SHERIFF'S BLUE RIBBON PANEL
Agenda: Meeting #6
Wednesday, June 7, 2006, 6:00 – 9:00 pm
Seattle City Council Chambers
600 Fourth Avenue, Second Floor, Seattle

Topic	**Lead Presenter**	***Estimated* Time**
• Introductions and agenda overview	Randy Revelle	6:00-6:05 pm
• Responses to prior panel questions; overview of materials	Morgan Shook	6:05-6:15 pm
• ***Presentation***: management, supervision, and promotion in the King County Sheriff's Office	Virginia Kirk, Human Resources Manager, King County Sheriff's Office	6:15-6:45 pm
• ***Discussion***: problem statement(s) and proposed recommendations	Randy Revelle	6:45-7:45 pm
• ***Discussion***: structure and content of report and recommendations	Marty Wine	7:45-8:30 pm
• ***Planning***: public hearings	Morgan Shook	8:30-8:45 pm
• Summary and next meeting topics	Morgan Shook	8:45-9:00 pm

Panel Members

- Randy Revelle, chair
- Faith Ireland, vice chair
- Tony Anderson
- Dave Boerner
- Michael O'Mahony
- Wilson Edward Reed
- Jennifer Shaw
- Richard K. Smith
- Pat Stell
- D. Gene Wilson

Panel Staff

- Berk & Associates (Marty Wine and Morgan Shook)
- Virginia Kirk, King County Sheriff's Office

Use of the City Council Chambers does not imply an endorsement by the Seattle City Council.

KING COUNTY SHERIFF'S BLUE RIBBON PANEL
Panel Meeting Summary: May 17, 2006, 6-9 PM

Seattle City Council Chambers
600 Fourth Avenue, Second Floor, Seattle, WA

Panel Members Present: Faith Ireland (vice chair), Tony Anderson, Dave Boerner, Michael O'Mahony, Wilson Edward Reed, Jennifer Shaw, Pat Stell and D. Gene Wilson
Panel Members Absent: Randy Revelle and Richard Smith

Proceedings:
Meeting convened at 6:00 PM by Faith Ireland, vice-chair.

Introductions and Agenda Overview

- Panel members introduced themselves. Panel vice chair presented an overview of the meeting agenda.

Overview of Materials

- Morgan Shook (Berk & Associates) provided a brief description of the meeting materials.

Presentation: Labor Organizations

- Steve Eggert (President, King County Police Officers Guild) and Dustin Frederick (Business Manager, SEIU, Public Safety Employees, Local 519) presented their perspectives on the Sheriff's internal management systems for addressing employee misconduct and discipline. The presentations were followed by questions and responses between panel members and presenters.

Presentation: Findings and Research

- Marty Wine, Morgan Shook, and Erica Natali (Berk & Associates) presented findings on the model practices and programs research.
- The agencies profiled are the Seattle Police Department, Washington State Patrol, Portland Police Bureau, Boise Police Department, San Jose Police Department, City and County of Denver, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

Public Hearings Planning

- Marty Wine (Berk & Associates) provided an update on the planning for three of public hearings the panel will hold in north, south, and east King County.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM by Faith Ireland, vice-chair
Summary: Berk & Associates

Blue Ribbon Panel
June 7, 2006
Management, Supervision and Promotion Issues

A. SUPERVISION ISSUES

1. Supervisor Training Upon Promotion:

Career Level Certification is mandated in RCW 43.101.350 for law enforcement personnel who are first level supervisors, middle-managers, or executive level managers.

First Level Supervision: (sergeants)

- Must successfully complete the 40-hour core class within six months of being promoted to a first level supervision position.
- Must complete a minimum of 72 hours of elective training within one year of the completing the core class. Courses must be those that are intended or approved for persons in a first level supervisory position.
- These may include, but are not limited to: role of the supervisor; advanced oral and written communication; team building; goal setting; workplace planning/time management; scheduling and delegating; performance monitoring; employee selection or recognition; performance appraisal; handling difficult staff and preventing grievances; handling criticism; preventing and handling staff burnout; leading meetings.
- A sample agenda for in-house sergeants training is attached.

Middle Management: (captains)

- Must successfully complete the 40-hour core class within six months of being promoted to a middle management position.
- Must complete a minimum of 72 hours of elective training within one year of completion of the 40-hour core class. Courses must be those that are intended or approved for persons in a middle management position.
- These electives may include, but are not limited to: teamwork; internal consulting; budgeting; program development; procedures development; program evaluation.

Executive Management: (majors and chiefs)

- Must successfully complete the core training prescribed by the Training Commission within six months of promotion, election, or appointment to an executive level law enforcement position.

- Must complete a minimum of 72 hours of elective training within one year of the completion of the core training requirements. Courses must be those that are intended or approved for persons in an executive level position.
- These electives may include, but are not limited to: team building and organizational goal setting; long range planning; public image of your agency; organizational change; organizational leadership; policy development; executive self care; managing limited resources; career ladder and power base; quality control; training systems; futures planning.

2. **Ongoing Supervisor Training**
   - The department is working to provide opportunities for captains, majors and chiefs to attend extended training at Northwestern School of Staff and Command, the FBI National Academy and other similar schools.
   - Subject specific supervisor training such as the recent disciplinary process training for supervisors is conducted throughout the year.
   - King County Supervisor Training programs are encouraged and open to all KCSO supervisors.

3. **Span of Control**
   - The Department, Guild and Union all agree that effective supervision requires a manageable supervisory span of control. There is not a fixed ratio that is ideal at all times; the appropriate ratio depends on a number of factors including geography, the nature of assignments and other available supervisory resources. Span of control is not a problem everywhere in the department. Nonetheless, it is generally agreed that in certain locations and at certain times of day, supervisors have too many employees to supervise. This is particularly evident in patrol. When the span of control is too large it is difficult for supervisors to adequately monitor the activities of their subordinates or leave their office.
   - A large span of control makes it difficult for supervisors to provide feedback to employees by way of regular contact. It also makes it difficult to given an employee a meaningful performance review.
   - The Sheriff will be requesting additional supervisors in the 2007 budget and is evaluating other internal changes to help with the span of control issues.

B. HUMAN RESOURCE ISSUES

1. **Promotions:**

   A successful promotional process includes encouraging good applicants to apply for promotions, determining the desired characteristics for that supervisory position, having a meaningful assessment process that measures those characteristics, and using objective and excellent assessors.

   - Deputy-to-Sergeant and Sergeant-to-Captain promotional processes are governed by civil service rules and some contractual agreements with the

Guild. After testing and ranking the candidates, the department must choose from the top three candidates on the civil service promotional list. Currently the civil service rules provide for promotional testing every two years.

- Captain-to- Major and Major-to-Chief promotions are by appointment.

2. **Performance Evaluations**

The department does not currently conduct performance evaluations on represented employees except during their probationary period.

Regular and probationary performance evaluations are conducted on non-represented employees. Non-represented employees are eligible for a step increase in pay each year provided there is adequate performance. After reaching the top step of their 10-step pay range, these employees are then eligible for merit pay. The amount does not carry over from year-to-year and is only renewed upon receiving an annual performance review with a good rating. The County-wide performance review form is attached. It is generic but it can be modified slightly by individual departments.

