



**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Selection Panel Members: Chairperson James Chanin (District 2), Vice Chairperson Brendalynn Goodall (Mayor), Gay Plair Cobb (At Large), Don Link (District 1), Langston Buddenhagen (District 3), Lorelei Bosserman (District 4), Mary Vail (District 5), Rickisha Herron (District 6), and Bill Thomasson (District 7).

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, members of the Police Commission Selection Panel, as well as City staff, will participate via phone/video conference, and no physical teleconference locations are required.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Oakland Police Commission Selection Panel encourages public participation in the online board meetings. The public may observe and/or participate in this meeting in several ways.

OBSERVE:

- To observe the meeting by video conference, please click on this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85237746987> at the noticed meeting time.

Instructions on how to join a meeting by video conference are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193>, which is a webpage entitled "Joining a Meeting"

- To listen to the meeting by phone, please call the numbers below at the noticed meeting time: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799. For each number, please be patient and when requested, dial the following Webinar ID: 852 3774 6987

After calling any of these phone numbers, if you are asked for a participant ID or code, press #. Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled "Joining a Meeting By Phone."

PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT: There are three ways to make public comment within the time allotted for public comment on an eligible Agenda item.

- Comment in advance. To send your comment directly to the Selection Panel and staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please send your comment, along with your full name and agenda item number you are commenting on, to Richard Luna at rluna@oaklandca.gov. Please note that eComment submissions close one (1) hour before posted meeting time. All submitted public comment will be provided to the Selection Panel prior to the meeting.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

• By Video Conference. To comment by Zoom video conference, click the “Raise Your Hand” button to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. You will then be unmuted, during your turn, and allowed to participate in public comment. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted. Instructions on how to “Raise Your Hand” are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129>, which is a webpage entitled “Raise Hand In Webinar.”

• By Phone. To comment by phone, please call on one of the above listed phone numbers. You will be prompted to “Raise Your Hand” by pressing STAR-NINE (“*9”) to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on a eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. Once it is your turn, you will be unmuted and allowed to make your comment. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted. Instructions of how to raise your hand by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting by Phone.”

If you have any questions about these protocols, please e-mail Richard Luna, at rluna@oaklandca.gov.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

2. Open Forum

Speakers will be called on by the facilitator as speakers “raise their hand” through video conference or by telephone. All speakers will be allotted a maximum of three minutes unless the Chairperson allocates additional time.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of Selection Panel Meeting Minutes

- [April 19, 2021 Meeting](#)

4. Annual Training and Orientation to City Charter Section 604 – Police Commission
In accordance with City Council Ordinance No. 13498 C.M.S., Section 2.45.030, the Selection Panel shall receive training and orientation regarding City Charter Section 604 – Police Commission on an annual basis, to occur at the regular meeting each May.

- [Presentation Slides – Oakland Police Commission, Oakland City Charter Section 604](#)

5. Public Safety Task Force Recommendations

The Selection Panel will discuss and take possible action on the Public Safety Task Force recommendations and/or recommendations provided by the Ad Hoc Committee in response to the Task Force’s proposals. This item was continued from the meeting of April 5, 2021.

- [Ad Hoc Committee: Recommendations from the Public Safety in Oakland Task Force](#)
- [Public Safety Task Force Recommendations](#)

6. 2021 Police Commissioner Nomination Process

The Selection Panel will discuss and take possible action on its process for appointing Police Commissioners during this current selection process, including setting its future meeting schedule.

- [Staff Report: 2021 Nomination Process](#)

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

7. Time Commitment for Serving on the Police Commission

The Selection Panel will discuss and take possible action on the time commitment needed to serve on the Police Commission, including requesting current members of the Oakland Police Commission to provide input at a future meeting of the Selection Panel. This item was not discussed at the meeting of April 5, 2021.

- There are no items related to this action item.

8. Adjournment

The meeting will adjourn upon the completion of the Selection Panel's business.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Do you need an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter or other assistance to participate? Please email rluna@oaklandca.gov or call (510) 238-4756 or (510) 238-2007 for TDD/TTY five days in advance.

¿Necesita un intérprete en español, cantonés o mandarín, u otra ayuda para participar? Por favor envíe un correo electrónico a rluna@oaklandca.gov o llame al (510) 238-4756 o al (510) 238-2007 para TDD/TTY por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión. Gracias.

你需要手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務嗎? 請在會議前五個工作天電郵 rluna@oaklandca.gov 或 致電 (510) 238-4756 或 (510) 238-2007 TDD/TTY.



**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 19, 2021
Via Teleconference

Selection Panel Members: Gay Plair Cobb (At Large), Don Link (District 1), James Chanin (District 2), Langston Buddenhagen (District 3), Lorelei Bosserman (District 4), Mary Vail (District 5), Rickisha Herron (District 6), Bill Thomasson (District 7), and Brendalynn Goodall (Mayor).

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Quorum was determined and the meeting started at 6:02 pm.

Members present: Lorelei Bosserman, Langston Buddenhagen, James Chanin, Gay Plair Cobb, Brendalynn Goodall, Rickisha Herron, Don Link, Bill Thomasson (arrived at 7:03 pm) and Mary Vail.

Members absent: None

Staff present: Richard J. Luna

City Attorney Staff present: Allison Dibley

2. Open Forum

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:

Heather Davison

A person identified as a West Oakland Resident

Valerie Baptiste

T Simmons

Written comments were submitted prior to the meeting by the following individuals:

Mayra Ramirez

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of Selection Panel Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Brendalynn Goodall, seconded by Lorelei Bosserman, to approve the meeting minutes of April 5, 2021. The motion passed with eight ayes (Bosserman, Buddenhagen, Chanin, Cobb, Goodall, Herron, Link, Vail) and one excused (Thomasson).

There were no public comments on this item.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Monday, April 19, 2021
Via Teleconference

4. Vacant Alternate Commissioner Seat

The Selection Panel interviewed Police Commission applicant Theodore Johnson.

Member Bill Thomasson arrived at 7:03 pm.

The Selection Panel continued interviewing Police Commission applicants Omar Farmer and Jesse Hsieh.

The Selection Panel took public comments before recessing from 8:38 to 8:50 pm.

Roll call was re-taken with all members present.

Selection Panel Members discussed the applicants, stating their preference in which candidate would receive a nomination to serve as an Alternate Commissioner on the Police Commission.

A motion was made by Don Link, seconded by Brendalynn Goodall to nominate Jesse Hsieh as the Selection Panel's nominee for the Alternate Commissioner vacancy. The motion passed with nine ayes (Bosserman, Buddenhagen, Chanin, Cobb, Goodall, Herron, Link, Thomasson, Vail).

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:
Assata Olugbala
Reisa Jaffe

5. Police Commissioner Application Outreach

The Selection Panel discussed upcoming outreach opportunities. City staff member Richard J. Luna stated the first step in outreach is to complete the edits to the application and post the updated document on the City's website. Member Lorelei Bosserman stated she could work with city staff in updating previously approved outreach documents so City staff can distribute materials to the Selection Panel Members and the public accordingly.

A motion was made by Langston Buddenhagen, seconded by Brendalynn Goodall, to approve the Selection Panel's current plan of Police Commissioner outreach. The motion passed with nine ayes (Bosserman, Buddenhagen, Chanin, Cobb, Goodall, Herron, Link, Thomasson, Vail).

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:
Assata Olugbala
Omar Farmer

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Monday, April 19, 2021
Via Teleconference

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39 pm.

DRAFT

Annual Selection Panel Orientation – Measure LL

Oakland City Charter Section 604

Presented by Allison M. Dibley
Office of Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker

Required Training

- ▶ Enabling Ordinance, section 2.45.030(F):

“The Selection Panel shall receive training and orientation regarding City Charter section 604 on an annual basis.”

Measure LL

- ▶ Measure LL passed by the voters in November 2016 by over 80%.
- ▶ Added Section 604 to the City Charter.
- ▶ City Charter section 604(a)(1): Establishes the Oakland Police Commission.
- ▶ Amended in November 2020 (Measure S1).

Oakland Police Commission

- ▶ Section 604(c)(1): 7 “regular members” and 2 “alternate members.”
- ▶ Commissioners are volunteers.
- ▶ Three Commissioners and one alternate appointed by the Mayor.
- ▶ Four Commissioners and one alternate appointed by the Selection Panel.
- ▶ Three-year terms; may serve up to 2 consecutive terms.
- ▶ Section 604(c)(10): City Council may remove for cause.

Measure S1 Amendment

- ▶ Section 604(c)(10): After a hearing, City Council may suspend for cause by an affirmative vote of at least 6 Councilmembers, and rescind suspension by an affirmative vote of at least 5 Councilmembers.

Measure S1 Amendment

- ▶ Section 604(c)(1):
 - “Alternate Commissioners shall be eligible to serve on any Commission standing or ad hoc committee, including any Discipline Committee.”

OPC's Charge

- ▶ Section 604(a)(1):
 - OPC “shall oversee the Oakland Police Department (hereinafter, Department) in order to ensure that its policies, practices, and customs conform to national standards of constitutional policing.”

OPC Powers and Duties

- ▶ Section 604(a)(1):

“The Commission shall have the functions and duties enumerated in this Section, as well as those assigned to the Commission by ordinance.”

