

Milwaukee Law Enforcement Alliance of Pride Collaborative Reform Hub Notes

Chapter 3:

1. The group felt as though the numbers appeared disproportionate and spoke for themselves. Additionally, the group noted there was no tracking consideration for LGBT members, which we feel, demonstrates how we are viewed and how we are valued by the department and the FPC.
2. The group agreed with the findings of the report. The group discussed that there was no apparent effort to target members of the LGBT community. The group suggests a better partnership between the Milwaukee Police Department and the Fire & Police Commission.
3. –
4. The group discussed the effectiveness of the Milwaukee Police Department recruiter.
5. The group found that it may be beneficial to establish a dedicated recruiting section.
6. The group discussed that the Fire & Police Commission is staffed by civilian personnel.
7. The group discussed the lack of protocol for members who are on extended leave during an open period of promotional application.
8. The group agreed and discussed how, if implemented, a career planning curriculum would correlate with the promotional examination held by the Fire & Police Commission. The group discussed how specialty-unit planning should be considered separate from career planning. However, the group did agree that there was no apparent method of selection for members assigned to a specialty unit. The group discussed a lack of a mentoring program.

Chapter 4:

10. The group agreed that there was no clear understanding of what community-oriented policing is defined as.
11. The group agreed that the department has come to defer community policing too heavily to the community liaison officers.
12. As discussed in #11, the group agreed that community policing was the duty of the community liaison officer.
13. –
14. The group discussed that MPD does not seek venues for exchange of dialogue with the community. The group discussed that MPD could do a better job of putting a more positive image of the department

out to the community. The group discussed that MPD fails to manage the negative narrative that is often propagated against it.

Chapter 7:

37. The group discussed the lack of definition as to what constitutes a complaint.

38. The group was informed that district-level discretion to dismiss complaints will soon be taken away.

39. The group was informed that the SOP regarding this issue will soon be modified to identify Integrity, Leadership and Restraint as being major violations.

40. The group discussed how notification to the member from MPD and the FPC should be immediate.

41. The group discussed that there should be a timeline as to how long it takes to complete an investigation forged against a member.

42. The group was provided with evidence to the contrary of this issue.

43. The supervisors of the group agreed and pointed out how items required to advance the investigation are often missing from the information they're supposed to receive.

44. The group discussed that there should be some way of updating the community regarding the process of the complaint investigation.

45. The group determined that there was too much discrepancy and an ill-defined matrix.

46. The group determined that EIP should be separate from discipline.

47. –

48. – The facilitator established that the department already engages in this practice.

49. – The group agreed and discussed the timeliness of EIP notification (delayed).

50. – The group is well aware of the department's stance on untruthfulness.

51. – FPC issue.

52. – The group discussed the possibility of peer recommendation and the implementation of a better reward system. Additionally, the group discussed the importance of one-on-one supervisory-to-subordinate recognition.

53. – The group discussed the lacking system for Top Acknowledgment dissemination.

54. – The group discussed proper rules of engagement, follow up and the explanation as to why.

55. – Communicating why, disparity between shifts.