The non-represented commissioned positions:

- Chief
- Major

The non-represented civilian positions include:

- Chief Financial Officer
- Confidential Secretaries
- Legal Advisor
- Technology Manager
- Payroll Supervisor
- Records Supervisor
- AFIS Manager
- Chief of Staff
- Human Resources Manager

The Department has developed a draft performance review form for all employees that is being tested a selected sites in the department and is being discussed with the various labor organizations. A copy of the draft performance review is attached.

3. **Employee Retention**

- KCSO would like to reduce the deputy failure rate during the probationary period. We are first looking to see if we are hiring the right people. We are examining information regarding all deputies from 2004 – present who left employment within the first year after academy graduation. We are reviewing test scores, rank on civil service list, psychological rating, critical and serious admissions on the application, job history prior to KCSO, FTO identities,

academy class rank, academy class, assigned precinct. To date we have not found any significant trends in the information but we will keep working on this project.

- There will soon be significant changes to our oral and written testing process. We will monitor our success rates with the employees who have been screened with the new tests. There is approximately two-years between testing and the end of the probationary period so it will be some time until we can evaluate if these new tests have caused any changes in the retention rate.
- The department is conducting a similar project related to the communication specialists working in our 911 emergency call center.

C. INTERNAL OVERSIGHT

1. Inspectional Services Unit:

- KCSO has requested funds to create the Inspectional Services Unit (ISU). This Unit will develop and implement internal controls. A copy of the job description for the ISU manager is attached.
- Initially the unit will oversee the department policy manual, daily training program, training bulletins and the internal audit schedule and audit compliance.
- Eventually the unit will manage the early intervention system and accreditation program.

2. Accreditation

- The department hopes to become accredited some time in the future. It will take a few years to prepare for and achieve accreditation. Currently only one sheriff's office in Washington (Clark County) is accredited.
- There are two avenues toward accreditation – national accreditation through CALEA (Commission for Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies) or state accreditation through WASPC (Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs). The sheriff will evaluate which accreditation path would be more appropriate for the department. A brief description of each program is attached.
- All of the planned work in policy manual revision and internal audits is compatible with eventual accreditation.

Virginia Kirk
Human Resources Director
King County Sheriff's Office

SUPERVISION

New Sergeant / Supervisor Orientation
ATU Training Room / CJTC (Burien)

Day 1	**October 5th**	
0800—0900	Welcome and Intro	Sgt. Davis
0910—0930	FLSA/OT, Medical Transports	Sgt. Davis
0930—1015	Personnel Issues	Virginia Kirk
1030—1200	Employee Injuries / Return to Work Issues	Linda Shropshire Virginia Kirk
1200—1300	Lunch	
1310—1415	IIU Complaints and Processing	Capt. Wardstrom
1430—1600	Contracting	Capt. Graddon R. Cady-Connolly
Day 2	**October 6th**	
0800—0900	M.A.R.R.	Sgt. Smith
0910—1015	Liability and Claims	Dan Fleming
1030—1200	Incident Reviews	Sgt. Davis
1200—1300	Lunch	
1310—1500	Major Crimes / Ofc Involved Shootings	Sgt. Toner Sgt. Gates
Day 3	**October 7th**	
0800—0900	Meeting with Chiefs (breakout session)	Chief Krogh Chief Turner
0910—1015	Media Relations	Sgt. Urquhart
1030—1200	Special Ops / Metro	Captain Elledge Captain Stensland
1200—1300	Lunch	

1310—1400	Personal Assistance Team	Captain Pingrey
1410—1530	Meeting with the Sheriff	Sheriff Rahr
1530—1600	Wrap-up. Certificates	Sgt. Davis

(topics for next: DV Issues for Supervisors)

Training & Organization Development

Management Career Development Classes

The public is demanding a more efficient and innovative government. The vision for King County is to become a high-performance regional government and a steward for the county's quality of life, economic future and natural environment. King County needs exceptional leaders to be able to accomplish this vision. This program is designed to ensure all leads, supervisors and managers have the core knowledge and skills they need to be successful in managing others and to actively support and carry out the County's vision.

Who Should Attend

All modules in the Mandatory Management program are required for leads, supervisors and managers. This training is recommended for shop stewards.

- ADA Awareness for Supervisors
- Communication Skills for Managers and Supervisors
- Employment Selection Processes and Techniques for Supervisors
- Ethics for Supervisors
- Fundamentals of County Leaves
- Managing Diversity
- Managing People Through Change
- Safety Management for Supervisors
- Classification: King County's System and Process
- The Employee Assistance Program: A Resource for Supervisors
- EEO and Anti-Harassment Awareness for Managers and Supervisors
- Facilitating Effective Meetings
- Managing Conflict
- Managing Individual Performance (MIP) - 4 modules
- Risk Management Program
- Wage and Hour Laws for Supervisors (FLSA)
- Workplace (Anti)Harassment Web-based Training - Manager Edition (internet)
- Workers' Compensation - How To Assist Your Workers In Filing A Claim
- Cross-Reference Guide for Current and Previous Class Titles

Fundamentals of Supervision: King County Certificate Program

This certificate program is designed for managers, supervisors and leads who have completed two or fewer of the mandatory management classes.

Advanced, Non-mandatory Management Classes

The modules included in this program are designed to advance the skills taught in the Mandatory Management classes. The focus of training is on assessing, understanding and developing personal leadership skills and improving performance through teamwork.

Advanced Conflict Resolution: A Leadership Approach to Resolving Conflict

Building Effective Teams
Group Process Facilitation
Improving Processes: Creating Excellence at Work
Project Management

HUMAN RESOURCES

SHERIFF
KING COUNTY

King County Sheriff's Office
Performance Appraisal

Employee Name:	Serial Number:	Date of Appraisal: mm/dd/yyyy
Rater's Name:	Rater's Serial No.:	Rating Period from mm/dd/yyyy to mm/dd/yyyy

Work Classification: Assignment Type:

In this area describe the employee's current assignment and responsibilities (Patrol @ Pct. 3; Sergeant @ CID; Latent Print Examiner) :

In this area describe the employee's ancillary duties and assignments (PAT member, SITE team, HNT; etc):

In this area describe the rater's interaction with the employee (amount of time working together during this period; direct supervisor or off site, etc.):

Following are factors that each employee should be appraised on. Comments are required for all ratings. Additional guidelines are included.

RATING CHOICES: (Choices appear on a drop down menu at the rating)

- Needs Improvement
- Meets Standards
- Exceeds Standards

1. **LEADERSHIP:** Creates and employs excellent skills and methods for providing law enforcement services. Maintains high professional standards. Demonstrates leadership by remaining calm while under pressure and demonstrating maturity, decorum, and poise.

Rating:_____

Comments:

2. **INTEGRITY:** Does what is known to be "the right thing," adhering to both the spirit and letter of the law. Acts in ways that bring honor to the profession and builds trust, confidence, and respect with the communities and people we serve. Displays honesty that is above reproach. Conscientious and reliable, maintains a sense of responsibility for own actions.

Rating: _____

Comments:

3. **SERVICE:** Serves the customer by responding in a professional, courteous, and efficient manner. Proactively solves problems. Responsive to requests and anticipates needs of customers.

Rating: _____

Comments:

4. **TEAMWORK:** Relates well with coworkers and the general public. Displays a courteous, friendly, empathetic manner; Performs in a professional and unbiased manner. Counted on to complete tasks correctly and on time.