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (1): ~~Organize, reorganize and~~ Oversee the Agency and the OIG. (Measure S1)
- ▶ Subsection (1): Contract with professional service providers. (Measure S1)
- ▶ Subsection (2): Conduct public hearings, at least once a year, on Department policies, practices and General Orders.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (3): Issue subpoenas for documents and/or testimony on any matter before the Commission.
- ▶ Exception (Measure S1): “the Commission shall not have the authority to issue subpoenas for the purpose of investigating any City employee, including an Agency employee, who is not a police officer.”

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (4): Propose Changes to Department policies, procedures, customs or General Orders which govern:
 - Use of Force;
 - Use of Force Review Boards;
 - Profiling Based on Protected Characteristics;
 - First Amendment assemblies; or
 - Elements expressly listed in federal court orders or settlements which pertain to the Department.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

▶ Subsection (4):

- All proposed changes & modifications must be submitted to City Council for approval or rejection.
- City Council has 120 days to approve or reject.
- If City Council does nothing, changes or modifications become final.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (5): Approve or Reject the Department's proposed changes to all policies, procedures, customs or General Orders which govern:
 - Use of Force;
 - Use of Force Review Boards;
 - Profiling Based on Protected Characteristics;
 - First Amendment assemblies; or
 - Elements expressly listed in federal court orders or settlements which pertain to the Department.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (5):
 - Department must submit proposed changes to the OPC.
 - The OPC has 120 days to approve or reject the proposed changes.
 - If OPC does nothing, Department's changes become final.
 - If OPC rejects Department's changes, notice must be submitted to City Council.
 - If City Council does nothing within 120 days of submission, OPC's decision becomes final.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (6): OPC may review and comment on all other Department policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders.
- ▶ All comments must be submitted to the Chief.
- ▶ If requested by OPC, the Chief must provide a written response.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (7): Department's Budget
 - Review the Mayor's proposed budget to determine whether budgetary allocations are aligned with the Department's policies, procedures, customs, and General Orders.
 - Must conduct at least one public hearing on the Department's budget per budget cycle.
 - Must forward recommendations for change to the City Council.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (9): Report at least once a year to the Mayor, to the City Council and to the public regarding information contained in the Chief's annual report, in addition to other matters relevant to OPC's functions and duties.
- ▶ Subsection (11): Send the Chair, Agency Director or Inspector General (Measure S1) to serve as a non-voting member of any Level 1 Oakland Police Force Review Board.

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

▶ OPC & the Chief

- OMC Section 2.29.020: The Chief is responsible for the management and operation of the Department, “subject to the direction of the City Administrator.”
- Subsection (8): Require the Chief to:
 - Attend Commission meetings (Measure S1);
 - Submit an annual report on matters OPC requires, including expenditures on community priorities (Measure S1);
 - Respond to Commission’s requests and provide an estimate of time required to respond (Measure S1).

Section 604(b): Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (10): Together with the Mayor, remove the Chief “by a vote of not less than 5 affirmative votes.”
- ▶ Acting alone, OPC must make a finding of “just cause” and “must follow a process for notification, substantiation and documentation which shall be defined by ordinance (Measure S1).”
- ▶ No person appointed to position of Interim Chief may hold simultaneous City employment or act as City officer or official. (Measure S1)

Section 604(b): Measure S1 Amendment to Powers & Duties

- ▶ Subsection (12): Hire legal counsel.
- ▶ Commission “shall consider the candidate’s familiarity with laws applicable to public entities, public meetings, employee privacy, labor relations and law enforcement.”

Section 604(d): Meetings

- ▶ Subsection (1):
 - Must meet at least twice a month.
 - At least twice each year, OPC must meet in locations other than City Hall.
- ▶ Subsection (2): OPC must establish rules and procedures for the conduct of its business.

Section 604(d): Meetings

▶ Subsection (3):

- Quorum is five members.
- If quorum not established by “regular members,” Chair may designate one or more alternates to establish quorum and cast votes.
- Motions may be approved by a majority of Commission members present.

Measure S1 Amendment: Office of Inspector General

- ▶ Created by Section 604(a)(2).
- ▶ Section 604(f)(5). OIG shall audit:
 - Department's compliance with NSA & make recommendations;
 - Lawsuits and investigations “by, against or involving” Agency & Department to ensure thorough investigations and identify systemic issues.

Measure S1 Amendment: OIG Access to Information

- ▶ Section 604(f)(5). OIG shall have access to:
 - Department data, investigative records, personnel records and staffing information as permitted by law.
 - Agency data, investigative records, personnel records, and staffing information.
 - OIG access to non-sworn employee personnel information limited to training records.

Measure S1 Amendment: Civilian Inspector General

- ▶ Section 604(e)(6):
 - OPC hires the Inspector General.
 - OPC conducts periodic performance reviews.
 - Inspector General has authority to hire and fire OIG staff.
 - OPC may remove Inspector General upon an affirmative vote of at least 5 members, and only after making a finding of cause as defined by City ordinance.

Measure S1 Amendment: Civilian Inspector General

- ▶ Subsection 604(e)(3): Inspector General may identify special qualifications and experience that candidates for OIG staff positions must have.
- ▶ Section 604(e)(6): Inspector General has the authority to organize and reorganize the OIG.
- ▶ Section 604(e)(7): OIG staff are civil service employees.

Community Police Review Agency

- ▶ Section 604(a)(2) establishes CPRA
- ▶ Section 604(e)(2):
 - Within 60 days of City Council's confirmation of first set of Commissioners, CPRB disbanded and business transferred to the Agency.
 - All CPRB staff transferred to the Agency.

CPRA: Executive Director

- ▶ Section 604(e)(2):
 - Executive Director of CPRB became Interim Executive Director of Agency.
- ▶ Section 604(e)(6):
 - OPC hires Agency Director.
 - Commission conducts periodic performance reviews.
 - Agency Director has authority to hire and fire Agency staff, and organize and reorganize the Agency.
 - OPC may remove Executive Director upon an affirmative vote of at least 5 members, ~~or by an affirmative vote of at least 4 members with the City Administrator's approval.~~ (Measure S1)

CPRA: Staffing

- ▶ Section 604(e)(1): Two full-time legal advisors (“Agency Attorneys”) (Measure S1).
- ▶ Section 604(e)(3):
 - OPC may identify special qualifications and experience that candidates for Agency staff positions must have.
- ▶ Section 604(e)(7):
 - Agency (& OPC) staff shall be civil service employees.

Measure S1 Amendment: Staffing

- ▶ Section 604(e)(5):
 - City Administrator to assign a staff member to act as liaison to the OPC, and to provide administrative support.
 - OPC budget shall include 1 full-time civil service employee who reports to Agency Director, provides administrative support to the Commission, and attends Commission meetings.

CPRA: Additional Staffing

- ▶ Section 604(e)(4):
 - One line investigator for every 100 officers, to be determined at the beginning of each budget cycle.
 - At least one investigator shall be a licensed attorney.

CPRA: Investigations

- ▶ Section 604(f)(1):

CPRA shall “receive, review and prioritize all public complaints concerning the alleged misconduct or failure to act of all Department sworn employees.”

CPRA: Investigations

- ▶ CPRA is required to investigate public complaints involving:
 - Uses of Force;
 - In-Custody Deaths;
 - Profiling based on protected characteristics;
 - Untruthfulness (Measure S1); and
 - First Amendment assemblies.
- ▶ OPC may direct CPRA to investigate any other possible misconduct or failure to act of a Department sworn employee, whether or not the subject of a public complaint.

CPRA Investigations: Access to Information (Measure S1)

- ▶ Section 604(f)(2). Commission, Agency and OIG have same access to information relating to sworn employees as IAD, including access to:
 - Department files and records;
 - IAD files and records;
 - Files and records from other City departments; and
 - Electronic databases as permitted by law.
- ▶ Police Officer Personnel Records: Commission must articulate “reasonable nexus” to its powers and duties.

CPRA: Investigations

- ▶ Section 604(f)(3):
 - CPRA shall make “every reasonable effort” to complete its investigation within 180 days of when complaint filed.
- ▶ Measure S1 Amendment: CPRA must complete its investigation within 250 days of when complaint filed unless Agency Director makes finding of “exceptional circumstances.”

CPRA: Investigations

- ▶ Agency Director issues written findings and proposed discipline to Chair of OPC and the Chief.
- ▶ Measure S1: Agency Director must issue written findings and proposed discipline within 48 hours of completion of investigation in cases involving:
 - Level 1 Use of Force
 - Sexual Misconduct; or
 - Untruthfulness.
- ▶ Section 604(g)(1): If Chief agrees with CPRA, sends notice to subject officer.
 - Chief may send notice before IAD has begun or completed its investigation.

CPRA: Investigations

- ▶ Section 604(g)(3): If Chief submits findings and proposed discipline to CPRA before CPRA's investigation is initiated or completed:
 - CPRA may close its investigation, or
 - CPRA may choose not to conduct an investigation.
- ▶ If investigation involves Level 1 use of force, sexual misconduct or untruthfulness, ~~required by section 604(f)(1),~~ OPC must approve CPRA's decision by a majority vote (Measure S1).
- ▶ Discipline proceeds as proposed by Chief.

