

Commissioner's Present:

Janet Jackson, Chair, Brooke Burns, Emily Buster, LaShaun Carter, Tammy Founier-Alsaada, Dr. Chenelle Jones, Matthew McCrystal, Ellen Moore Griffin, Andrea Morbitzer, Traci Shaw, Erin Synk, Oleatha Waugh, Tiffany White

Commissioner's Absent:

Dr. Vlad Kogan, Pastor Jason Ridley, Mary Wehrle, Dr. Reginald Wilkinson

Staff Present:

Denise Bauer, Rick Blunt, Bryan Clark, Amy DeLong, Zak Davidson, Jeffrey Furbee, William Gramlich, Commander Bob Meader, Kate Pishotti, Thomas Quinlan, Elizabeth Reed, Elon Simms, George Speaks, Brenda Sobieck, Miranda Vollmer

MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME

Chair Janet Jackson welcomed the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission ("Safety Commission") to the meeting.

SAFETY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Chair Jackson asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes of the May 31, 2018 Safety Commission Meeting. Mr. Carter moved to approve the meeting minutes as written. Ms. Synk seconded the motion. Mr. Clark did note on the minutes of the May 31, 2018 that Ms. Buster was incorrectly noted as absent and the change will be made. **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

SAFETY RFP UPDATE

Mr. Clark briefed the Safety Commission on the status of the Safety RFP. He noted he previously shared there were seven bidders that provided responses to the RFP for the safety process. For the operation review, we have a 5 member committee reviewing the responses and they are Chair Jackson, Bryan Clark, Elon Simms, Carla Williams Scott (Director of Neighborhoods, City of Columbus) and George Speaks. We've had one meeting of that evaluation committee and selected three vendors that we will be inviting in to present to the evaluation committee. We are working with the City Attorney's office to work through the best way to present this information to the Safety Commission without violating the confidentiality of the process. Currently we are hoping to enter into negotiations sometime in July and have that complete and have the relevant documents signed mid to late July.

GROUP DISCUSSION: REFLECTIONS ON LEGAL ADVISOR PRESENTATION



Chair Jackson reminded the Safety Commission they are going to have these informational sessions with presentations and then the discussion is to follow and to please hold questions until the question and answer session.

Chair Jackson updated the Safety Commission on the rules of the Safety Commission and that members of the public are allowed to sit and observe these meetings but that the audience cannot participate in the sessions with us unless a public notice is served.

Chair Jackson opened a group discussion on Mr. Furbee's Legal Advisor Presentation from the May 31, 2018 meeting. Mr. Carter noted that one of things we've been covering is dispelling of the myths from the legal side, but will we be able to hear the myths from the other side and how these myths impact and how they are created. Mr. Carter indicated that these myths are true for somebody and whether we will hear from who those myths are true for. Chair Jackson inquired if he is asking about inviting the public to a forum. Mr. Carter shared he thinks that would be the Safety Commission sharing what they have been hearing to those presenters. Chair Jackson indicated she didn't know if we anticipated specific presenters coming back but that many presenters are still in the remaining meeting. She went on to clarify that she feels that once the consultant is selected, she see where this dialogue would occur. Chair Jackson asked everyone review the document provided to the Safety Commission in the beginning and see what topics are going to be discussed in the future. Chair Jackson asked that the document be sent again to the Safety Commission.

Mr. Waugh noted he found Mr. Furbee's presentation very informative but wonders if we can have discussion about introducing this information into the lives of our students, high schoolers and junior high schoolers as this information would be immensely valuable to young people to know how they can engage and what the implications of their actions may be when interacting with the police. Chair Jackson reminded the Safety Commission that it is their responsibility to make these recommendations to the Mayor so please make a note of their recommendations as this is going to be a long process. Mr. Speaks noted information related to educating our youth will be covered in depth at meeting number 6.