Rating: _____

Comments:

5. **COMMUNICATIONS:** Communicates well with other employees and supervisors. Effectively relays and interprets information and view points with verbal, nonverbal, written and electronic communications.

Comments:

employee initials_____

6. SEEKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE: Solicits critique in order to improve performance. Learns and benefits from it. Works to keep skills and knowledge current.

Rating: _____

Comments:

7. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES : Working knowledge of KCSO policies and procedures. Familiar with requirements for current assignment as well as organization goals.

Rating: _____

Comments:

List required and optional certifications acquired in this period along with training attended:

Goals for upcoming review period:

I have read this report, and the rater has discussed the contents with me.
Signing this form does not necessarily constitute agreement with the conclusions of the rater

Employee Signature: _____ Date Received: _____

❑ I accept this report as written

❑ I wish to appeal this report per G.O.M. 2.25.030

Employee comments (additional pages may be attached if desired):

Rater's Signature: _____ Date Appraisal Delivered: _____

Manager's Signature: _____ Date Appraisal Reviewed: _____

Manager's Comments (additional pages may be attached if desired):

employee initials_____

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL RATING CRITERIA

1. LEADERSHIP

- Needs Improvement

Fosters a negative work environment through criticism of department, policies and procedures; lacks vision or motivation. Does not maintain professional standards. Fails to see the overall mission of the department, focuses on a narrow scope of issues. Requires close supervision and constant direction.

- Meets Standards

Employee contributes to the improvement of the work environment, strives to see the positive aspects of decisions and supports goals of the department. Maintains professional standards. Encourages subordinate employees and encourages a positive atmosphere and safe workplace, accepts feedback and takes corrective action, requires little direction or motivation.

- Exceeds Standards

Employee is easily identified as a leader in their work area, professional, knowledgeable, forward thinking and positive. Encourages employee development. Confident, loyal, dedicated to public service. Accepts responsibility and strives for improvement, is accountable and decisive. Accepts new challenges; adapts well to change. Creates and employs excellent skills and methods for providing law enforcement services. Excels in professional standards. Exhibits maturity, decorum and poise in all situations. Participates in activities outside the department representing public service and law enforcement. Self motivated and motivates others. Inspires confidence and respect of department personnel.

2. INTEGRITY

- Needs Improvement

Is not reliable and does not take responsibility for own actions. Is not honest or forthright in interactions with the public and co-workers. Cannot be trusted with confidential or sensitive information.

- Meets Standards

Does the right thing, adhering to both the spirit and letter of the law. Conscientious and reliable, maintains a sense of responsibility for own actions. Ability to maintain an honest approach in all dealings. Behaves in accordance with department and King County ethics rules. Demonstrates integrity in day-to-day behavior; keeps sensitive information confidential.

- Exceeds Standards

Consistently acts in ways that bring honor to the department and the profession and builds trust, confidence and respect to the communities and people we serve. Behaves in accordance with department and King County ethics rules. Displays honesty that is above reproach. Accepts responsibility for own actions; always maintaining ethical principles and telling the truth, regardless of consequences; displaying uncompromising values.

3. SERVICE

- Needs Improvement

Finds excuses not to provide requested services, impatient or discourteous with the public on occasion, rarely goes out of their way to perform an extra effort. Performs minimum work. Unnecessary delay in providing services.

- Meets Standards

Routinely handles interactions with the public and others politely and respectfully, provides timely responses and thinks of customer needs as a priority, meets service requests and expectations.

- Exceeds Standards

Quickly develops a positive approach and rapport with public and other agency peers, is always respectful and helpful, seeks resolution of problems. Makes self available to provide service. Frequently exceeds service requests and expectations

4. TEAMWORK

- Needs Improvement

Employee promotes personal agenda instead of department goals, prefers to work alone, does not solicit input or opinions different from their own; is disruptive in discussions, fails to support team decisions once made. Demonstrates inadequate skills in working with co-workers or other agency personnel. Occasionally uncooperative and/or discourteous with co-workers or other agency personnel. Has difficulty working with most co-workers. Causes friction in work relationships.

- Meets Standards

Works in cooperation with others to achieve a desired result, works in partnership with citizens, co-workers and supervisors. Avoids unnecessary conflict. Maintains an average or above average working relationship with most co-workers and other agency personnel. Cooperative, courteous, and understanding in most work situations. Creates a constructive climate for teamwork, allows others to express their opinions. Works with others well enough to get the job done. Willing to listen and participate as a team member.

- Exceeds Standards

Shows exceptional skill in working with all co-workers and other agency personnel. Routinely works with others in a positive team approach to problem solving and work assignments, always willing to assist others, expresses opinions in a positive manner. Cooperative, courteous, and understanding, even in difficult situations. Willing to put aside immediate needs in favor of the overall team objective.

5. COMMUNICATION

- Needs Improvement

Communicates with others reluctantly, does not respond to requests for information in a timely manner, fails to communicate with supervisor, gives incomplete instructions to team members, written information is vague, defensive, overly expressive. Writing is poor, with errors in grammar and sentence structure. Written materials often need correction.

- Meets Standards

Communicates clearly and constructively, respects the opinions of others, listens attentively, gives clear instructions, demonstrates tact and diplomacy. Understands the appropriate style of communication for the situation. Written skills include good understanding of English, grammar, sentence structure. Writing is clear and concise. Materials seldom require follow up or correction. Effectively relays and interprets information and viewpoints with verbal, nonverbal, written and electronic communications.

- Exceeds Standards

Addresses supervisors, co-workers and the public in a positive and constructive way. Shows outstanding ability to relay and interpret information and viewpoints with verbal, nonverbal, written and electronic communications. Respects the opinions and ideas of others, encourages expressions of differing views and keeps an open mind, and be relied upon to deliver a difficult message, seeks to resolve problems through effective communications. Excellent written skills, clear responsive answers, good use of grammar, spelling, sentence structure. Materials rarely needs correction or follow up.

6. SEEKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

- Needs Improvement

Will not accept constructive criticism, requires close supervision and constant direction. Does not work to keep relevant skills and knowledge current. Performs only the minimum to complete job. Does not seek training or improve job skills.

- Meets Standards

Employee accepts criticism and feedback. Employee regularly seeks to improve performance, works to keep skills and knowledge current. Learns new procedures quickly, regularly seeks training and new assignments to advance skills and learn new procedures and methods.

- Exceeds Standards

Employee solicits input and critiques to improve performance. Learns and benefits from the feedback. Seeks superior knowledge of subject matter on a frequent basis, up to date on current methods, practices and procedures, regularly seeks training and new assignments to improve and learn new skills, considered by others as an authority or subject matter expert.

7. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- Needs Improvement

Employee is not familiar with KCSO policies and procedures. Is not familiar with requirements for current assignment or organizational goals.

- Meets Standards

Employee is familiar with KCSO policies and procedures. Is familiar with requirements for current assignment or organizational goals.

- Exceeds Standards

Employee is fully versed in KCSO policies and procedures, makes effort to understand them and implement them. Is familiar with requirements for current assignment, the policies and procedures for subordinates and larger organization. Employee is familiar with relevant King County, state and federal policies affecting current assignment or organizational goals.