OPC: Discipline Committees

- ▶ Section 604(g)(2):
 - Formed if Chief and CPRA disagree about findings and/or proposed discipline.
 - Comprised of 3 Commissioners.
 - Chief submits findings and proposed discipline to Discipline Committee. City Administrator has no authority to reject or modify.
 - Agency submits findings and proposed discipline to Discipline Committee. City Administrator has no authority to reject or modify.
 - Discipline Committee may require Agency to further investigate complaint (Measure S1).

OPC: Discipline Committees

- ▶ Discipline Committee resolves dispute between Chief and Agency based on the record presented to it.
- ▶ Discipline Committee submits its decision to Chief who notifies the subject officer.
- ▶ City Administrator has no authority to reject or modify the Discipline Committee's findings and proposed discipline.

Measure S1 Amendment: Discipline Committees

- ▶ Section 604(g)(5): OPC may convene Discipline Committee for cases involving Level 1 Use of Force, Sexual Misconduct or Untruthfulness when:
 - Either Agency or Department has not completed investigation within 250 days; or
 - When evidence upon which findings are based does not include available body-worn camera footage; or
 - Body-worn camera footage was required by policy but not recorded or available.

Due Process Proceedings

- ▶ Section 604(g)(4):
 - Officers still entitled to *Skelly* hearing on proposed Findings and Discipline (whether decided by the Chief, the CPRA, or the Discipline Committee).
 - Officers still entitled to grievance and arbitration procedures after findings and imposition of discipline have become final (if such rights are prescribed in a collective bargaining agreement).
 - Agency Director consults with City Attorney to decide whether Agency Attorney or OCA represents the City (Measure S1).

Measure S1 Amendment: Performance Audits

- ▶ Section 604(a)(4): City Auditor was required to conduct a performance and financial audit “no later than 2 years after City Council confirmed the first set of Commissioners.”
- ▶ Performance audits must be performed once every 3 years thereafter.
- ▶ Independent contractor may be used for audit; selected by Inspector General in consultation with City Auditor.

Measure S1 Amendment: City Administrator Authority

- ▶ Section 604(a)(5):
 - No managerial authority over Commissioners, Agency Director or the Inspector General.
 - “The City Administration . . . shall not initiate an investigation for the purpose of removing a Commissioner.”
 - “City employees maintain the right to file, and appropriate City officials and/or staff maintain authority to investigate, complaints alleging violations of applicable” employment-related laws, policies and collective bargaining agreements (MOUs).

Questions?

MEMO

TO: Selection Panel for the
Oakland Police Commission

FROM: Lorelei Bosserman
Selection Panel Member

SUBJECT: Recommendations from the Reimagining
Public Safety in Oakland Task Force

DATE: March 25, 2021

Background

Recommendations for process improvement were submitted to the Selection Panel (SP) by the Reimagining Public Safety in Oakland Task Force research/work groups “Legal and Policy Barriers Advisory Board – Leverage Existing Structures Work Group.” The point person for these recommendations is Megan Steffen, who served on the Leverage Existing Structures Work Group.

An SP ad hoc committee consisting of SP members Lorelei Bosserman and Mary Vail reviewed the SP’s existing practices and the task force’s recommendations. This memo contains (1) our analysis of the recommendations, (2) our proposals about what actions the SP should take, and (3) some outstanding issues for the SP to consider.

Analysis

This ad hoc committee agrees with some of the task force’s recommendations and disagrees with others.

Most of the task force’s recommendations seem to be concerned with the experience of those who apply to be on the Police Commission, based on input received from some applicants. It is true that the process can be stressful, particularly when interviews are conducted publicly. The SP should do everything in its power to minimize the stressfulness of the experience—as long as that does not make the selection process less effective. Selecting the best possible candidates to serve on the Police Commission has to be our top priority.

The task force recommends that each annual selection process be decided at the beginning of that year’s selection cycle to make it more predictable for applicants, and this ad hoc committee agrees. We believe that creating a written procedure and reviewing the procedure every year in October, November, or January will make this possible without overextending the SP in February, March, and April.

The task force recommends that we formalize a process, timeline, and series of standard questions, and then not make substantial changes from year to year. “While we can imagine sometimes wanting to add one or two timely questions . . . there is absolutely no reason to substantially change questions every cycle.”

We agree that formalizing a process is a good idea, and we have written a rough draft of a procedure for the SP’s consideration. The SP already has a formalized list of standard questions. We disagree with the task force’s recommendation to NOT make substantial changes from year to year. One reason is that continuous improvement is a good thing. Another reason is that this is still a new process and we are still learning. (The SP was formed in 2017, and its first task was to figure out how to do its job. The process it developed has only been used three times, last year was the first time the SP evaluated an incumbent commissioner, and the SP has not used a reserve pool yet.) A third reason is that the members of the SP change from year to year, and future members should not be shackled to the decisions of the current members. Future members may have different priorities, they may want to seek different information, and they may be interested in qualifications the current members didn’t think of.

The task force recommends that the SP either discuss the merits and flaws of every candidate publicly or not at all to avoid giving the public the impression that there is something wrong with the process. The task force also recommends that the SP publicly evaluate whether we want to reappoint an incumbent. In addition, the task force seems to suggest (when discussing the Public Ethics Commission) that the SP use a process in which “the merits and flaws of each individual candidate” are not discussed and “there is no attempt to reach ‘alignment’ or convince others before the vote.”

We disagree with these recommendations. We discuss a candidate’s merits or our concerns when we think there is something important that the other SP members might not be aware of. We realize this can be uncomfortable for applicants, but it is essential for making the best possible selections. If one member of the SP notices something about a candidate that is a concern to them, they should be able to share that with the other panelists. On the other hand, there is no need to discuss everyone’s merits and flaws, and it would be a waste of time.

In addition, the SP considers diversity and representation on the Police Commission as a whole when deciding who to select. If the top two vote-getters are both men and there is only one woman on the commission, we might want to have a conversation about that.

The task force has good suggestions about modifying the existing process for incumbents. One of their recommendations is that the incumbent be allowed to give a short speech as part of their interview. We think this is a good idea for new applicants as well.

The task force’s suggested questions for incumbents are good, but it should be remembered that the SP does not need to rely on the way an incumbent describes their own performance. The SP can see firsthand what the incumbent’s performance on the commission has been, and this should be the primary consideration in deciding whether to reappoint someone.

The task force suggests that the initial round of interviews be done by ad hoc committees of less than a majority of the SP members so the interviews do not have to be public. This is an issue the SP has

discussed many times. In 2017, when 152 people applied and the SP chose to interview all the applicants, ad hoc committees performed the first round of interviews. Since then the initial interviews have been conducted by the full panel. There are major advantages and disadvantages to either approach. Keeping the interviews private would certainly be easier on the applicants, but it might not be the most effective process for choosing the best possible applicants. This is something the full SP will have to decide. Some are in favor of making a decision about this after all the applications have been received for the year and we know how many people applied. We have listed some of the pros and cons of each approach in the section called “Outstanding Issues” at the end of this memo.

The task force suggests making evaluation criteria clear and public. The evaluation criteria have always been clear and public. The “competencies and qualifications” the SP looks for are clearly listed in the Applicant Evaluation Tool, which appears in each year’s agenda packets. In addition, there was an extensive discussion of the Applicant Evaluation Tool at one of last year’s meetings (all of which were public). An email was also sent to candidates before their interviews telling them they could find the Application Evaluation Tool (which also contains the list of standard questions) in the agenda packet.

Proposed Actions

We cannot guarantee that all of the process changes we recommend accepting can be implemented this year, particularly if we want to avoid making changes at the last minute.

The ad hoc committee proposes that the SP take the following actions:

1. Create a written procedure for the selection process.
A draft procedure has been written by the ad hoc committee and will be presented to the SP for review, revision, and approval. It includes a clear rubric that highlights the importance of recruiting from impacted communities.
2. At the end of each year’s selection cycle, after the selections have been made, create a process improvement ad hoc committee to review the process in October, November, or January and create a list of recommended changes for presentation to the full SP at the beginning of the following year’s selection cycle (in February). Alternatively, the full SP could meet in October, November, or January to review and revise the process.
3. At the beginning of each year’s selection cycle (in February), vote on the process changes recommended by the process improvement ad hoc committee. If there was no process improvement ad hoc committee, or if the committee makes no recommendations, decide whether to review and revise the procedure as a full panel or simply use it unchanged. Do this as early as possible, preferably in February or March.

NOTE: Some decisions about the process might not be made until after the application deadline, such as whether candidates will be interviewed by ad hoc committees in private or the full SP in public.