Ms. Fournier expressed concerns that there have been 3 presentations but a lack of dialogue and asked the Chair for clarity on how they can weigh in and how to move forward. Chair Jackson responded that the presenters will share the information and allow them to get through their presentations before allowing dialogue. Clarifying questions will be allowed.

CIVIL SERVICE PROCESS FOR HIRING

Chair Jackson introduced Amy DeLong, Director of the Civil Service Commission. Ms. DeLong noted that she and her staff will review the Civil Service role in hiring a police officer. Ms. DeLong shared that Civil Service has two roles; testing and compliance and they are involved throughout the entire process. Ms. DeLong's full presentation can be found on the OneDrive site. Ms. DeLong shared the Charter Rules of Civil Service (see attached). Ms. DeLong introduced Elizabeth Reed, Personnel Administrative Manager, Civil Service Commission, to



review the hiring process of a police officer. Ms. Reed shared the examination process in the role of hiring a police officer sharing:

- The examinations specific to a job of police officer –
 - Cognitive Skills
 - Writing Skills
 - Interpersonal and problem solving skills
 - Physical Abilities
- The selection process;
 - The candidate making the decision and commitment
 - File an Application
 - Minimum Qualification/Abbreviated Background Questionnaire
 - Take the examination
 - Background investigation
 - Safety Director Review
 - Post-Offer Medical and Psychological Examination
 - Ohio Police Officer Training Commission Physical
 - Training Academy
 - Field Training
- Police officer examination sources of information
 - Notices sent to candidates
 - Civil Service Commission website
 - Information sessions
 - Contact Civil Service

Ms. Reed shared The Selection Process Guide and Study Guide with the Safety Commission (attached).

Next, Ms. Reed shared an overview of the Test Phases:

- Multiple-Choice Exam
 - Spelling
 - Vocabulary
 - Reading comprehension
 - Map reading
 - 100 Questions with a 2 hour time limit
 - The exam is pass/fail (no score given)
- Writing Sample:
 - Watch a video/take notes
 - 1 hour time limit
 - Pass/Fail
 - Form Completion
 - Scored on information
 - Written narrative
 - Scored on information
 - Scored on writing skill



- Columbus Oral Police Exam (COPE)
 - 8 scenes with 45 second response time
 - Scored on problem solving skills
 - Scored on interpersonal relations
 - 100% weighting (score given)
- Physical Test
 - Administered on a separate day
 - Must pass the 1st three exam phases
 - 3 events (based on your age/gender)
 - 300 meter run
 - Sit-ups
 - Push-ups
 - Pass/Fail (no score given)

Ms. DeLong then shared the 2017 Exam Stats (attached) and also shared the 2017 applicant data, noting:

- 2495 Applicants Applied to Take the Police Officer Test
- 1230 Showed Up for All Parts of the Test (less than half)
- 928 Passed the Multiple Choice (MC) (75% pass)
- 834 Passed the Writing Sample (WS) (90% pass)
- 716 Passed the Columbus Oral Police Exam (COPE) (86%)
- 540/716 Showed to Take the Physical Exam (25% didn't show)
- 450 Passed the Physical Exam (83% pass)

Next, Ms. DeLong shared the 2017 Candidate Banding:

	450		163		320		67		61		389	
Band	All Candidates		All Minority Candidates		All White Candidates		All Black		Female		Male	
90	161	36%	61	37%	115	36%	23	34%	29	48%	132	34%
80	175	39%	68	42%	119	37%	29	43%	19	31%	156	40%
70	114	25%	34	21%	86	27%	15	22%	13	21%	101	26%



Ms. DeLong was asked to describe banding and she noted that per Charter Rule 149 they are required to use no fewer than three bands for each competitive eligible list. The bands do not have to be 90, 80 and 70 – it could be 1, 2 and 3.

Next, Ms. DeLong shared 2016 and 2017 demographic data on application to hire. Ms. DeLong shared some ideas the Civil Service Commission has to attract and retain test applicants.