King County
Performance Appraisal

King County

Employee Name:

Department / Division:

Merit Group Number: Ten Digit Position Number:

Rating Period: ☐September-February ☐March - August ☐Probationary

1 Criteria Letter	2 Weight	3 Rating	4 Score (2x3)	Criteria and/or Comments
A				Accomplishment of Job Requirements:
B				Work Relationships with Co-workers:
C				Dependability and Reliability:
D				Gathers and Uses Information:
E				Job Knowledge and Technical Competence:
F				Punctuality / Affirmative Action:
G				Work Relationships w/other Depart./Div./Clients and the Public:
H				Imagination and Initiative in Performance of Job:
I				Oral Communication:
J				Makes Decisions and/or Recommendations within the Scope of the Position:
K				Meets Work Deadlines:
L				Cost Consciousness:
M				Written Communications:
N				Quantity of Work:
O				Safety:
P				Supervision:
Total				Performance Score:
	Performance Score = Total Score of Column 4 divided by Total Weight of Column 2			

Comments of Rater:

Development Program for Next rating Period (attach additional sheets if necessary):

_____ Date _____
Raters Signature

`omments of Employee:

_____ Date _____ I wish to meet with Reviewer Yes / No
Employees's Signature

Date

INTERNAL OVERSIGHT

King County
Classification Specification

XXXXXXX

INSPECTION SERVICES UNIT MANAGER
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Class Summary

The responsibilities of this classification include managing and overseeing audits of critical department operational and administrative functions and processes in the King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO). The incumbent will supervise staff in the KCSO Inspection Services Unit and is responsible for developing, implementing and overseeing audit procedures and systems. The incumbent will also provide guidance and oversight for the Take 5 training program, policy manual revisions, and the accreditation process.

Distinguishing Characteristics

This is a single level classification. Incumbents in this classification apply advanced knowledge of law enforcement standard operating procedures, general civil and criminal laws, methods of conduct for criminal investigations and operational audit techniques and principles. The classification is responsible for managing and overseeing audits that ensure compliance with the KCSO's standard operating procedures, processes and systems. The incumbent is not directly responsible for conducting audits or supervising staff who conduct the audits. The classification reports directly to the King County Sheriff.

This class is distinguished from the Internal Auditor classification series in that the classification is not responsible for overseeing and managing audits of non-King County Sheriff's Office operations and administrative functions and processes.

Essential Duties

1. Oversee and manage work of the KCSO Inspectional Services Unit, including providing technical and administrative direction, personnel and work load planning, and budget development.
2. Develop audit procedures, processes, and systems; identify and determine KCSO department audits to be conducted; and develop and monitor audit schedules.
3. Assign audits to internal staff and external agencies, manage and coordinate the process to contract with external auditors.
4. Review audit findings and recommendations; analyze results; and make necessary policy recommendations to the sheriff and executive team.
5. Prepare and deliver annual report and other periodic reports on audit status and findings to the sheriff and other senior management officials.
6. Review KCSO departmental standard operating policies (SOP) for each division/unit/section to ensure compliance with all current polices, relevant laws, and regulations; provide direction and assistance to department staff on development and/or revisions of SOPs when needed.

7. Direct and supervise the work of the unit's professional and/or administrative staff; evaluate employee performance; and ensure the quality, timeliness and appropriateness of work produced by the unit.

8. Oversee and direct the policy manual revision process; keep current on latest law enforcement policies and best practices.

9. Oversee and direct the development and implementation of daily training topics resulting from new directives.

10. Direct the accreditation process and facilitate KCSO interaction with accreditation agency; participate in accreditation compliance.

11. Plan and coordinate special research and investigative projects regarding administrative and program problems and issues; develop and recommend courses of actions.

Knowledge/Skills (May vary by position)

Advanced knowledge of law enforcement standard operating procedures

Knowledge of general civil and criminal law; methods of conduct of criminal investigations and of public safety labor issues

Knowledge of law enforcement accreditation

Knowledge of legislative/legal governing bodies that have the potential to affect or change department policy

Knowledge of practices of other law enforcement agencies to discover improved methods, policies and procedures

Knowledge of Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS)

Knowledge of evaluation and policy analysis methodologies

Skill in planning, directing, supervising and evaluating the work activities of assigned staff

Skill in establishing and maintaining effective working relationships with others

Skill in exercising independent judgment and handling sensitive and confidential information

Skill in determining the relevance and appropriate application of laws, federal regulations, statutes, ordinances, contractual agreements, and factual information to specific situations

Skill in analyzing and organizing facts, evidence, precedents, and investigations

Skill in compiling, organizing, evaluating and summarizing data, including statistical data

Skill in preparing and maintaining an annual budget

Verbal and written communication skills

Skill in the use of computer software applications such as electronic mail, word processor, spreadsheet and database programs

Skill in managing multiple projects with accuracy

Skill in organizing and prioritizing assignments, and strictly adhering to established rules, regulations, procedures and deadlines

Licensing/Certification Requirements

Must pass a comprehensive background check, including polygraph

---

EEO Code

MSA: 01 / PS: 1

FLSA Designation

Exempt

Worker's Comp Code

536

Class History

Adopted: 2/16/06

About CALEA®

The Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA®), was established as an independent accrediting authority in 1979 by the four major law enforcement membership associations: International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); National Sheriffs' Association (NSA); and Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). The Executive Directors of these four associations appoint members to the Commission annually; an endorsement requires a majority vote for each appointment.

The Commission has 21 members; 11 members are law enforcement practitioners; the remaining 10 members are selected from the public- and private-sectors. Commissioners are appointed to a term of three years. The position of Commissioner is voluntary and receives no salary, although travel and per diem expenses are provided when conducting Commission business.

CALEA® maintains a small, professional staff managed by an Executive Director. The staff conducts all administrative and operational duties as directed by the Commission. Commission staff is available to assist applicant and accredited agencies through a toll-free telephone number. CALEA® produces a newsletter and offers workshops to explain the accreditation process and standards during the Commission Conference held three times annually.

The Commission's Authority

CALEA® derives its general authority from the four major law enforcement membership associations mentioned above. Their members represent approximately 80% of the law enforcement profession in this nation. The Commission derives its accreditation authority from those agencies that voluntarily participate in the accreditation program.

The Purpose of the Commission

The overall purpose of the Commission's accreditation program is to improve delivery of law enforcement service by offering a body of standards, developed by law enforcement practitioners, covering a wide range of up-to-date law enforcement topics. It recognizes professional achievements by offering an orderly process for addressing and complying with applicable standards.

The Voluntary Nature of the Accreditation Program

Successful completion of the accreditation program requires *commitment* from all levels of the organization, starting with the chief executive officer. To foster commitment, a decision to participate should be *voluntary*. To this end, the Commission insures that law enforcement accreditation™ is and will continue to be a voluntary program.

Benefits

Besides the recognition of obtaining international excellence, the primary benefits of accreditation provides management model, provide better services, controlled liability insurance costs, administrative improvements, greater accountability from supervisors, increased governmental and community support.