4. Choose an application deadline and stick with it each year. I recommend May 31—except this year, when it will have to be later because outreach won't get started until April.
This will reduce confusion and frustration for applicants. It will also enable us to create outreach materials that we can use for the whole year.
5. Ask the City to do outreach to radio stations, local social media accounts, KTOP-TV, the local press, including the minority press, and more.
6. Create a new application for incumbents.
Refer to the task force's recommendations for some useful ideas.
7. Move some questions from the interviews to the application.
8. When contacting a candidate to schedule an interview, inform them (in writing) how many people will be interviewing them and whether or not the interview will be public. Also inform them (in writing) that the SP recognizes that this is stressful, hopes that they will not let that keep them from coming to the interview, and really, really appreciates their willingness to apply for this very difficult and demanding work.
9. Write a statement about evaluation criteria, and send it to the people who have been chosen for interviews, along with a copy of the Applicant Evaluation Tool.
Include the following: We are not looking for one specific type of candidate. We want a mix of skills and backgrounds on the Police Commission.
10. Make announcements at public SP meetings about the evaluation criteria. Refer to the Applicant Evaluation Tool in the agenda packet. Specify which agenda packet it is in. Read the written statement about evaluation criteria.
11. Allow 3-5 minutes at the beginning or end of each interview for the applicant to make a presentation. (New applicants and incumbents.)
We will learn a lot about them if we let them take the reins for a few minutes, and they might tell us some things that are more relevant than the information we get by asking our questions.
12. Create a new list of interview questions for incumbents.
Refer to the task force's recommendations for some useful ideas.
13. Before and after interviewing incumbents, remind the public that the incumbent's interview is only part of what the SP considers. The SP also considers the incumbent's demonstrated performance as a commissioner. Refer the public to the video recordings and agenda packets from the last 3 years of Police Commission meetings.
14. Allow discussion of a candidate's merits and any concerns the SP has, but do not require it. In general, avoid discussing concerns about individual candidates to avoid embarrassing them publicly. Discuss a candidate's flaws only if you feel it is necessary, for example if there is important information about a candidate that you think other SP members might be unaware of or might not recognize the importance of.
15. Add a statement to the applications about how to request language support.

This ad hoc committee advises the SP to reject the following recommendations:

1. Decide at the beginning of each selection cycle whether any feedback or evaluation will be given publicly to any candidate.
The SP has never given feedback to applicants, publicly or privately, and the ad hoc committee doesn't think it is necessary to announce this.
2. Don't discuss the merits or flaws of candidates publicly.
See the "Analysis" section above for why this recommendation should be rejected.
3. Either discuss the merits and flaws of all candidates publicly or do not discuss the merits and flaws of any candidates publicly.
See the "Analysis" section above for why this recommendation should be rejected.
4. Do not make substantial changes in the process from year to year.
See the "Analysis" section above for why this recommendation should be rejected.
5. Give incumbents preferential treatment.
If a commissioner is not doing a good job, they should not be reappointed, and incumbents already have a significant advantage over new applicants. New applicants can only talk about what they would do; incumbents can point to their actual accomplishments.
6. Ask the City to work with community-based organizations to recruit younger candidates.
This ad hoc committee does not believe City staff are the right people for this work. What the City does isn't how community-based organizations are engaged. Also, this should be part of a larger conversation. There are specific challenges recruiting youth, and we also want to reach out to community-based organizations to recruit people from impacted communities.

The following recommendation is for the City, not the SP:

- The task force recommends that the City establish "a clearer rubric that highlights the importance of recruiting from impacted communities."
The SP has always made it quite clear—in word and deed—that recruiting applicants from impacted communities is a high priority.

Outstanding Issues

The following questions are submitted to the full SP for consideration:

1. Should the first round of interviews be conducted by ad hoc committees of less than a majority of the SP members, so the interviews do not need to be public, or by the full SP?
2. Should this question be left open, so the SP can make a decision on this matter every year?
3. Should the SP wait until after all the applications have been received and we know how many people applied before making this decision?

This approach is favored by some SP members, who want to consider the number of applicants and vacancies before deciding on how to conduct the first round of interviews. Doing this would make it impossible to decide on the selection process early in the selection cycle, which is one of the task force's recommendations.

There are significant advantages and disadvantages to each approach:

- **Ad hoc committees:**
The most obvious advantage to three-person ad hoc committees is that the interviews could be conducted in private. This would probably lead to a better interview, and it would certainly be kinder to the applicants. It would also allow the three members of the ad hoc committee to discuss the applicants more freely without worrying about embarrassing them publicly. When the full SP discusses applicants publicly, there is a desire not to say negative things about them. Ad hoc committees also allow the SP members to divide up the work, allowing them to interview more applicants while spending less time on it. A disadvantage is that only a minority of the SP interviews each candidate. The SP members have to trust the judgment of the members of the other ad hoc committees. In addition, a worthwhile candidate could be eliminated from further consideration by just two members of an ad hoc committee voting no.
- **Full SP:**
Having the full SP do all the interviews provides more transparency to the public and allows all SP members to participate in all the interviews. It is nerve-wracking for the candidates, though, and probably results in an interview that is not as useful. It also reduces the number of applicants who can be interviewed, because each panel member has limited time. And while ad hoc interviews mean an applicant can be eliminated by two no votes, full panel interviews mean several applicants are eliminated without even being interviewed by anyone (because the work is not distributed, which means we can't interview as many people).
- **One ad hoc committee:**
Another alternative would be a single ad hoc committee made up of the three panel members who most want to interview the candidates and are willing to spend more time interviewing more candidates or interviewing candidates for longer periods of time. The advantages are that people who do not want to spend hours interviewing candidates do not need to, and more candidates can be interviewed. The disadvantage is that the SP would have to rely on the judgment of the ad hoc committee members, and, again, a worthwhile candidate could be eliminated from consideration by a mere two votes on the ad hoc committee.

Improve the Police Commission Selection Panel process

Recommendation Summary: We recommend the Selection Panel for the Police Commission improve their process by making it more predictable for community applicants. By deciding on the process in advance, making evaluation criteria clear and public, and ensuring candidates know how many steps are in the process will make the selection process less onerous for applicants, more legible to the public, and easier for Selection Panelists. We further recommend that the Selection Panel draw on techniques from some of the City's other public selection processes, such as the Public Ethics Commission's, and ask applicants to prepare speeches to present themselves rather than relying on interview questions.

Background and Statement of Need: Former community appointed Commissioners and applicants have described the Selection Panel process for the Police Commission as unpredictable, confusing, and frustrating. By improving the experience of the process for community applicants, the Selection Panel will advance racial equity by making it easier for people from impacted communities to know what to expect when they apply. Having more people apply for the Police Commission will increase public safety by ensuring the Commission is made up of the best qualified people in the City.

Estimated Timeframe: The recommendation could be implemented as soon as the Selection Panel meets if they are available.

Estimated Cost: There is no estimated cost to implementing this recommendation.

Contact Information: Megan Steffen (meganamanadsteffen@gmail.com)

[Matrix and additional information.](#)

REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY IN OAKLAND

Research/Work Groups: Legal and Policy Barriers AB - Leverage Existing Structures WG

Point person: Megan Steffen

RECOMMENDATION: Improve the Selection Panel process for Police Commissioners.

Recommendation and rationale: We recommend improving the Selection Panel process for Police Commissioners by setting it at the beginning of an application cycle to make it more predictable for applicants, making evaluation criteria clear and public, and deciding at the beginning of each cycle whether **any** feedback or evaluation will be given publicly to any candidate. We further recommend that the City support the Selection Panel's outreach campaigns and provide language support for candidates whose preferred language may not be English.

While the Selection Panel currently seems constrained by its need to comply with the Brown Act, it is possible to conduct a selection process for a Commission in an orderly, formalized way. For example, community appointees to the Public Ethics Commission (PEC) are selected in the following way:

- A call for applications goes out.
- Applicants must submit a form with a resume, several short essay prompts, and a list of references.¹
- The PEC creates an Ad Hoc committee of less than a majority of the Commission to conduct preliminary interviews without violating the Brown Act. The Ad Hoc committee uses standardized questions for each candidate.
- The Ad Hoc committee asks four finalists to appear at a meeting of the full PEC, give a short speech, and answer questions. These questions are usually non-standard and in response to what the finalists have said in their remarks, which finalists are able to prepare in advance.
- Without discussing the merits or flaws of each individual candidate, the Commissioners vote on who to appoint.

This is one possible process the Selection Panel could adopt. While Commissioners do sometimes mention applicants during their discussion before the vote, there is no requirement to do so, and unlike in Selection Panel meetings, there is no attempt to reach "alignment" or convince others before the vote. One issue that emerged during the 2020 Selection Panel cycle is that Panelists would justify their reasons for voting inconsistently. This inconsistency helped fuel the perception of community members that there was something wrong with the process.

¹ Crucially, references are sometimes never called--this is up to the discretion of the sitting Commissioners.

To counter these perceptions, we recommend either discussing the merits and flaws of every candidate publicly or else not at all. While there are differences between the PEC and the Police Commission--namely that the PEC has fewer applicants per cycle and that Public Ethics Commissioners are expected to do less technical and legal work than Police Commissioners--the PEC process shows that it is possible to conduct a fair, thorough and non-controversial selection process for a board within the bounds of the Brown Act.

To improve the Selection Panel process, our high level recommendations for the Selection Panel are as follows:

- **Agree on a process at the outset of a cycle and stick with it for the sake of applicants.** The Selection Panel should formalize a process, timeline, and series of standard questions. While we can imagine sometimes wanting to add one or two timely questions (such as this year's question about the Police Chief), there is absolutely no reason to substantially change questions every cycle.
- **Create a separate process for evaluating Commissioners who are re-applying to extend their term.** Several months before a Commissioner's term is set to expire, the Panel could reach out to the Commissioner asking if they'd like to apply for another term. If the Commissioner says no, then the Panel should look to the pool of applicants to replace the Commissioner. If the Commissioner says yes, the Panel should send the Commissioner a prompt or series of questions that will give the Panel the insight they need to evaluate the Commissioner's work so far. Here are some examples:
 - Describe your accomplishments on the Commission.
 - What do you think your most important accomplishment on the Police Commission has been? Why?
 - Describe an incident that you faced as a Commissioner where you could have acted differently.
 - If reappointed, what do you plan to do on the Commission in your next term?
 - How has sitting on the Police Commission changed your perception of policing in Oakland?
 - What unique skills or perspectives do you bring to the Police Commission?