Ms. DeLong introduced Brenda Sobieck, Personnel Administrative Manager, Civil Service Commission, to review the Background Removal Standards (attached). Ms. Sobieck noted that the background standards are a set of automatic disqualifiers for police officer hiring. Ms. Sobieck shared:

- What are the Standards
- Who Created the Standards
- How Long have the Standards Existed
- Process
- Three Standards Where Most Applicants are Lost
- Background Administrative Review Process

Chair Jackson then solicited questions from the Safety Commission. Discussed ensued regarding racist affiliation of potential candidates, the use of polygraph and psychological evaluation. Ms. Sobieck noted that the presenters from the police department will address the question of racial affiliation in their remarks. Ms. Sobieck shared the various types of instruments utilized by the psychologist contracted to perform testing and noted that the psychologist chooses the type of instrument to use. Ms. DeLong noted that the instruments used will be provided during the next meeting. Discussed ensued regarding veteran's receiving additional points toward testing and Ms. Fournier Alsaada questioned whether veteran's received additional psychological testing. It was noted that veteran's receive the same testing. Mr. Waugh inquired into how many versions of the police testing exams exist and how often are they changed and Ms. Reed explained the testing process and how the test is rotated.

Ms. DeLong further explained the 2016 and 2017 demographic data on application to hire. A number of questions were raised about racial disparity in the background check. Ms. DeLong noted that background removal standards will be addressed during the background investigation process presentation. Further questions were raised on veteran status and whether any other interest group is eligible for extra points and Mr. Clark noted that by charter rules, it's currently only veterans. It was also noted that veterans still must pass the test before receiving any additional points.

Ms. Morbitzer inquired about the exam and whether there is a process to review the police officers job analysis to ensure sure it's accurate, contemporary, encompassing all criteria necessary, etc. Ms. Reed shared the process is reviewed every 8 years and how the job analysis is performed.



Ms. Shaw inquired if COPE is the only test that is not pass/fail. Ms. Reed noted that it is correct and that the results of the COPE test is where an applicant gets banded. Discussion ensued about the objectivity/subjectivity of the review board and implicit bias.

BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION PROCESS

Ned Pettus, Director of Public Safety introduced Mark Gramlich, Human Resources Analyst, Public Safety, Miranda Vollmer, Human Resources Manager, Public Safety and Rick Blunt, Public Safety Manager- Background Investigations.

Mr. Gramlich provided an Overview of the Police Officer Selection Process, covering the following topics:

- Recruitment
- Application Process
- Testing
- Establishment of Eligible List
- Background Investigation process
- Oral Board Interview
- Review of candidates by the appointing authority
- Medical/Psychological Phase
- Final appointment to training academy

Mr. Gramlich shared a detailed background ground investigation process noting the following:

- Conducted by the Background Investigation Unit of the Division of Police and consists of:
 - Polygraph Examination
 - Investigation (Family history, criminal/traffic checks, credit history, employment and personal references)
 - Oral Board Interview
 - Chain of Command Review
 - Professional Standards Bureau Commander
 - Administrative Subdivision Deputy Chief

Mr. Gramlich shared that the Oral Board interview is conducted at the Division of Police and the board generally consists of 1 police supervisor, 1 police officer, and a human resources representative. The review of candidates by the appointing authority, the Director of Public Safety. The Director of Public Safety has two options:

1. Conditional Offer of Employment
 - Candidate continues to the medical phase of the process
2. Appeared not Appointed (ANA)
 - Candidate is removed from the eligible list



At this stage, background issues not governed by the Civil Service Commission Background Removal standards (finances, polygraph admissions, maturity concerns, etc.) are taken into consideration by the Director in reaching his final decision. Those that receive a conditional offer, proceed to the Medical/Psychological Phase consisting of:

- Medical Evaluation
- Stress test
- Psychological Evaluation

Upon passing all of the examinations, candidates are eligible to be appointed to an upcoming academy class.