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SHERIFFS & POLICE CHIEFS

3060 Willamette Dr NE Lacey, WA 98516 PHONE (360) 486-2380 FAX (360) 486-2381 WEBSITE – www.waspc.org

Serving the Law Enforcement Community & the Citizens of Washington

Accreditation

A Way of Doing Business

For many agencies, accreditation is an event that takes place only once every three or five years. Agencies operating under this philosophy typically select and assign one employee as the department's accreditation manager who is responsible for the entire accreditation program. Problems for agencies operating under this philosophy typically include:

- Lack of support and involvement from command staff;
- Lack of understanding and support from other agency personnel/sections and;
- Lack of support when he/she is involved in the self-assessment phase

The accreditation manger in this position typically is solely responsible for the entire process which consists of collecting the information needed to develop and complete the mandatory annual reports as well as collecting all information needed for the accreditation files in order to prove compliance. If the manager waits until the accreditation date is near to collect the information they often time have difficulty locating three or five years worth of proofs of compliance.

In an effort to reduce or eliminate these problems many agencies are adopting the philosophy that accreditation *must be* **"a way of doing business".** Implementing this philosophy should ensure the following:

- All command staff and managers will be knowledgeable and supportive of accreditation;
- Agency personnel will understand the benefits of accreditation;
- More personnel are involved in ensuring the agency is accredited and that it maintains its accredited status;
- Mandatory reports, inspections and audits are completed in a timely manner and:
- The agencies liability risks are reduced.

Following are suggestions for agencies that want to develop the philosophy that accreditation is "a way of doing business":

- Accreditation must become institutionalized and include every component/section of the agency both in the self-assessment (initial accreditation) and during accreditation renewal.
- Agency command staff and all agency managers need to understand and support accreditation.
- Every department member needs to fully understand accreditation and the benefits accreditation brings to the department. Third edition standard **33.5.3** requires that familiarization with the accreditation process is provided to agency employees as follows:
    1. To all newly hired agency personnel within a reasonable period (time-line created by the agency) after their employment begins.
    2. To all agency personnel during the self-assessment phase associated with achieving initial accreditation and each re-accreditation.
    3. To all agency personnel just prior to an on-site assessment associated with initial accreditation and each re-accreditation.

President	President Elect	Vice President	Past President	Treasurer
JAMES I. SCHARF *Chief - Everett*	CRAIG E. THAYER *Sheriff - Stevens County*	RANDALL H. CARROLL *Chief – Bellingham*	DAN LaROCHE *Sheriff – Douglas County*	MIKE VANDIVER *Chief – Tumwater*
Executive Board				
SCOTT G. SMITH *Chief – Mountlake Terrace*	COLLEEN WILSON *Chief – Sumner*	GARRY ANDERSON *Chief – Renton*	BRUCE J. BJORK *Chief - Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*	LOWELL M. PORTER *Chief – WSP*
GENE DANA *Sheriff – Kittitas County*	JOHN L. DIDION *Sheriff – Pacific County*	DAVID G. REICHERT *Sheriff - King County*	PATRICK J. ADAMS *SAC – FBI*	LARRY V. ERICKSON *Executive Director*

3rd edition standard **11.4.3** requires that agencies have a system for ensuring that periodic reports, reviews and other activities mandated by applicable accreditation standards are accomplished. Every component of the agency (patrol, traffic, juvenile, detectives, records, support staff, jail, evidence, volunteers, etc.) must be involved. Each agency component should produce monthly reports that address mandatory accreditation reporting requirements. As an example, Patrol/Operations supervisors would report on the following: performance reviews completed, training classes/hours, roll call training issues/topics, equipment and personnel inspections and use of force issues and audits.

- The reporting formats (see attached examples) should be designed with WASPC third edition standard numbers for each report section.
- Periodic reports (daily, monthly, semi-annually and annual)will be sent through the chain of command for approval and then filed in the appropriate accreditation standard folder.

Agencies should realize that after they have been awarded accredited status it is critically important to maintain the positive momentum that got them through the accreditation process and to keep accreditation on the agencies "front burner" throughout the year.

WASPC ACCREDITATION INFORMATION

Accreditation is a way of helping institutions evaluate and improve their overall performance. The key to this successful system lies in the consensus of published and circulated standards containing a clear statement of professional objectives. In 1976, at the direction of the Washington State Legislature, WASPC President James McMahon appointed a task force to develop "standards and goals" for Washington State Law Enforcement.

The WASPC Law Enforcement Accreditation Program was conceived to recognize the achievement of meeting these standards. However, WASPC also realized that in order to do so many agencies would require assistance, particularly smaller cities and counties; therefore WASPC designed the Loaned Executive Program (LEMAP), a program to deliver agencies on-site managerial and technical support.

Washington was the first state to have a totally operational independent accreditation process. However, the WASPC Accreditation Program is not in competition with the national accreditation body, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Incorporated (CALEA). We are merely offering an affordable method of professionalizing police departments that is tailored to meet the needs of their region and to help them better serve and protect their constituents.

Many agencies in Washington have already met WASPC professional standards and have had accreditation conferred upon them. Many other agencies are in the process of meeting the standards. The process is difficult and takes considerable time, effort, and determination on the part of the Chief or Sheriff to achieve. The stages of the accreditation process are as follows:

- **Interest and Contract**
- **Self-Assessment**
- **Formal On-Site Assessment and Evaluation**
  In addition to looking for proof of meeting the standards, the on-site team interviews rank-and-file members of the police department to determine if they have been trained and are following the objective provisions of the standards. Team members also make random contacts with community and legislative body members to determine their perceptions of the agency seeking accreditation. Our experience has shown that approximately one-half of the police agencies need additional time for corrections, thus 60 days are allotted to meet the standards not met during the first on-site visit.
- **Citizen Review Committee**
  The on-site review team leader, the chief administrator of the agency seeking accreditation, and the departmental accreditation manager appear before the Citizen Review Committee in Olympia, for determination if they have met the standards and that the on-site review team has done a complete job. This committee consists of: a county commissioner, a city mayor, a county prosecutor, a risk-pool manager, and a criminal justice educator. This committee acts as a check and balance to ensure that the on-site team members are forthright and candid in their observations and evaluations.

- **WASPC Executive Board**
  After the review committee determines that the agency seeking accreditation has met all applicable standards, they recommend to the Executive Board of WASPC that the agency be accredited. The Executive Board then makes the final decision.
- **Accreditation Conferred**
  A plaque is presented to the chief administrator at a semi-annual banquet. Photos are taken and media representatives are invited. Subsequent presentation can also be made in the agency's jurisdiction by the WASPC President or staff.

Proven benefits of participation in the WASPC accreditation program include:

- Improved morale within the police agency.
- Increased credibility with governing body.
- Increased pride in the agency.
- Systemized self-assessment.
- Broadened perspectives.
- Intensified administrative and operational effectiveness.
- Confidence that recruitment, selection, and promotion processes are fair and equitable.
- Strengthened understanding of agency policies and procedures by all police personnel.
- Decreased susceptibility to litigation and costly civil court settlements.
- Potential reduction in premiums for liability insurance.
- Greater public confidence in the agency.
- State and local acknowledgment of professional competence.