Based on the Commissioner's written answers to these prompts and the Panel's own knowledge of the Commissioner's performance, the Panel should publicly evaluate whether they want to reappoint the Commissioner. If the Panel elects to reappoint the Commissioner, they should no longer recruit new candidates for that position. If the Panel decides not to reappoint the Commissioner, they should provide the reasons for doing so in writing to the Commissioner. Those reasons should be based on the Commissioner's work on the Commission and the answers they provided to the

prompts. They should not be based on how the Commissioner compares with new candidates for the Commission.

Alternatively, if the Selection Panel feels strongly about comparing the incumbent Commissioner with the new applicants, the incumbent Commissioner can be invited to the finalist stage and evaluated at that point.

- **Agree on a rubric in advance.** Because the Selection Panel balances a desire to select for applicants who best represent impacted communities and those whose professional expertise will help the Commission perform its duties, criteria for Commissioners can appear to be unevenly applied. Establishing evaluation criteria early and publicly will both help the Panelists make decisions and help applicants understand which criteria were used to evaluate them.
- **Shorten the process.** Right now, the process takes up too much of the Panelists' time and the applicants' time. To that end, we recommend making sure as many questions as possible are listed in writing on the application. Selection Panelists seem to be using interviews during meetings to find out information about candidates to better compare them (e.g., the question "how long have you lived in Oakland"). We recommend doing the majority of this "informational" questioning in advance to respect both the Panel and applicants' time. Ideally, **only finalists** should have to appear before the Selection Panel. This is to decrease the amount of time required from applicants and decrease the amount of stress on applicants. In addition, we suggest flipping the prompt and asking finalists to prepare remarks to represent themselves rather than creating a new series of questions for finalists.

To help the Selection Panel increase community leadership, improve racial equity and choose from candidates with different backgrounds, our recommendations for the City are as follows:

- **Support and help coordinate the Selection Panel's outreach campaigns.** Currently volunteer panelists must reach out to radio stations, local social media accounts, and other public venues on their own. To support the Selection Panel, we recommend that the City take a more active role in doing outreach for applicants, particularly as a deadline approaches.
- **Provide language support for candidates' whose preferred language is not English.**
- **Work with Community Based Organizations to recruit younger candidates.**
- **Establish a clearer rubric that highlights the importance of recruiting from impacted communities.**

With these changes or changes like them, we hope the Selection Panel can conduct a more orderly and less onerous search for new Police Commissioners that makes it easier for all applicants to apply but especially those from impacted communities and Black communities.

MATRIX SUMMARY: Explain if (y/n) and how recommendation accomplishes the following

Increase safety in Oakland? Over what timeframe?	Unclear.
Shift responsibilities away from police and reduce scale of policing?	Unclear.
Address root causes of crime and violence?	Unclear.
Utilize a harm reduction, restorative, and trauma informed approach?	Unclear.
Have proof of concept in U.S. or internationally?	The Public Ethics Commission in Oakland conducts a similar community selection process to the one recommended here.
Create <u>immediate</u>, measurable impact?	It will hopefully shorten the amount of time required of volunteers serving on the Selection Panel.

RACIAL EQUITY

Address racial equity disparities in stops, arrests, and use of force (data), specifically for black communities in Oakland? Are there unintended new negative impacts?	Unclear.
Address disparities in provision of public safety services and infrastructure (based on data), specifically for black communities in Oakland?	Potentially. A clearer rubric that highlights the importance of representing Black communities in Oakland could lead to more people from impacted communities serving on the Commission.
Foster community leadership, build community power, agency and	Yes. Our belief is that making the Selection Process for the community appointees to the Police Commission more predictable will make applicants from BIPOC communities feel more empowered.

self-determination, especially within BIPOC communities?	
--	--

BUDGET AND DATA ANALYSIS	
---------------------------------	--

What is the estimated cost?	N/A
Is the cost one-time lump sum or annual/recurring?	

What are the budget implications for this recommendation?	None.
---	-------

Where would funds come from? Is this currently a city- or county-level line item?	None.
---	-------

Cost-Benefit Analysis and Return on Investment (ROI)? (i.e., Current cost of police action/involvement versus proposed action?)	N/A
---	-----

<p>What types of programming or budgetary changes are needed at the County and/or state levels to better meet Oakland's needs related to the proposed recommendation?</p> <p>What opportunities are there to leverage county and state funding streams?</p>	N/A
---	-----

LEGAL AND POLICY OPPORTUNITIES AND BARRIERS	
--	--

<p>What legislation/policies are necessary to implement the recommendation?</p> <p>What policies or legal barriers currently exist that need to be changed in order to better serve the community and/or implement the recommendation?</p>	<p>The only thing necessary to implement this recommendation is the will, support, and work of the appointed members of the Selection Panel.</p>
--	--

Provide detailed analysis, including policy models implemented elsewhere that can inform implementation in Oakland.

OPD ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

What will OPD no longer be responding to as a result of this recommendation?

Estimated staffing reduction resulting from redirecting proposed responsibility out of OPD?

N/A

How should OPD restructure to account for the proposed recommendation?

N/A

Does the proposed recommendation create any opportunity for OPD to shift personnel and resources toward addressing violent crime especially in black communities that are underserved? If so, how?

N/A

Proposed Guiding Principles from RPSTF: Make Sure the above checks the bottom boxes; ensure we answer the below questions	
Police reductions will only be made when a suitable alternative is in place that is proven to offer an equivalent or better impact on Public Safety (equivalence to include both timeliness and effectiveness of the response)	No reductions would immediately take place with this recommendation.
If an alternative response is proposed, but has not been demonstrated/proven, then a pilot/transition period is needed, during which the two systems will operate in parallel until effectiveness has been demonstrated/proven	No alternative response is proposed in this recommendation.
Estimated cost savings from a police budget reduction must first be directed toward the suitable alternative response, prior to being invested in an alternative solution that addresses a different need	No immediate cost saving is proposed in this recommendation.
Anticipated cost savings may be directed toward a non-police response/public safety solution, OR an under-invested police service that will continue undermining public safety if not more appropriately resourced (e.g., investigations, or missing persons)	No cost savings are proposed in this recommendation.
Final recommendations adopted by the Taskforce must include: 1) Description of Recommendation 2) Cost Analysis (start-up and ongoing operating cost) 3) Safety Impact Analysis (immediate impact and longer-term impact) 4) Likely Impact on overall workload per officer (including overtime, fatigue, and attrition) 5) Transition/ Implementation Plan (timeline and steps to move from current state to desired future state - including possible people/ organizations to implement) 6) Evaluation Criteria (how will we measure effectiveness of the proposed recommendation?) 7) Community Feedback (how has the broader community responded to the	1) Improve the Selection Panel process for the Police Commission 2) N/A 3) N/A 4) N/A 5) The timeline would depend on the will of the Selection Panel 6) We could consider the recommendation a success if two Selection Panel cycles in a row were conducted using the same process. 7) There has been very little feedback on this except from former Commissioners and former finalists

<p>proposed recommendation? - disaggregated by police beat and by race/ethnicity)</p>	
<p>Recommended provider of an alternative response must possess: 1) Relevant technical expertise/ professional knowledge 2) Knowledge of current local context for response types 3) Cultural relevancy</p>	<p>There are no alternative responses in this recommendation.</p>

Further research required:

List local organizations, groups, experts who may already be involved in advocating for proposed recommendation and/or are partners to consult in further building out recommendation.



SELECTION PANEL REPORT

TO: Selection Panel for the
Oakland Police Commission

FROM: Richard J. Luna
Assistant to the City Administrator

SUBJECT: 2021 Nomination Process

DATE: April 28, 2021

Action Requested:

For the Selection Panel to:

1. Review, discuss and/or modify the 2021 Nomination Schedule.
2. Review, discuss and/or modify the 2021 Selection and Interview Process.
3. Determine its next meeting or series of meetings.

Executive Summary:

In February 2021, the Selection Panel initiated its months long process in nominating a candidate to serve on the Oakland Police Commission. As such, the Panel continues to review its nomination process, evaluation tools, and schedule to determine what changes, if any, should be made for this year.

The term for the nominee will initiate on October 17, 2021. Staff proposes the Selection Panel make its decision no later than mid-August 2021, which will allow staff time to complete the required background check and submit the scheduling request and staff report to be heard no later than the City Council meeting of October 5, 2021.

Background:

In 2021, the Selection Panel will be nominating a slate of one (1) appointee to the Police Commission for City Council approval. The term for Commissioner Jose Dorado, currently serving as the Commission's Vice-Chair, expires on October 16, 2021. Vice-Chair Dorado is eligible for reappointment to serve an additional three-year term.

