 AM
Keynote Address
 Conference Theme:
 "Meeting the Challenge and Duty
 of Oversight: The Work of Community
 and Police."

10:45 TO 11:00 PM
Break

11:00 AM TO 12:30
Panel Discussion:
Assessing Credibility
 The panel will address complaints where little evidence and conflicting and often uncorroborated statements from complainant and subject officer exist to uncover hidden information, and to judge credibility of investigation documents. The panel will also address issues of police corruption, police or complainant fabrication, planting evidence, false reporting and inadequate internal affairs investigations. Attendees will learn strategies to evaluate complainant and officer statements and come to a definite conclusion.

12:30 PM TO 1:15 PM
Lunch hosted

2:00 PM TO 5:00 PM
Panel Discussion
Case Study: Practicum:
Group Skill Building Training:
Skill Training Scenario: Case study to be made up of a complainant's and a subject officer's conflicting statements. The panel will conduct training in small groups to explore how the group will examine the statements, and the complainant & subject officer to come to a conclusion. If no conclusion can be made, small groups will outline what makes it impossible to decide, and will identify further investigation they must conduct or have their Internal Affairs Units conduct before completing the investigation.

6:00 PM TO 9:00 PM
Dinner
 Hawaiian entertainment with cash bar

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28

8:00 AM TO 9:00 AM
Continental Breakfast

9:00 AM TO 10:15 AM
Panel Discussion
Mediation: When, Why, and How
 This workshop will highlight the mediation process in these various cities such as Berkeley, Minneapolis, Portland & Hawaii and map out timelines; budgets; what has worked, what hasn't; how to adapt to other methods. The speakers will also cover what research has shown and describe the usefulness of mediation, when to and not to use it. Conference attendees will learn "how to build a mediation process from ground up and what pitfalls to avoid in the process.

10:15 AM TO 10:30 AM
Break

10:30 AM TO 11:45 AM
Panel Discussion
Mediation: When, Why, and How

12:00 PM TO 1:45 PM
Luncheon
Keynote Moderator:
Teresa Guerreo-Dailey, Auditor
City of San Jose, and California
Topic: Racial Profiling Update

2:00 PM TO 5:00 PM
Panel Discussion-Two Tracks
TRACK-I
Models of Civilian Oversight: Similarities, Differences and Expectations
 This presentation is designed for persons new to civilian oversight and for jurisdictions intending to implement an oversight process. Varieties of oversight will be described; their similarities and differences will be highlighted. Pros and cons of the models will be described. The expected, predictable challenges to oversight will be outlined. Technical assistance and further resources will be available.

TRACK-II
Managing the Oversight Process: Making Sense of it All
 A nuts and bolts discussion of issues faced by new executive directors in setting up agency offices, implementing operation procedures, policies, and oversight mandates. Attendees will learn to field public information requests, and to understand open meeting laws. Practitioner will learn to create agency budgets while interfacing as effective liaisons with city administration, law department, police executives and unions.

Hotel Registration Form

Participants will discuss strategies to build coalitions with community, media, and other concerned entities.

5:00 PM

Dinner - on your own

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29

8:30 AM

Coffee

9:00 AM TO 10:45 AM

**Wrap-up
Announcements**

11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM

**Business Meeting
Election**

12:00 PM

Lunch - on your own

6:00 PM

**Banquet Dinner and
Cocktails
Entertainment Program
Aloha Remarks**

CONFERENCE END

See you next year!

CONFERENCE LOCATION:

4331 Kauai Beach Drive Lihue, HI
96766 Reservations can be made
by calling:

1-888-245-7717 Tel. (808) 245-
1955

Fax: (808) 245-3956/Group
Department

Check in time is 3:00 PM.
Check out time is 12:00 noon.
Children 17 years and under
are free when sharing with
parents and utilizing existing
beds. **INDIVIDUAL GUEST
WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR
HOTEL BELLMAN SERVICES.**
(Current Industry Rate: \$4.90
inclusive, round-trip, per
person)

DEADLINE: Final day for
reservation is: **August 24, 2000.**

Cancellation: A reservation
must be **canceled no later
than 72 hours** prior to arrival.
Deposit by personal check
preferred (U.S.. dollars): pay to
the order of **Outrigger Hotels
Hawaii.**

CREDIT CARDS are accepted.
*A name and deposit is
required for each reservation.
*Reservation is confirmed
when deposit is received
within 10 days of booking. A
written confirmation will be
mailed.