Sheriff's Blue Ribbon Panel
Problem Statement & Recommendations Development
Discussion Draft

(numbers are for reference only and do not signify priority)

1. Management and supervision

(prevention of misconduct, intervention when it occurs, and correction/discipline when needed)

- **Concern:** lack of follow-up on discipline with line officers by line supervisors: it is not clear how it is done and tracked, if at all.
- **Concern:** supervisors are asking for help to be good managers and investigations and due process steps have gone awry in the past. **To address it:** how can supervisors be encouraged and empowered to take the right corrective actions and be supported to do so. Ensure that basic due process steps are followed.
- **Concern:** delegation of supervision and discipline to line supervisors is not being carried out effectively. **To address it:** identify the risks that exist or barriers that prevent first-line supervisors from being able to fully take on their management role. Identify supports needed to identify and address conduct issues early.

2. Human resource systems

(recruitment, hiring, training, promotions, and recognition)

- **Concern:** Testing for characteristics and values such as integrity and ethical behavior. **To address it:** encouragement for regional officer testing, oral board testing that emphasizes desired characteristics. This is difficult but should be encouraged.
- **Concern:** the influence of the Field Training Officer program on the conduct of officers. **To address it:** ensure the FTO program is reflective of desired characteristics.
- **Concern:** Difficulty hiring and retaining people who possess the right characteristics to serve the public. **To address it:** Focus on resolving problems early in their experience with the department, including conflicts with the FTO, or other issues that can be resolved (could include remedial training, counseling). Identify what influences the FTO dropout rate.
- **Concern:** recruiting. A high dropout rate between academy graduation and field training.

3. Complaint process

(how it is structured and conducted, including intake, investigation, discipline, remedies, and appeals)

- **Concern:** complaint intake process does not address responsibility or consistency of persons who take complaints (whether at IIU or precinct), concern is not given to how that influences the image of the agency. **To address it:** more outreach so people know how and where to make complaints, and more training for complaint takers

- **Concern:** complaint tracking is done for only the most serious complaints in IIU, not at all at the line level; responses to citizens are inconsistent, and no record is kept of patterns of problems.

- **Concern:** who watches the watchers? **To address it:** the Panel must make a clear statement of the need for better conduct, performance, and oversight. Our recommendations need to focus on the influential factors 5-8: complaint process, internal oversight, external oversight.

4. Internal oversight

(tracking, monitoring, and reporting procedures and systems to provide feedback, evaluate individual performance, identify patterns of misconduct, and developing systemic improvements)

- **Concern:** it is not clear if there is a pattern underlying discipline trends that led to misconduct problems now being reported. Are employees burned out, new to the process? Who are those with conduct problems? **To address it:** Panel needs to dig into these cases to understand what went wrong, and whether the contributors were burnout, supervision, investigation, length of time to resolve, or something else?

5. Transparency

(public access to relevant information and the public's perception of the openness of the investigation and discipline processes)

- **Concern:** low level of support by the community. **To address it**: better communication practices to allow the public to see into the process. Report to the citizens about how issues reported in the paper are being handled. Have meetings to instill public confidence. Implement an early intervention system to ensure that patterns of problems are identified.

6. Department leadership and culture

(customs, values, informal standards of conduct, and professionalism expected and modeled by departmental leaders)

- **Concern:** lack of performance standards. **To address it**: set performance standards, and if precedent is binding, set a bright line in writing to signify a change.

- **Concern:** Hard to see into police culture and what it really is at the KCSO. As civilians, the Panel can't reach into the department to identify whether a code of silence or covering up issues exists. **To address it:** a cultural audit to gain an understanding of attitudes and beliefs that influence behavior.

7. Labor environment

(collective bargaining agreements and relations with and influence of labor unions)

- **Concern:** content and administration of the collective bargaining agreement over time. It is very unusual to have no change in the agreement over a decade, when changes in agreement happen because of changes in law, society, budget, and leadership.

- **Concern:** attitude of management: labor-management philosophy of not losing, versus winning. Perception of being hamstrung by contract. The structure for effective approaches to labor-management issues, and misconduct and discipline, may be there, but it is insufficient. **To address it**: a proactive attitude to prevail in spite of the risks of losing. Encouragement to understand employee rights and see the bargaining process as a discussion process.

8. External oversight

(governmental and citizen oversight of police misconduct and discipline processes)

- **Concern:** no citizen oversight of police actions. **To address it:** more public input, communicate to the public, and build public confidence in the department.

9. External forces

(events or factors that prompt changes, such as politics, media coverage, and community reactions)

ACLU
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION of WASHINGTON

DATE June 7, 2006

TO: King County Sheriff's Blue Ribbon Panel Members

FR: Jennifer Shaw

RE: ACLU of Washington's Suggestions for Essential Elements of an Effective Police Accountability System

---

Reviewing the material about the various police accountability systems used in cities across the country has taught us that there is no one model of accountability that will address all of the needs of every city or county. A system of police accountability must be created with an eye towards the needs of the citizens of the affected jurisdiction, the history of the law enforcement agency and the ability of the governing body to implement and fund the system.

I have drafted the following memo in order to prepare for the discussion about the elements of an effective system of police accountability. This list includes the elements that the ACLU of Washington considers to be essential to a functioning system of police accountability. We have discussed most of these elements in our public meetings and I won't repeat the specifics of each element in detail here. However, I am happy to give additional information to the group if needed to fully explain our position.

These elements are broken up into two main categories: internal management and external oversight. They are not listed in a particular order but we believe that all are essential to a good system of police accountability.

The ACLU has appreciated the opportunity to be a part of this process. We hope that this list will aid in our discussions of these elements and in our consideration of the public input.

Internal Management

1. Early Intervention

Small problems, if left unchecked, can easily turn in to big problems. An effective early intervention system will help supervisors spot problem behaviors and give the officer the training and support needed to change the behavior. An "informal" intervention system is not adequate because it will not be consistently applied.

2. Complaint Tracking

The system for tracking complaints against King County deputies must be overhauled. The system for receiving complaints does not ensure that complaints made to precinct commanders

705 2ND AVENUE, 3RD FL., SEATTLE, WA 98104
T/206.624.2184, F/206.624.2190, WWW.ACLU-WA.ORG

or sergeants or any place other than Internal Investigations are logged and tracked. The tracking system only provides for logging of complaints made to or referred to IIU and tracking those investigated by IIU through the system. Complaints that are referred to the deputy's supervisor for action are not tracked after the referral and there is no way to know if the supervisor has followed up on the complaint or resolved it in any way.

There must be a consistent system to log and track every complaint that is made about a Sheriff's deputy regardless of where the complaint was originally lodged. The system must include a means of tracking all complaints through resolution whether the resolution is reached through the IIU or line supervisor.

3. Complaint Classification

Currently it appears that complaints are classified by the IIU Captain or staff based on IIU policies, though some classifications may be made on an informal "rule of thumb" basis. There is no clear explanation of the classification system and no way to challenge a complaint's classification. For example, the IIU Captain may believe that a complaint is "minor" because the deputy was allegedly rude to a civilian. However, if the "rude behavior" included a racial slur or a threat, the complaint should be considered more serious. Or if the same "rudeness" complaint has been made against the same deputy by different members of the public over a period of time, then the complaint shows a pattern of negative behavior and should be considered more serious.

The classification policies must be available for review by the civilian oversight staff and the public. IIU staff must provide justification based on these policies for the complaint classifications.