Likewise, the term for Commissioner Regina Jackson, currently serving as the Commission's Chair, expires on October 16, 2021. Chair Jackson is a Mayoral appointee and is also eligible for reappointment to serve an additional three-year term.

On March 11, 2021, Vice-Chair Dorado informed Chair Jim Chanin, Vice Chair Brendalynn Goodall and city staff that he does intend to seek a second term in serving on the Police Commission.

Police Commissioner Terms

Table 1: Terms for Current Police Commissioners

Commissioner	Appointing Authority	Term End Date
Regina Jackson, <i>Chair</i>	Mayor	Oct. 16, 2021
Jose Dorado, <i>Vice-Chair</i>	Selection Panel	Oct. 16, 2021
Henry Gage III	Selection Panel	Oct. 16, 2022
Brenda Harbin-Forte	Mayor	Oct. 16, 2022
Sergio Garcia	Selection Panel	Oct. 16, 2023
Tyfahra Singleton	Selection Panel	Oct. 16, 2023
David Jordan ¹	Mayor	Oct. 16, 2023
<i>Vacant, Alternate</i>	Selection Panel	Oct. 16, 2022
Marsha Peterson, <i>Alternate</i>	Mayor	Oct. 16, 2023

On April 19, 2021, the Selection Panel voted to nominate Jesse Hsieh as the Selection Panel's choice to serve in the vacant Alternate Commissioner seat. Mr. Hsieh completed his required background check and staff is working to schedule his appointment confirmation to the City Council meeting of May 18, 2021.

Nomination Schedule

The Selection Panel will need to complete its 2021 nomination schedule in **Table 2**, specifically the Selection Panel's deadline for reviewing all applications and target dates to hold interviews with the top candidates.

Table 2: 2021 Nomination Schedule (dates subject to change)

Activity	Date
Incumbents notified	March 5, 2021
Updated application released	April 21, 2021
Joint press release with Mayor announcing 2021 nomination period	April 21, 2021
Community organizations contacted by staff	April 23, 2021
Previous applicants invited to reapply	April 26, 2021
Email to Mayor and City Council Offices requesting officials to share information	April 28, 2021
Application deadline	June 15, 2021
Deadline for Selection Panel to review applications	<i>TBD</i>
Candidate interviews (first round)	<i>TBD</i>
Finalist interviews (second round)	<i>TBD</i>
Determination of slate	mid-August 2021
Background check process complete	early-September 2021
Council confirmation	October 5, 2021

¹ David Jordan was an Alternate member nominated by the Selection Panel. He was promoted by the Police Commission to fill the vacancy of James Jackson, a Mayoral appointee.

Applicant Statistics

Table 3 shows application statistics by nomination year. There were no nominations required in 2018.

Table 3: Applications Statistics by Year

Nomination Year	Applications Received	Applicants Invited to Interview	Nominations made by Selection Panel
2017	146	28	4 Commissioners; 1 Alternate
2019	16	10	1 Commissioner; 1 Alternate
2020	68	17	2 Commissioners

As of drafting of this report, the Selection Panel has received two applications to serve on the Police Commission (**Attachment A**) under the newly updated application.

Evaluation Tools

Attachment B is the Applicant Evaluation Tool that the Selection Panel used during the interview process in 2020. This evaluation tool was last reviewed and edited on July 22, 2020.

Attachment C includes the questions asked to all finalists in the 2020 second round interviews. The Selection Panel finalized these questions on August 10, 2020, prior to initiating the finalist interviews.

Outreach

The Police Commissioner application is available online in English, Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese on the Police Commission webpage (www.oaklandca.gov/policecommission). Additionally, staff has completed the following outreach:

- Press release to all media contacts
- Email communication to announce and request distribution of information to:
 - Mayor's and City Council Offices
 - Selection Panel Members
 - Oakland community-based organizations

Staff is also working to complete the following outreach:

- Email communication to announce and request distribution of information to:
 - Oakland Police Commissioners
 - Community Police Review Agency

In 2020, Vice Chairperson Brendalynn Goodall worked with KLBX radio to run a 15-second Public Service Announcement (PSA) leading up to the application deadline. The PSA was advertised free of charge and aired 30 times between May 29 to June 12, 2020.

Also in 2020, Member Lorelei Bosserman organized outreach efforts by the Selection Panel and maintained a database of organizations that were contacted directly by Selection Panel Members.

Reserve Pool

On March 13, 2019, the Selection Panel elected to establish a Reserve Pool of applicants in cases where a vacancy occurs. The Reserve Pool:

- Is comprised of no less than three (3) applicants;
- Expires after two (2) years;
- Includes only applicants that receive at least a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Selection Panel members present for the vote; and
- Requires applicants in the Reserve Pool to give notice to City staff if applicant no longer has interest in being in the Reserve Pool.

The reserve pool process was used in 2021 to expedite the nomination of Jesse Hsieh (a former reserve pool applicant) to fill the Alternate Commissioner vacancy on the Police Commission.

For questions regarding this report, contact Richard J. Luna at (510) 238-4756 or rluna@oaklandca.gov.

Attachments (3):

- [Current Police Commission Applications](#)
- [2020 Applicant Evaluation Tool](#)
- [2020 Finalist Interview Questions](#)

ATTACHMENT A
Current Police Commission Applications

2021 Police Commission Applicants (as of April 28, 2021)

No	Last	First	Zip	Council District	Selection Panel / Mayoral	Race	Gender	Disability	Oakland Residency	# of Meetings
1	Howell	Rudolph	94609	3	Both	Black/AA/Asian	M	No	8 years	1-2
2	Clayton	Tre	94611	4	Both	Black/AA	M	No	22 years	0



Police Commission

Application for Position of Commissioner

The purpose of the Police Commission is to oversee the Oakland Police Department in order to make sure that its policies, practices and customs meet national standards of constitutional policing.

A Selection Panel of volunteer community members will select Oakland residents to serve on the Police Commission. Seated Commissioners are volunteers and will not be compensated.

Applicant Information

Full Name: Howell Rudolph Date: 4/25/2021
Last First M.I.

Home Address: [Redacted]
Street Address Apartment/Unit #
Oakland Ca 94609
City State ZIP Code

Phone: [Redacted] Email [Redacted]

Supplemental Questionnaire

The purpose of this supplemental questionnaire is to evaluate your qualifications to serve on the Police Commission. This application, along with your answers to these questions, will be used by the Selection Panel to select the most suitably qualified candidates (Question 1, 2, 3 and 4 below.)

- Applications submitted without a completed supplemental questionnaire will not be considered.
- Please limit your response to each question to one 8.5" x 11" sheet of paper (single or double spaced).

Please respond (in writing) to the following questions:

1. Please describe any life work and significant community volunteer experiences that prepare you to contribute to the work of the Commission.
2. Please describe your contacts or experiences with the Oakland Police Department.
3. Please describe, if applicable, if you or an immediate family member has had significant volunteer or employment experience:
 - a. as a police officer,
 - b. as a criminal prosecutor or defense attorney,
 - c. with a public agency or nonprofit community group serving or advocating for crime victims or persons charged or convicted of crimes.
4. Have you ever served on a board, committee, commission, or other group? (Examples might include church boards or school organizations.) Please describe your experiences. What were the most challenging aspects of your participation?

Application Considerations

Check all that apply:

I would like to be considered as a Selection Panel appointee?

YES

NO

I would like to be considered as a Mayoral Appointee?

YES

NO

References

Please list three professional or personal references who are familiar with your background, experience and qualifications, and who can answer questions about your ability to serve as a Commissioner.

Full Name: Caitlin Henry

Relationship: Attorney

E-Mail

Phone:

Full Name: Rhody McCoy

Relationship:

E-Mail

Phone:

Full Name: Deborah Mukamal

Relationship: Professor

E-Mail

Phone:

Voluntary Self-Identification Questionnaire

1. With which race and/or ethnicity do you identify? (Check all that apply.)

- White
- Black or African American
- Latino
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Other: _____
- I do not wish to Self-Identify

2. What is your gender?

- Male _____ I do not wish to self-identify

3. You are considered to have a disability if you have a physical or mental impairment or medical condition that substantially limits a major life activity, or if you have a history of such an impairment or medical conditions.

Please check one of the boxes below:

- Yes, I have a disability (or previously had a disability)
- No, I do not have a disability
- I do not wish to answer

Required Questionnaire

4. How long have you lived in Oakland?

8 years

5. How many meetings of the Police Commission have you attended, on Zoom or in person? (You can find a link to the next meeting on the agenda for that meeting, which can be found at www.oaklandca.gov/policecommission. You can also find video recordings of past meetings there.)

- 0
- 1-2
- 3 or more

6. How did you hear about applying to be on the Police Commission?

News

Disclaimer and Signature

The City Charter requires background checks for all Police Commission members and alternates. Prior convictions will not eliminate you from consideration. The Selection Panel strongly encourages formerly incarcerated individuals to apply.

I certify that I am over eighteen years of age and that my answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

My signature below also indicates my acknowledgement that, by applying for the position of Commissioner, I will be subject to a background check.

Once submitted, your application form, along with all attachments, becomes a public record.