CREDIT INFORMATION:

Cardholder Name:

Expiration Date:

Type of Card:

Card Number:

Mastercard Interbank Number (4
Digits):

Billing Address:

Please return this form and
one night's deposit to:

**Kauai Beach Resort,
Beach Drive,
Lihue, HI 96766**

Attn: Cory Manalani/Reservations

Conference Registration Form

Name:

Title/Agency:

Address:

City:

State/Zip:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

EARLY REGISTRATION (by August 24, 2000)

- \$250 Regular Member
- \$250 Organizational Member
- \$275 Student Member

- \$300 Associate Member
- \$300 Non Member

Registration Plus Membership

- \$550 Organizational Member
- \$400 Regular Member
- \$400 Associate Member
- \$300 Student Member

- Take 20% discount for groups of two or more from the same agency
- Add \$50 for each **late registration postmarked August 24, 2000** or after

Amount Enclosed \$ _____

Please make checks payable to
NACOLE and mail it to:

P. O. Box 1110 Lanham, MD 20703

- **No refund for cancel after August 24, 2000**

For office use only

Date postmarked _____ Date paid _____ Received by _____

Cash Check Check No. _____ Member Status _____

Registration Status Early Late

Compromise creates effective Denver commission

Denver PSRC looks forward to continuing its work into the new millennium

by Joseph G.
Sandoval
sandovaj@mscd.edu

The enabling legislation leading to the creation of the Public Safety Review Commission of the City and County of Denver, Colorado was the result of compromise. The Denver City Council enacted the ordinance creating the commission in August of 1992. The Commission began to function in January 1993 with seven Commissioners appointed by the Mayor. The selection process now requires the City Council to approve the appointment of the Mayor. Each Commissioner serves a four-year term and there are limitations of two terms.

The Commission serves as a reviewing body over the investigations and conclusions of the Denver Police Department

in matters involving alleged police misconduct. The Commission does have subpoena power and the authority to hire an independent investigator. However, all Commissioners are volunteers and one staff person serves the Commission.

During the past seven years the Commission has reviewed 468 complaints. All complaints are not reviewed, but the complainant must request review after the Denver Police Department has investigated the complaint and issued a finding of not sustained, unfounded or exonerated. The Denver Police investigated 2635 citizen complaints during the past eight years and sustained 11.7% (306) of those complaints. Complain-

ants requested the Commission to review 17.5% (468) of all citizen complaints.

After review by the Commission, Commissioners recommended a change in the finding for 16% of the complaints reviewed. Although Commissioners agreed with the departmental findings in 84% of cases reviewed, the Commission has had to defend its authority under the Ordinance since the beginning. The Police Protective Association has made efforts to eviscerate the power granted under the ordinance through political and legal challenges. Fortunately, the Commission has prevailed in most of these challenges and looks forward to continuing its work into the new millennium. ■

Employment opportunities

Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Special Litigation Section

The Civil Rights Division is hiring lawyers with at least two to three years' experience, paralegals, and investigators. Thirty to forty positions are available in two sections, the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section and the Special Litigation Section. Other sections may also be hiring but in lesser numbers.

The Special Litigation Section is charged with enforcing federal civil rights statutes in three major areas: conditions of institutional confinement, conduct of law enforcement agencies, and access to reproductive health facilities and places of religious worship.