4. Strong Top-Down Policy of Respect for and Acceptance of Citizen Complaints

Very few citizens ever file complaints against law enforcement officers regardless of the validity of the complaint or the severity of the officer's behavior. Many people are too intimidated by the power of law enforcement, or confused by the complaint system, or embarrassed that they were targeted for harassment, or simply do not like to take the time to get involved. As a result, the complaints that are made should be taken very seriously.

The Sheriff and top management in the Sheriff's office must make clear that citizen complaints are an important part of improving law enforcement services. Citizens should be encouraged to come forward with complaints, concerns and recommendations without fear of retaliation. The complaint system should be simple and comprehensible. The complainants should be treated respectfully. Deputies should be clearly instructed that all complaints will be heard and tracked and all complainants will receive a response.

5. Mediation

The Sheriff's office should offer citizen-officer mediation as an alternative to an internal investigation in certain, limited circumstances. The deputy and civilian must agree to the process after being fully informed of the procedures, timelines and potential outcomes. Deputies with a

history of complaints and civilians with an interest in punishment should be excluded from the process.

6. Improved Use of Force Policies

In order to avoid injury to the public and false allegations of misuse of force, the Use of Force policies and procedures must be carefully reviewed and improved. All sworn officers must receive training in the improved polices and procedures to ensure appropriate use of force and to prevent abuse.

7. Comprehensive Policy Review

The Sheriff's Office must conduct a thorough review of all current policies and procedures in order to update and improve them. The review must focus on creating agency that meets the "best practices" standards in all service areas. We understand that the Sheriff has arranged for such an audit. We applaud this effort and suggest that it become a part of the routine review process for the Sheriff's Office.

8. Easy Public Access to Policy and Procedures Manual

The manual should be available through the Sheriff's Office web site. The manual should also be available in other public places such as libraries, county offices and precincts. All publicly available copies of the manual should be consistently updated and replaced if damaged or destroyed.

9. Regular Communication to the Public About Polices and Procedures

The Sheriff's Office should hold regular public meetings throughout the county to provide information to the public about policies and procedures and the complaint system.

External Oversight

1. Independent Professional full-time Civilian Oversight Staff

The professional civilian oversight staff must have confidential, unredacted access to all complaint files regardless of classification. The access must be early in the investigation process and must include attendance at witness interviews. The oversight staff must have the authority to respond to the scene of critical incidents such as police shootings, police response to demonstrations and any incident where a deputy allegedly causes the death or critical injury of a civilian.

The civilian oversight must have confidential unredacted access to investigatory records. By this we mean that information provided to the civilian oversight staff will remain confidential and will not be disclosed during the investigation. The duty of confidentiality will remain unless the complaint is sustained. The confidential access does not create an attorney-client relationship

between the civilian oversight staff and the deputy even if the civilian oversight staff is an attorney.

The professional civilian oversight staff must also have the authority to recommend policy and procedure changes. The Sheriff must respond to these recommendations. If the recommendations are rejected in whole or in part, the Sheriff must timely explain in writing the reasons for the rejection.

Finally, the civilian oversight staff must publish periodic public reports regarding policies, practices and procedures. Reports must be published at least annually in order to give the public the necessary insight into the police accountability process and the recommendations of the professional civilian oversight staff.

2. Civilian Advisory Group for the Professional Oversight Staff

In addition to the independent professional civilian oversight staff, there should be a civilian advisory group to work with the professional oversight staff and to act as the link to the community. This group would advise the oversight staff about police accountability concerns of the community and can work with the oversight staff on community outreach and education.

DISCUSSION DRAFT

KING COUNTY SHERIFF'S BLUE RIBBON PANEL
Report and Recommendations Outline
Discussion Draft (for August 2006)

1) **Report Cover Options**

   a) Photographs/graphics

   b) Inside cover: quotation that captures challenge of Panel's charge; or

   c) Inside cover: list of Panel members and staff support

2) **Transmittal letter** (2 pages maximum)

   a) To Sheriff, Prosecutor, Executive, Council: top-line recommendations

   b) Signed by Panel

3) **Executive Summary** (3 pages maximum)

4) **Table of Contents** (1 page)

5) **Summary: Panel Charge and Work Program** (2 pages)

   a) Why Panel was convened

   b) Panel process: work program, operating guidelines, schedule and how the Panel worked together (detail can go into Appendix)

   c) Sources of information and acknowledgments of contributions to work by others

6) **Problem Statement/Situation Assessment**

   a) Must be a clear statement of what the Panel thinks the problem is to be solved. Distinguish findings from assertions.

   b) One approach to structuring findings: outline strengths, challenges (concerns) and opportunities regarding misconduct, discipline, and management systems (could come from P-I articles, "concerns" discussion, and findings from presentations. Our list, in no particular order):

      i) Strengths/Opportunities: Panel could offer reinforcement for efforts already underway at KCSO. Examples might include: supervisor training; clarification of who provides legal advice to the Sheriff; new personnel manager; implementation of performance evaluations; development of performance standards; establishment of inspectional services unit; pursuing accreditation;

implementation of Hiring in the Spirit of Service initiatives; other aspects of 100-day plan.

ii) Challenges/Concerns: Draw from current list of concerns discussed at April meetings and make a clear statement of what needs to be improved. Examples might include: improved supervision and discipline at the line level; complaint tracking; record-keeping/inability to detect patterns of problem behavior; recruitment and retention during FTO; labor-management philosophy; lack of ethical performance standards and clear expectations; low level of community support; lack of citizen oversight; need for cultural audit; greater support for supervisors to be good managers; lack of transparency in complaint process; testing for corporate values in recruitment; high span of control ratios.

7) Influential Factors and Strategic/Environmental Map

a) What the Panel sees as the influential factors that determine the success or failure of a discipline/misconduct system

b) How those influential factors combine to make KCSO functional or not: need for alignment of strategy, systems and structure

8) Best Practices (to address challenges and opportunities)

a) How Panel examined model practices and programs

b) Which departments we interviewed (department profiles as an appendix)

c) Findings from profiles/summary themes: what others have done to address similar problems

d) What models and practices are portable to King County and why the Panel thinks they could make a difference

9) Recommendations and Conclusions

a) Alternatives: structure according to influential factors, or another organizing principal that will evolve from current discussions.

b) Reinforce framework for recommendations: strategy, systems, structure

c) Structured in terms of who should do what, by when

d) Ensure to relate recommendations to findings outlined in problem statement

10) Next Steps

a) What needs immediate action (next 100 days)

b) Implementation issues (what are the implications of recommendations – bargaining, work with the Executive, restructuring, etc.)

c) Potential fiscal impact of recommendations (don't know how the Panel will want to handle this, just to flag those recommendations expected to cost money)

11) Appendices (5 pages)

a) Panel credentials

b) Panel charge, operating guidelines, work program

c) Bibliographic list: sources cited

d) Persons interviewed and contributors to Panel's work

e) Reference to links for all Panel materials

BERK & ASSOCIATES

Strategic and financial planning • Public finance
Policy development • Facilitation

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 7, 2006

TO: King County Sheriff's Blue Ribbon Panel Members

FROM: Marty Wine and Morgan Shook, Berk & Associates

RE: Review of Resources to the Panel

This memo documents the resources that have been or will be made available to the panel in its research into the misconduct/discipline and management systems of the King County Sheriff's Office. The purpose of this memo is to identify any further resources or information you believe would inform the Panel in drafting recommendations.