Rick Blunt, Public Safety Manager, Division of Public Safety, shared an overview of the background investigation process (see attached) and their role in the hiring process. Once the eligibility list is released, they send out an email to candidates by band (starting with the 90 band) through a software system called the Peace Officers Background Investigation Tracking System (POBITS). Each person receives a Personal History Statement (PHS) via the POBITS system. Once the PHS are received, staff begins to review the documents for the background removal standards. Once that phase is completed, those who do not meet a background removal standard are then moved to the background investigation. The background investigation is federal, state and local and investigates: Personal, References, Family/Marital, Residences, Employment, Military, Education, Traffic, Criminal, and Financial. The next phase is the pre-interview and polygraph. Candidates meet with a background investigator to review the PHS that the candidate submitted is complete and accurate. The candidates are then taken to the Police ID unit to be photographed and fingerprinted. The next phase is the polygraph. Once the polygraph is complete, Civil Service will review all of the information to ensure each candidate does not meet a removal standard. Those candidates who do not meet a removal standard will have their file certified by Civil Service to proceed. The next process is for the candidate to meet with the background investigator (the background final interview). This interview is conducted at the Columbus Police Academy and includes the candidates spouse or significant other (or whoever they live with/knows them the best). A joint interview and a separate interview is conducted by the background investigator.

Mr. Blunt further explained the polygraph examination. During the polygraph, there are three outcomes; no deception indicated, deception indicated or inconclusive. The pre-employment polygraph is the same test for everyone.

The department then summarizes the information for each candidate; investigative summary, polygraph summary, credit report, and PHS. The candidate is then scheduled to meet with the Personal Evaluation Board (also known as the Oral Board).

Miranda Vollmer then presented the Oral Board Phase to the Safety Commission, outlining the steps. The Oral Board is comprised of 6 structured oral interview questions, 4 additional



standardized questions and then the panel is free to ask the candidate background questions comprised from the background investigation unit. Ms. Vollmer shared how the questions are created and the makeup of the Oral Board Committee. After the interview is over, the Oral Board rates the candidate on the 6 structured questions, additionally rating the candidate on their overall communication throughout the interview. The Oral Board then makes one overall consensus rating on a scale of 1 to 5. Each Oral Board member submits a summary of the candidate. The information is then sent to the background unit and they create another form to give to the Chain of Command Review. The Chain of Command Review then rates the candidate on a scale of 1 to 5. That information is then sent to the Professional Standards Bureau Commander.

Mr. Gramlich then shared the candidate review by the Director of Public Safety. The Director of Public Safety has two options after reviewing candidates for the position of police officer: Conditional Offer of employment - candidate continues in selection process or ANA (Appeared/Not Appointed) candidate is removed from the Civil Service eligible list. In reaching this decision, the following documents are reviewed by the office of the Director of Public Safety:

- ✓ Background investigative summary
- ✓ Polygraph report
- ✓ Credit history
- ✓ Criminal record
- ✓ Traffic record
- ✓ Oral Board report (Ratings/recommendations of board members
Chain of command ratings/recommendations)

A summary of each candidate's history is prepared for the Director by the Human Resources Analyst after a thorough review of the aforementioned documents. In order to ensure consistency, the following areas of each candidate's background history are addressed:

- ✓ Education/degrees/certifications
- ✓ Military service
- ✓ Employment History
 - attendance, performance, disciplinary actions
- ✓ Criminal History (undetected criminal acts)
 - thefts, illegal drug use, other violations of law
- ✓ Traffic History
 - recent citations, admissions of DUI
- ✓ Financial History credit debt in arrears or not being paid, accounts in active collection, civil judgments, tax liens and arrearages, failure to file/pay taxes

All of this information is presented to the Director of Public Safety and he renders the final decision on each candidate; Conditional Offer or ANA. This decision is final and there is no appeal. However, candidates are advised in the ANA notification sent by Civil Service that they



may contact our office, and an explanation will be provided regarding the reason(s) for their removal.

