Police Institutional Reform

Jeffrey Fagan Columbia Law School

September 14, 2016

Critical Issues in Police Reform

- Who are the police?
- Transparency v secrecy
- Incentives
- Policing models
- Monitors
- Police unions and contracts
 - LEOBOR's
- Political intimidation
- Governance and regulation

Mechanisms

- § 14141 Investigations and Consent Decrees
- § 1983 litigation damage awards
- Class action civil rights litigation court order
- Democratic regulation and collaboration
- Political reform
- Internal reform

Notable Consent Decrees

- Pittsburgh
- NJ State Police
- Los Angeles PD
- Los Angeles SD
- Seattle
- Portland, OR
- Ferguson
- Miami

- Oakland
- Cleveland
- Baltimore
- New Orleans
- Maricopa County SD
- Cincinnati
- East Haven, CT
- New York (Stipulated Settlement)

- Chicago (in process)
- Detroit
- Newark
- Albuquerque
- Suffolk County, NY
- Puerto Rico

General Design of § 14141 Protocols

- Training
- Record-keeping
- Critical incident investigations and aggregation
- Early warning mechanisms
- Body cameras (recent)
- Citizen surveys

10 FAIR POLICE UNION CONTRACTS							

POLICE UNION CONTRACT PROJECT

Police unions have established unfair provisions in their contracts with cities that help police officers avoid accountability for misconduct. Here are some of the ways these contracts obstruct accountability in many U.S. cities.

AustinAABaltimore—A—ChicagoAA—ChicagoAA—Cleveland—AAColumbusAAAColumbusAAAHoustonA—AJacksonville—A—LouisvilleA—AMiamiA—AMinneapolisA—ANew York City—A—San AntonioA—ASeattleAAA		Delays interrogations	elays Erases officer Disqua nterrogations personnel files compla		Limits civilian oversight
ChicagoAA—Cleveland—AAColumbusAAAColumbusAAAHoustonA—AJacksonville—A—LouisvilleAA—Los AngelesA—AMinneapolisAA—New York City—A—San AntonioA—ASan DiegoA—A	Austin				
ClevelandAAColumbusAAAHoustonAAAJacksonvilleAAALouisvilleAAALos AngelesAAAMiamiAAANew York CityAAASan AntonioAAASan DiegoAAA	Baltimore	—		—	Δ
ColumbusAAAHoustonAAAJacksonvilleAAALouisvilleAAALos AngelesAAAMiamiAAAMinneapolisAAANew York CityAAASan AntonioAAASan DiegoAAA	Chicago	Δ		—	_
HoustonAAJacksonvilleAALouisvilleAALos AngelesAAMiamiAAMinneapolisAANew York CityAASan AntonioAASan DiegoAA	Cleveland	-		A	Δ
JacksonvilleImage: market instant ins	Columbus	Δ			Δ
LouisvilleAAALos AngelesAAMiamiAAAMinneapolisAAANew York CityASan AntonioAASan DiegoAA	e Houston	A	—		A
Los AngelesAAMiamiAAAMinneapolisAAANew York CityASan AntonioAAASan DiegoAA	Jacksonville	-		-	—
MiamiAAAMinneapolisAAANew York CityAAASan AntonioAAASan DiegoAAA	Louisville	Δ		—	Δ
MinneapolisImage: Constraint of the second seco	Los Angeles		—	-	A
New York CityImage: Constraint of the second se	Miami			-	
San AntonioImage: Constraint of the second seco	Minneapolis			—	Δ
San Diego 🔺 🗕 🔺	New York City	—		—	_
	San Antonio		—		
Seattle	San Diego		—		-
	Seattle	Δ			
St. Louis — — —	St. Louis	—	-	-	
Washington DC 🛕 🛕 🗕	Washington DC			—	A

CAMPAIGN ZERO

For more visit http://joincampaignzero.org/reports

Was

CAMPAIGN ZERO



Yes No

Unclear

TRACKING BODY CAMERA

Body cameras are rapidly becoming the norm in communities across the country. Campaign Zero reviewed available police department body camera policies from the <u>largest 30 cities</u> in America to determine whether this new technology is being implemented in ways that ensure accountability and fairness while protecting communities from surveillance.

Dept BC Policy	Coverage ¹	Fairness ²	Transparency ³	Privacy ⁴	Accountability ⁵
Austin	<u>1%</u>				
Baltimore	<u>5%</u>				
Charlotte	<u>100%</u>				
<u>Chicago</u>	<u><1%</u>				
Dallas	<u>2%</u>				
Denver	<u>14%</u>				
Fort Worth	<u>40%</u>				
Louisville	<u>51%</u>				
Los Angeles	<u>8%</u>				
<u>Memphis</u>	<u>23%</u>				
Milwaukee	<u>11%</u>				
<u>New York City</u>	<u><1%</u>				
<u>Phoenix</u>	<u>5%</u>				
<u>San Diego</u>	<u>50%</u>				
<u>San Jose</u>	<u>2%</u>				
Seattle	<u>1%</u>				
Washington DC	<u>13%</u>				

Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights

2010 Maryland Code PUBLIC SAFETY TITLE 3 - LAW ENFORCEMENT Subtitle 1 - Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights Section 3-104 - Investigation or interrogation of law enforcement officer.

§ 3-104. Investigation or interrogation of law enforcement officer.

(a) In general.- The investigation or interrogation by a law enforcement agency of a law enforcement officer for a reason that may lead to disciplinary action, demotion, or dismissal shall be conducted in accordance with this section.

Case Study – Body Cameras

- New York delay
- Boston resistance
- Issues driving resistance