- Panel Presenters
    - Sue Rahr, Sheriff, King County Sheriff's Office
    - Virginia Kirk, Manager, Human Resources, King County Sheriff's Office
    - Cameron Webster, Captain, Internal Investigations Unit, King County Sheriff's Office
    - Amy Calderwood, Director, King County Office of Citizen Complaints-Ombudsman
    - Susie Slonecker, King County Prosecutor's Office
    - Nancy Buonanno-Grennan, King County Office of Human Resources Management
    - Rick Hayes, King County Office of Human Resources Management
    - Dustin Frederick, Business Manager, SEIU, Public Safety Employees, Local 519
    - Steve Eggert, President, King County Police Officers Guild
    - Chris Vick, Attorney for the King County Police Officers Guild
- Consultation and/or research materials from individuals and organizations
    - Samuel Walker, *The New World of Police Accountability*
    - Police Assessment Resource Center
    - National Association for Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement
    - National Coalition on Police Accountability
    - Police Executive Research Forum

Ph. 206.324.8760 • Fx. 206.324.8965 • E-mail: bai@berkandassociates.com • Suite 200 • 120 Lakeside Avenue • Seattle, WA 98122

    - National Sheriffs' Association
    - Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs
    - International Association of Chiefs of Police
    - U.S. Department of Justice
    - State Justice Institute
    - National Center for State Courts
    - American Civil Liberties Union
    - National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
    - Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
    - National Council of La Raza
    - Japanese American Citizens League
    - Human Rights Watch
    - Justice Charles Z. Smith, Washington State Supreme Court
- Profile of police and sheriff agencies
    - City of Boise, ID
    - City of Portland, OR
    - City of San Jose, CA
    - City of Seattle, WA
    - City and County of Denver, CO
    - Los Angeles County, CA
    - Washington State Patrol
- Panel members' diverse professional and personal expertise/contacts
- Public testimony
    - Three public hearings in Kenmore, Issaquah, and Renton in June, 2006
    - Public comment provided at Panel meetings since March, 2006
- News media, including the Seattle Post-Intelligencer's series, *Conduct Unbecoming*

BERK & ASSOCIATES

Strategic and financial planning • Public finance
Policy development • Facilitation

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 7, 2006

TO: King County Sheriff's Blue Ribbon Panel

FROM: Marty Wine and Morgan Shook, Berk & Associates

RE: National Experts on Police Accountability

This memo suggests a preliminary list of individuals that are generally recognized as experts on police accountability issues. The listing is intended to provide the panel with a sample of experts that potentially could be invited or made available to the panel as resources, or asked to review and critique the panel's draft report.

- Merrick Bobb, Director, Police Assessment Resource Center
- Mike Gennaco, Special Counsel, Office of Independent Review, LA County Sheriff's Office
- Richard Rosenthal, Director, Office of the Independent Monitor, City and County of Denver
- Barbara Attard, Director, Independent Police Auditor, City of San Jose and President, National Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement
- Dr. Samuel Walker, Professor of Criminal Justice, Omaha, Nebraska, author of 12 books on policing, criminal justice policy, and policing

Ph. 206.324.8760 • Fx. 206.324.8965 • E-mail: bai@berkandassociates.com • Suite 200 • 120 Lakeside Avenue • Seattle, WA 98122

Public Invited to Bring Ideas to Sheriff's Panel

The King County Sheriff's Blue Ribbon Panel is seeking public comment at three public hearings about potential reforms to the King County Sheriff's Office misconduct/discipline processes and management systems.

The ten-member citizen panel was convened in March 2006 by the King County Sheriff, Metropolitan King County Council, King County Executive, and King County Prosecutor. The Panel is charged with recommending reforms by August 2006.

SOUTH	*Date:* *Time:* *Location:*	**Monday, June 12, 2006** 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. City of Renton Community Center 1715 Maple Valley Highway, Renton, WA
NORTH	*Date:* *Time:* *Location:*	**Thursday, June 15, 2006** 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. Northshore Utility District Lakeshore Room 6830 NE 185th Street, Kenmore, WA
EAST	*Date:* *Time:* *Location:*	**Thursday, June 22, 2006** 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. King County Library System Administrative Service Center 960 Newport Way NW, Issaquah, WA

See reverse for directions to each meeting. Sign-in will begin at 5:30 p.m. Testimony will be time-limited depending on the number of people who want to address the panel.

The panel is asking for public comments to be focused on the following questions:

(1) **What problems related to misconduct/discipline and management systems do you believe the King County Sheriff's Office needs to address and solve?**

(2) **In the future, how should the Sheriff's Office be more accountable to the public when dealing with citizen inquiries and complaints against its employees?**

(3) **In the future, what kind of independent review of the misconduct/discipline processes should be put into place for the Sheriff's Office?**

Information: www.metrokc.gov/sheriff/sheriff/blueribbon/ or
Morgan Shook, Berk & Associates, phone (206) 324-8760 or
e-mail: sheriff@berkandassociates.com

Directions: Renton Community Center

From the North: Take I-405 southbound to Exit #4 (Renton-Enumclaw). Go through the first stop light, turn left on Maple Valley Highway (South SR-169). This will take you under I-405. Continue about 800 feet and turn right at the first stop light. Follow the entrance driveway to the large parking lot area. The Renton Community Center and Carco Theatre are adjacent to one another and the parking lot.

From the South: Take I-405 northbound to Exit #4 (Maple Valley-Enumclaw). This exit will divide; take the first exit to Maple Valley-Enumclaw (South SR-169). At the stop sign at the end of the off ramp, turn right. Go about 500 feet to the stop light and turn right. Follow the entrance driveway to the large parking lot area. The Renton Community Center and Carco Theatre are adjacent to one another and the parking lot.

Directions: Northshore Utility District

From I-405 Going North: Take Exit 23A and merge onto SR-522 heading west. Stay on the road, which becomes Bothell Way, for about 4.6 miles. Turn RIGHT at the light onto 68th Avenue NE and go 0.3 mile. Turn right into Northshore Utility District driveway.

From I-5 Going North: Take Exit 171 (Lake City Way) and follow the road for 6.9 miles. Turn left at light onto 68th Avenue NE and go 0.3 mile. Turn right into Northshore Utility District driveway.

From I-5 Going South: Take Exit 177 (NE 205th Street) towards Lake Forest Park. Keep left at the fork in the ramp. Turn left onto NE 205th Street/244th Street SW. Stay straight to go onto Ballinger Way NE. Turn left onto Bothell Way NE. Turn left onto 68th Avenue NE and go 0.3 mile. Turn right into Northshore Utility District driveway.

Directions: King County Library System Administrative Service Center

From I-90 Going East: Take exit 15, 900/Renton (which is the first of the Issaquah exits), turn right at the light (17th Avenue NW), and turn left at the second light (Maple). You will travel past the park-and-ride lot. Stay on Maple as the lanes narrow from four to two. Maple becomes Newport Way. The Service Center is ahead on Newport Way, on your left, just behind Target.

From I-90 Going West: Take exit 15, 900/Renton exit, turn left at the light (17th Avenue NW), and turn left at the third light (Maple). You will travel past the park-and-ride lot. Stay on Maple as the lanes narrow from four to two. Maple becomes Newport Way. The Service Center is ahead on Newport Way, on your left, just behind Target.