Candidates approved by the Director of Public Safety to receive a conditional offer of employment, must first pass the OPOTC Pre-Academy Fitness Standards. This consists of a 1.5 mile run, push-ups, and sit-ups, and must be successfully completed no more than 120 days from the start of the academy class. The passing benchmarks in each event are set by the OPOTC and are standardized according to age and gender.

The next phase is the Supplemental PHQ and Polygraph. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits specific questioning of candidates about their illegal use of drugs and alcohol prior to a conditional offer being extended. Consequently, candidates who disclose the illegal use of drugs and substances in the preliminary stages of the background investigation must complete an additional PHQ and take a second polygraph relative to their use of illegal substances.

All of this information is presented to the Director of Public Safety and he renders the final decision on each candidate; CO or ANA. This decision is final and there is no appeal. However, candidates are advised in the ANA notification sent by Civil Service that they may contact our office, and an explanation will be provided regarding the reason(s) for their removal.

Chair Jackson then opened up the meeting for questions from the Safety Commission. Chair Jackson inquired about the background check and whether social media is part of the background check. Mr. Blunt indicated that they are not allowed to ask for their user name or password so they are limited to a google search – anything open to the public. Mr. McCrystal asked if they ask anything specific related to being racist. Ms. Vollmer shared what questions are asked regarding racial discrimination and are as follows: Are you now, or have you ever been, a member or associate of a criminal enterprise, street gang, or any other group that advocates violence against individuals because of their race, religion, political affiliation, ethnic affiliation, ethnic origin, nationality, gender, sexual preference, or disability Has any member of your family ever been a member of, or associated with, any street gang or organized criminal enterprise such as outlaw motorcycle groups, prison gangs, or tagging crews. Do you have, or have you ever had, a tattoo signifying membership in, or affiliation with, a criminal enterprise, street gang, or any other group that advocates violence against individuals because of their race, religion, political affiliation, ethnic origin, nationality, gender, sexual preference, or disability.

Discussed ensued about the use of polygraph testing. Ms. Fournier-Alsaada shared concerns about the use of polygraph testing as it's not permissible in court or recognized by science. Mr. Blunt shared that the polygraph is not a background removal standard; you cannot be removed for eligibility based on the results of the polygraph.

Ms. White expressed concerns over the credit history portion of the background check. Mr. Gramlich indicated that the credit history portion is a very small aspect of the background check.



Ms. Synk inquired if any information on the demographics of who is adversely affected by the credit history check is compiled. Mr. Gramlich responded that no data is collected. Further discussion ensued related to credit history of a candidate.

Ms. Burns inquired if any data is kept on the candidates that receive an ANA that could be potentially be reviewed for demographic information, i.e.: the ultimate reason why they weren't chosen. Mr. Gramlich indicated that yes, case by case, but otherwise, no. Ms. Jones expressed concerned that there is no cumulative data on why a candidate was not selected. Mr. Clark indicated that the city would like the opportunity to solicit a third party to look at this raw data and report back.

Discussed ensued regarding the minimum age to be a police officer and whether raising the minimum age should be considered. Mr. McCrystal inquired whether we are limited by the minimum age of 21 and who sets that minimum. Ms. Reed noted that the State of Ohio sets the minimum age.

GROUP REPORT OUT: ONE BIG TAKEAWAY

Chair Jackson welcomed the Safety Commission to share their thoughts or their one big takeaway. The Safety Commission discussed some key takeaways with Ms. Fournier-Alsaada sharing that her concern is what happens once a person becomes a police officer. She questions whether the same rigor is being applied after they become a police officer. Ms. Buster shared that she feels there is a need for better demographic data on applicants.

REVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Chair Jackson noted that the next meeting is Wednesday, June 27, 2018 from 2:00 to 6:00 pm with the location to be determined.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jackson adjourned the meeting at 6:42 pm.