Interested persons should send a resume to:

Steven H. Rosenbaum
Chief

Special Litigation Section
Civil Rights Division
US Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 5200
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 514-6255

The Housing Section enforces the Fair Housing Act and the

Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

Send resumes to:
Joan A. Magagna
Chief
Housing and Civil Enforcement Section
Civil Rights Division
US Department of Justice
601 D. Street NW, Suite 5909
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 514-4713

Employment opportunity

City of Riverside, Executive Director, Community Police Review Commission

The City of Riverside (pop. 255,000) is seeking the City's first Executive Director for the newly created Community Police Review Commission.

The Executive Director will report directly to the City Manager and will administer the activities of the Commission Office including review of police

misconduct investigations, evaluating overall quality of police conduct and recommending policy changes and educating the public.

The successful candidate will possess a Bachelor's Degree and significant full time experience in inspector general, audit/investigation, law or professional administration.

The ideal candidate will possess exceptional investigative and analytical skills combined with political astuteness and the highest level of personal integrity.

The proposed salary range is \$65,916 - \$80,148. The City also offers an attractive benefit package. A brochure is available.

Submit resume, cover letter with current salary and three work-related references by **Friday, June 23, 2000** to:

SHANNON ASSOCIATES
740 University Avenue,
Suite 130
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: (916) 567-4280
Fax: (916) 567-1220
Email:
resumes@shannonassoc.com

Resources for civilian oversight

Sue Quinn, NACOLE board member

Respectful and Effective Policing

Vera Institute, March 1999

Available online at:

<http://www.vera.org/vhp.Bronx-web.3html>

Focusing on two New York precincts, the 42nd and 44th, which experienced both reduced crime and reduced complaint levels, this report outlines “broken windows” policing and exposes the fallacy that reduced crime must include aggressive, disrespectful policing. The authors suggest that the impressive statistics in the 42nd and 44th precincts are the result of two police managers with differing management styles, each expecting their subordinates to interact respectfully with the populations they serve. This article provides an innovative methodology for studying comparative crime and complaint rates in other jurisdictions and poses critical questions for training discussions among board members and law enforcement professionals.

Eleventh Semiannual Report on the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

Merrick Bobb, October 1999

Special Counsel to Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on Sheriff's Department

Available online at:

<http://www.co.la.ca.us/11thereport.htm>

The latest installment in a series of semiannual reports on issues in the Sheriff's Department, this report discusses sexual harassment within the department and attempts and costs to curtail it, retention of personnel data, use of force training, use of canines and litigation. These reports are always instructive to those examining law enforcement accountability. If your jurisdiction is examining any of the current topics, you are likely to find useful information here.

Investigative Procedures and Guidelines

San Jose Independent Police Auditor, Professional Standards and Conduct Unit

This manual provides an important model for investigation monitoring, based on established practices of the San Jose Independent Police Auditor.

Contact Theresa Guerrero-Daley at Teresa.Guerrero-Daley@ci.sj.ca.us

USA: Race, Rights and Police Brutality

Amnesty International

Available online at

<http://www.amnesty.org/rightsforall/police/brutality>

Amnesty's September 1999 report discusses critical issues in police brutality including national and federal initiatives, international standards, on-going investigations of pepper spray, stun belt and police dog misuse and police abuse of gays, lesbians and the mentally ill.

Use of Force by Police: Overview of National and Local Data

National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics

Available online at

<http://www.ncjrs.org/txtfiles1/nij/176330.txt>

The NIJ's October 1999 report provides an overview of research on the use of force, the latest findings from NIJ-sponsored research projects and suggests areas needing further research.

If you know of a resource that would be of use to your colleagues, please forward the information to Sue Quinn at Suelqq@aol.com for inclusion in future issues of The NACOLE Review.



The NACOLE Review is published twice a year
for the members of NACOLE.

National Association for Civilian Oversight of
Law Enforcement
P.O. Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703

(301) 731-5808 ■ Fax (301) 794-0264
E-mail: NACOLE95@aol.com

Editor: Suzanne Egbert
segbert@yahoo.com

© 2000 NACOLE, Inc. All rights reserved.

THE NACOLE REVIEW

**National Association for
Civilian Oversight of Law
Enforcement
P. O. Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703**

first class mail