Signature: *Rudy Howell* Date: 4/25/2021

Completed applications must be received by **June 15, 2021**, by mail, hand-delivery, or email as follows:

Mail or Hand-Delivery (Monday-Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm)	Selection Panel for Police Commission c/o City Administrator's Office 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 3rd Floor Oakland, CA 94612
Email	Address: CityAdministratorsOffice@oaklandca.gov Subject: Police Commission Application
For assistance or additional information contact	City Administrator's Office CityAdministratorsOffice@oaklandca.gov (510) 238-3301

Oakland Police Commission 2021 Supplemental Questionnaire

1. Please describe any life work and significant community volunteer experiences that prepare you to contribute to the work of the Commission.

I experienced the full impact of the American criminal justice system at the age of 23. It was at this age I entered the federal prison system with a 25 year 1st time sentence. At 23 years of age I was charged with a federal drug crime and sentenced to 294 months. It was a soul crushing experience for a 23 year old kid. Nevertheless, after coming out of a 5 year stupor I took on the work of deconstructing and reconstructing myself. It took me 17 years to complete my transferable A.A. degree in Business Admin from Lassen College. This accomplishment allowed me to be accepted at San Francisco State University before my release. I was released from federal prison to the halfway house on Taylor St in San Francisco in January of 2013. I arrived on a Wednesday and that Monday I was at SFSU attending my first class at a 4yr college. I graduated with a B.A. in Criminal Justice in May of 2016. I began working for Rubicon Programs, a non profit in Richmond, Ca. that provides reentry services for citizens returning home to the Bay Area from prison. My role as the Rubicon Education Partnership program Impact Coach / Case Manager is to support any formerly incarcerated individual, from Oakland, Ca. who wants to go to college, get to college. I coach, mentor, motivate and help these students on the academic road to a career that will help increase their earning potential in an effort to eliminate poverty in the East Bay. I believe that my degree in Criminal Justice, my direct experience with the criminal justice system and my work with others impacted by the criminal justice system gives me a unique view that will allow me to contribute to the work of the Commission in a very positive and creative way.

2. Please describe your contacts or experiences with the Oakland Police Department.

My limited contact and experience with the Oakland Police Department has been friendly, so far. I have had to report stolen cars that are abandoned in the area where I live. The exchanges have been friendly and professional. The breadth of my experience with authority stems from my interactions with the FBI, DEA, BNE, LAPD, Riverside County Police and Sheriffs, Federal Marshals, Federal Correctional Officers and Federal Probation Officers. These interactions and experiences occurred from California to Texas and back were varied from bad to good.

3. Please describe, if applicable, if you or an immediate family member has had significant volunteer or employment experience:

- a. as a police officer

No one in my immediate family has experience as a police officer.

- b. as a criminal prosecutor or defense attorney

No one in my immediate family has experience as a criminal prosecutor or defense attorney

- c. with a public agency or nonprofit community group serving or advocating for crime victims or persons charged or convicted of crimes.

Oakland Police Commission 2021 Supplemental Questionnaire

No one in my immediate family has experience working with a public agency or nonprofit community group serving or advocating for crime victims or persons charged or convicted of crimes.

4. Have you ever served on a board, committee, commission, or other group? (Examples might include church boards or school organizations.) Please describe your experiences. What were the most challenging aspects of your participation?

I have served on a board that seeks to bring community based organizations to college campuses whose mission is to help formerly incarcerated students navigate their respective college campuses. The board known as BASIC Bay Area System Impacted Consortium was developed by the Urban Strategies Council in Oakland. Before COVID we met twice a month to design, develop and promote a prison to college pipeline. The most challenging aspect is the limited funding to get things done. I would like to see more action than talk. Hopefully, with the advent of some normalcy returning to everyday life the efforts to build the prison to college pipeline will resume.



Police Commission

Application for Position of Commissioner

The purpose of the Police Commission is to oversee the Oakland Police Department in order to make sure that its policies, practices and customs meet national standards of constitutional policing.

A Selection Panel of volunteer community members will select Oakland residents to serve on the Police Commission. Seated Commissioners are volunteers and will not be compensated.

Applicant Information

Full Name: Clayton Tré L Date: 4/25/2021
Last First M.I.

Home Address: [REDACTED]
Street Address Apartment/Unit #

Oakland CA 94611
City State ZIP Code

Phone: [REDACTED] Email [REDACTED]

Supplemental Questionnaire

The purpose of this supplemental questionnaire is to evaluate your qualifications to serve on the Police Commission. This application, along with your answers to these questions, will be used by the Selection Panel to select the most suitably qualified candidates (Question 1, 2, 3 and 4 below.)

- Applications submitted without a completed supplemental questionnaire will not be considered.
- Please limit your response to each question to one 8.5" x 11" sheet of paper (single or double spaced).

Please respond (in writing) to the following questions:

1. Please describe any life work and significant community volunteer experiences that prepare you to contribute to the work of the Commission.
2. Please describe your contacts or experiences with the Oakland Police Department.
3. Please describe, if applicable, if you or an immediate family member has had significant volunteer or employment experience:
 - a. as a police officer,
 - b. as a criminal prosecutor or defense attorney,
 - c. with a public agency or nonprofit community group serving or advocating for crime victims or persons charged or convicted of crimes.
4. Have you ever served on a board, committee, commission, or other group? (Examples might include church boards or school organizations.) Please describe your experiences. What were the most challenging aspects of your participation?

Application Considerations

Check all that apply:

I would like to be considered as a Selection Panel appointee?

YES

NO

I would like to be considered as a Mayoral Appointee?

YES

NO

References

Please list three professional or personal references who are familiar with your background, experience and qualifications, and who can answer questions about your ability to serve as a Commissioner.

Full Name: Sheilagh Andujar Relationship: Principal
E-Mail: [REDACTED] Phone: [REDACTED]

Full Name: Byron Delcomb Relationship: Current Employer
E-Mail: [REDACTED] Phone: [REDACTED]

Full Name: Ingrid Merriwether Relationship: Past Employer
E-Mail: [REDACTED] Phone: [REDACTED]

Voluntary Self-Identification Questionnaire

1. With which race and/or ethnicity do you identify? (Check all that apply.)

- White
- Black or African American
- Latino
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Other: _____
- I do not wish to Self-Identify

2. What is your gender?

Male _____ I do not wish to self-identify

3. You are considered to have a disability if you have a physical or mental impairment or medical condition that substantially limits a major life activity, or if you have a history of such an impairment or medical conditions.

Please check one of the boxes below:

- Yes, I have a disability (or previously had a disability)
- No, I do not have a disability
- I do not wish to answer

Required Questionnaire

4. How long have you lived in Oakland?

22 years

5. How many meetings of the Police Commission have you attended, on Zoom or in person? (You can find a link to the next meeting on the agenda for that meeting, which can be found at www.oaklandca.gov/policecommission. You can also find video recordings of past meetings there.)

- 0
- 1-2
- 3 or more

6. How did you hear about applying to be on the Police Commission?

Instagram advertisement

Disclaimer and Signature

The City Charter requires background checks for all Police Commission members and alternates. Prior convictions will not eliminate you from consideration. The Selection Panel strongly encourages formerly incarcerated individuals to apply.

I certify that I am over eighteen years of age and that my answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

My signature below also indicates my acknowledgement that, by applying for the position of Commissioner, I will be subject to a background check.

Once submitted, your application form, along with all attachments, becomes a public record.

Signature: Tré Clayton Date: 4/25/2021

Completed applications must be received by **June 15, 2021**, by mail, hand-delivery, or email as follows:

Mail or Hand-Delivery (Monday-Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm)	Selection Panel for Police Commission c/o City Administrator's Office 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 3rd Floor Oakland, CA 94612
Email	Address: CityAdministratorsOffice@oaklandca.gov Subject: Police Commission Application
For assistance or additional information contact	City Administrator's Office CityAdministratorsOffice@oaklandca.gov (510) 238-3301

Supplemental Questionnaire

1. My professional, personal and academic experiences have prepared me to effectively fulfill the duties of a commissioner. I am currently working as a 4th grade teacher at Markham Elementary School near Eastmont Mall. Before this position, I have worked with community organizations and schools in other areas of Oakland, the Mission District of San Francisco, and in South Central Los Angeles. Throughout these experiences, I have worked with many people and families negatively affected by policing.

As an Oakland native, many of my friends and family have had negative experiences with Oakland Police (i.e. racial profiling and harassment). Fortunately, none of them have died at the hands of police, but some have been convicted of crimes or incarcerated after encounters with OPD.

I graduated from San Francisco State University with a B.A. in Communications and University of Southern California with a Master's in Education. Both of these experiences have prepared me to effectively review policies, procedures, and budgets. Additionally, these academic experiences have equipped me with the writing and communication skills necessary to handle the many other responsibilities of a commissioner.

2. Outside of my family's and friend's aforementioned encounters with Oakland Police Department, I have fortunately had neutral experiences with OPD.
3. N/A
4. With the Black Graduate Student Union at University of Southern California, I served on the board as the Director of Civic Engagement. In this position, I created a platform for Black Students to sign up for events that would engage them with the community such as food drives, political marches, and youth programs. I also organized events for students to discuss political and racial matters with established professionals.

The most challenging experiences were delivering constructive feedback to the president and other board members about their ideas or opinions. While this process is beneficial for any board, it was sometimes challenging for me to deliver honest feedback while simultaneously being considerate of other member's emotions and egos.

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Applicant Evaluation Tool



APPLICANT EVALUATION TOOL
Position: Police Commissioner (Volunteer)

Position Description

Serve on Police Commission public body of seven (7) members plus two (2) alternates. The Police Commission's role is to oversee the Oakland Police Department's policies, practices and customs to meet national standards of constitutional policing and oversee the Community Police Review Agency that investigates police misconduct and recommends discipline.

Core Competencies, Interview Questions & Evaluation

Core competencies are the identified knowledge, skills, and/or abilities that are necessary to the successful performance of an Oakland Police Commissioner. The objective of the interview is to assess the competency and qualifications for serving as a Police Commissioner. The Selection Panel will ask each applicant a series of questions that are designed to understand the applicant's qualifications in the following areas:

- A. Interpersonal / Collaborative
 - a. Works cooperatively and productively with others to achieve results.
 - b. Respects and welcomes diverse perspectives. Able to process multiple points of view and achieve constructive results.
 - c. Respects the confidentiality of information or concerns shared by others.
 - d. Strong communications skills – both written and oral.
- B. Judgement / Decision-Making
 - a. Has a strong sense of urgency about solving problems and getting work done.
 - b. Effectively analyzes and interprets rules and regulations.
 - c. Understands inter-relational systems and influences.
 - d. Applies factual information, due diligence and sound judgment in making decisions and dealing with confidential and/or sensitive information.
- C. Analytic / Investigative Practices
 - a. Has knowledge and/or experience in sound investigative practices.
 - b. Has knowledge and/or experience in applying a racial equity framework and systems thinking approach to identifying and addressing issues.
- D. Values / Commitment / Perspective
 - a. Seeks and synthesizes community perspective into decision-making.
 - b. Able to commit time and energy to serving on Police Commission.
 - c. Brings perspective of community most impacted by law enforcement (e.g., race, gender, disability, residency, etc.)
- E. Level of Interest
 - a. Understands role and authority of Police Commission.

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

A. Based on the responses to the following interview questions, rate the applicant’s strength of the **Core Competency – Interpersonal / Collaborative**:

1. Tell us about your experience working effectively with others, including your experience working on other boards, commissions and groups. How did you handle conflict in these situations?

Additional questions as time permits...

2. Scenario: The Commission is deadlocked on a decision and cannot move forward. How will you unite the conversation so the commission can come to a decision?

Core Competency	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Interpersonal / Collaborative					
Comments	<i>Note. The Comments section allows for a qualitative assessment, to complement the quantitative scores.</i>				

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

B. Based on the responses to the following interview questions, rate the applicant’s strength of the **Core Competency – Judgement / Decision-Making**:

3. While serving on the Police Commission there will be a great deal of pressure from the public, fellow commission members and City staff. What skills will you draw on to manage this and come to a fact-based decision?

Additional questions as time permits...

- 4. Tell us about your experience and/or opinion of the Oakland Police Department.
- 5. Describe an experience where you had to make a difficult decision that affected someone’s life.
- 6. Being a Commissioner may involve being insulted by the public and criticized by the police. Have you ever been publicly insulted? What advice would you give to someone about how to handle it?
- 7. Has someone you disagreed with ever changed your mind about something? Please provide an example.

Core Competency	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Judgement / Decision-Making					
Comments	<i>Note. The Comments section allows for a qualitative assessment, to complement the quantitative scores.</i>				

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

C. Based on the responses to the following interview questions, rate the applicant’s strength of the **Core Competency – Analytic / Investigative Practices**:

8. Throughout the Federal Court's oversight of O.P.D., the Court has consistently criticized OPD's Internal Affairs Division for the thoroughness, objectivity and professionalism of its investigations of alleged officer misconduct and there is a public perception that both line police officers and their supervisors are rarely held accountable. What structural or policy changes should the Commission explore to address this issue?

Additional questions as time permits...

9. How does institutional racism and systemic oppression impact the department’s ability to achieve compliance with the Negotiated Settlement Agreement?

10. How do you define police brutality and what are the key elements that produce it?

11. With the assistance of a Court-appointed expert, it has been fully established that OPD officers have for some time and continue to make racially-biased stops of motorists and pedestrians. What actions should the Commission take to change this OPD practice?

Core Competency	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Analytic / Investigative Practices					
Comments	<i>Note. The Comments section allows for a qualitative assessment, to complement the quantitative scores.</i>				

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

D. Based on the responses to the following interview questions, rate the applicant's strength of the **Core Competency – Values / Commitment / Perspective**:

12. Experience has shown that the time commitment to effectively serve on the Police Commission is approximated to be between 10 to 20 hours a week. What are some limiting obligations that might make it difficult for you to effectively perform as a Police Commissioner and complete your term, and how will you manage these obligations?

Additional questions as time permits...

13. Tell us about your community involvement and what groups you are affiliated with.

14. While serving on the Commission you will learn information that may not be familiar to your life experience, share a brief experience where you had to see through many lenses.

15. Why do you want to be part of the Oakland Police Commission and what impacts would you like to see the Oakland Police Commission have and accomplish?

16. What skills would you bring to the Oakland Police Commission?

17. What is the Police Commission doing right?

18. If you became a Police Commissioner, what would you do differently?

19. For you personally, which of your work, community service and/or organizational leadership experiences would help you in serving on the Oakland Police Commission?

POLICE COMMISSIONER APPLICANT EVALUATION TOOL

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

Core Competency	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Values / Commitment / Perspective					
Comments	<p><i>Note. The Comments section allows for a qualitative assessment, to complement the quantitative scores.</i></p>				

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

E. Based on the responses to the following interview questions, rate the applicant’s strength of the Core **Competency – Level of Interest**:

20. When did you first become interested in the Police Commission? What have you done to learn more about it? And what are your impressions?

Additional questions as time permits...

21. Have you attended any Police Commission meetings either in person or virtually?

Core Competency	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Level of Interest					
Comments	<i>Note. The Comments section allows for a qualitative assessment, to complement the quantitative scores.</i>				

POLICE COMMISSIONER APPLICANT EVALUATION TOOL

Applicant Name: _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

	Exceptional (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Not Acceptable (1)
Overall Score					
Comments					

ATTACHMENT C
2020 Finalist Interview Questions

Standard Questions

1. Would you tell the Panel about your involvement in Public Safety matters in Oakland, and how that involvement has influenced your desire to serve on the Oakland Police Commission?

Follow-up, time permitting

What do you hope to achieve on the Commission?

2. How can the commission make the best use of the data in VISION?

If they don't know, explain it to them and then get an answer.

3. What change in OPD policy is needed to break up the 'thin blue line' or code of silence?
4. What concrete steps should the Commission take to expand community engagement and input? And, what would you do to educate and engage the community in the work of the Commission? Please be specific.
5. While serving on the Commission you will learn information that may not be familiar to your life experience. Please share a brief experience where you had to see through someone else's life experience and give an example.
6. How would you work to gain consensus in a chaotic situation where the Commission is deeply divided on an issue? Are there any similar examples where you have done this?
7. What is your approach to creating highly effective teamwork with colleagues on the Commission, even when belief systems about the work may vary widely? Please give examples where you have done that.
8. How would you handle specific concerns and complaints about the OPD, which are brought to the Commission? These can include instances of excessive force, failure to act in a situation that requires police intervention, etc.
9. What would you advocate as the best process to use to identify the recommendations for the next Police Chief? Would you give preference to promoting from within OPD or to an outsider?
10. How does institutional racism and historic bias influence the effectiveness of efforts by the Courts, the Commission and OPD leadership to revise and implement policy and operational reforms.

Optional & Follow Up Questions

11. How do you define police brutality, and what are the key factors responsible for it?
12. How would you grade the Oakland Police Commission's accomplishments to date, and what are its major challenges going forward?

Finalist Interview Questions

13. What is the most important asset that a candidate for Inspector General should possess? -OR- In the coming year, the Commission will likely recruit and hire its first Inspector General. What do you believe are the most important skills, experience and other qualifications that candidates for this position should have?
14. Describe an experience where you had to make a difficult decision that affected someone's life.
15. Has anyone you disagreed with ever changed your mind about something? Please provide an example.
16. If you are appointed, what would you want your legacy to be after completing your term? What significant contribution would you want the Commission to remember you for?
17. It's often been said that police culture has police policy for lunch. What strategies can the Commission use to align the pace of policy change and cultural change at OPD?
18. In Oakland, in the area of crowd/demonstration control the OPD's "cycle" is to violate both the law and its existing policy, the City to be sued, the City to settle the new lawsuits, sometimes with revisions to its prior policy, and OPD commanders and line personnel to again violate the same laws and policy during future demonstrations. What steps can the Commission take to help break this cycle?
19. With guidance from the Commission, the CPRA Executive Director is in the process of developing a uniform process for charge intake, categorization, investigation and timely decision or resolution of complaints of officer misconduct. What do you believe are the most important components of such a case-handling system?
20. How long have you lived in Oakland?
21. Have you read Measure LL, the 21-page document that defines the Police Commission? (Available on the Police Commission website, <https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/police-commission>. Scroll down to "About," near the bottom of the page.)
22. Have you read any of the minutes or agenda packets for any of the Police Commission meetings? (Available on the Police Commission website, <https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/police-commission>. Under "Meetings," click "View All Meetings, Minutes & Agendas.")