



# MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

January 13, 2025

## CHAIR

Margaret R. Hinkle

## COMMISSIONERS

Lester Baker

Hanya H. Bluestone

Lawrence Calderone

Eddy Chrispin

Deborah Hall

Marsha V. Kazarosian

Charlene D. Luma

Rev. Clyde D. Talley

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Enrique A. Zuniga

In accordance with [M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25](#), and [St. 2021, c. 20](#), as amended by [St. 2022, c. 22](#), by [St. 2022, c. 107](#), and by [St. 2023, c. 2](#), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission. The meeting will take place as noted below.

## NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

**Public Meeting #59**

**January 16, 2025**

**8:30 a.m.**

**Remote Participation via [Zoom](#)**

**Meeting ID: 977 0816 7275**

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes
  - a. December 19, 2024
- 3) Executive Director Report – Enrique A. Zuniga
  - a. In Service Training Update
  - b. Finance & Administrative Update – Eric Rebello-Pradas
- 4) Matters not anticipated by the Chair at the time of posting
- 5) Executive Session in accordance with the following:
  - M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(1), to discuss “the discipline or dismissal of, or complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, . . . or individual”;
  - M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(5), to discuss the investigation of charges of criminal misconduct;
  - M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7), combined with M.G.L. c. 6E, § 8(c)(2), and to the extent they may be applicable, M.G.L. c. 6, §§ 168 and 178, to discuss the initiation of preliminary inquiries and initial staff review related to the same, and regarding certain criminal offender record information; and
  - M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7), combined with M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 22(f) and (g), to discuss and approve the minutes of a prior Executive Session.

84 State Street, Suite 200  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

TEL: 617.701.8401

[mass.gov/orgs/post-commission](http://mass.gov/orgs/post-commission)

## MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

- a. Reports of Preliminary Inquiry in the following cases:
  - i) PI-2024-023
  - ii) PI-2024-052
  
- b. Division of Standards request to enter into voluntary decertification or suspension agreement in the following cases:
  - i) PI-2024-050
  
- c. Division of Standards request for approval to conduct Preliminary Inquiries in the following cases:
  - i) PI-2025-001
  - ii) PI-2025-002
  - iii) PI-2025-003
  - iv) PI-2025-004
  - v) PI-2025-005
  - vi) PI-2025-006
  
- d. Approval of the minutes of the Executive Session of December 19, 2024

*Note that M.G.L. c. 66, § 6A(d) provides that “[a]n electronically produced document submitted to an agency . . . for use in deliberations by a public body shall be provided in an electronic format at the time of submission.”*

2a.

# MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION

## Public Meeting Minutes

December 19, 2024

8:35 a.m.

Via Zoom

### Documents Distributed in Advance of Meeting

- November 21, 2024, Public Meeting Minutes
- Executive Director Report
- Memo concerning the results of a survey of agency chiefs regarding physical fitness and behavioral health, as well as recommendations for the Commissioners' consideration
- Memo on a draft agency certification standard regarding the use of force and reporting uses of force
- Draft agency certification standard regarding the use of force and reporting uses of force, redlined version
- Draft agency certification standard regarding the use of force and reporting uses of force
- Memo on a draft agency certification standard regarding an officer code of conduct
- Draft agency certification standard regarding an officer code of conduct

### Commissioners In Attendance

- Commission Chair Margaret R. Hinkle
- Commissioner Lester Baker
- Commissioner Hanya H. Bluestone
- Commissioner Lawrence Calderone
- Commissioner Eddy Chrispin
- Commissioner Deborah Hall
- Commissioner Marsha V. Kazarosian
- Commissioner Charlene D. Luma
- Commissioner Clyde Talley

#### 1. **Call to Order**

- The meeting began at 8:35 a.m.
- Chair Hinkle took a roll call of the Commissioners present. The roll call proceeded as follows:
  - Commissioner Baker – Present
  - Commissioner Bluestone – Present
  - Commissioner Calderone – Present
  - Commissioner Chrispin – Present
  - Commissioner Hall – Present
  - Commissioner Kazarosian – Present
  - Commissioner Luma – Present
  - Commissioner Talley – Present

#### 2. **Approval of Minutes**

- Chair Hinkle asked for a motion to approve the November 21, 2024, minutes. There was a motion by Commissioner Kazarosian, seconded by Commissioner Talley.
- The Commissioners voted to approve the November 2024 public meeting minutes as follows:

- Commissioner Baker – Yes
  - Commissioner Bluestone – Yes
  - Commissioner Calderone – Yes
  - Commissioner Chrispin – Yes
  - Commissioner Hall – Yes
  - Commissioner Kazarosian – Yes
  - Commissioner Luma – Yes
  - Commissioner Talley – Yes
  - The minutes were approved.
- 3. Executive Director Report – Enrique A. Zuniga**
- Executive Director Zuniga began his report by acknowledging the recent passing of Sergeant Jeremy Cole of the Endicott College Police Department.
    - Sergeant Cole was killed on Thanksgiving morning after leaving his evening shift, when his vehicle was struck by a wrong-way driver. The Commission’s thoughts go out to his family and the Endicott College community.
  - Executive Director Zuniga then congratulated Rick Rathbun, who was appointed to serve as the new Executive Director of the Municipal Police Training Committee (“MPTC”).
  - He went on to state that Rick Rathbun had been a great collaborator with the Commission, and he looked forward to working with him.
  - Executive Director Zuniga reported on the major milestones of 2024. He stated as follows.
    - During 2024, the Commission continued their hiring efforts. They welcomed Commissioner Eddy Chrispin along with 12 new employees.
    - These new hires bring the total POST Commission employees to 49 (excluding interns, Hearing Officers, and Commissioners).
    - The Commission certified 5,951 officers, along with 2,193 academy graduates.
    - Seven meetings of the Subcommittee on Certification were held to gather information and make recommendations for the Commission’s new certification process.
    - The Commission’s new website was released in 2024, and the Commission has seen a large increase in engagement compared to the former website.
    - Earlier in 2024, the Commission released a new portal for agencies to submit information to the Commission. This was a major upgrade from the email system that was used previously.
    - The Commission transitioned to releasing and updating disciplinary records monthly.
    - In 2025, the Commission would continue to enhance these disciplinary records with the intent of keeping the data consistent, uniform, and more detailed.
    - In 2024, the Commission promulgated 555 CMR 12.00: Maintenance, Reporting, and Audits of Law Enforcement Records and Information.
  - Executive Director Zuniga then provided an update on the disciplinary records and proceedings from 2024. He stated the following.
    - 152 instances of disciplinary cases were presented at Commission meetings;
    - 52 decisions and orders were issued and published;
    - 4 hearings and 22 pre-hearings were conducted; and

- The Commission received an average of 30 new complaints from the public and 10 reports from agencies on a weekly basis.
  - He noted that, although there seems to be an imbalance between the complaints received from the public and those received by agencies, the Commission tracks all of the complaints and closes them as necessary.
- Executive Director Zuniga also provided an update on the Commission’s major projects and initiatives for 2025.
  - The Commission expects to see an increase in cases that the Division of Police Standards will bring for consideration. With this, there is an effort to increase efficiency in reviewing and closing each case.
  - The Legal Division will also continue to present policies and standards for consideration on the topic of agency certification.
  - The Commission will deploy a business intelligence tool to enhance the reporting and analyzing of the data collected.
  - The Commission will enhance the quality of disciplinary records data and increase efforts of communicating with and educating agencies regarding information due to the Commission.
  - The Commission will deploy a law enforcement agency audit program to ensure agency compliance with the current regulations and reports that are due to the Commission and to educate agencies on their requirements for submittal.
- Executive Director Zuniga concluded his report and introduced Chief Financial & Administrative Officer Rebello-Pradas for his update.

**4. Finance & Administrative Update – Chief Financial & Administrative Officer (CFAO) Eric Rebello-Pradas**

- CFAO Rebello-Pradas shared a presentation and began a review of a memo and presentation regarding fiscal year 2025 and the budget request to the Executive Office for Administration and Finance for fiscal year 2026. He stated the following.
  - A memo detailing the budget was distributed in advance of the meeting to prepare for a vote.
  - The proposed budget totals \$9.5 million, reflecting an 8.5% increase over fiscal year 2025. This included adjustments such as the removal of \$139,000 in one-time funding and a baseline increase from \$8.6 million.
  - Economic constraints may result in level funding or smaller increases.
  - Payroll costs will rise to over \$7 million. The Commission plans to hire 7 additional employees, bringing the total number of employees to 60 by fiscal year 2026.
  - Information technology costs have stabilized, showing a 70% reduction as the Commission nears full operational status. Spending was focused on system maintenance, with total costs kept under \$1 million. Development continues for a business intelligence tool.
  - An updated organizational chart shows 49 current employees, 4 open positions to be filled by the end of fiscal year 2025, and 7 proposed positions for fiscal year 2026.
  - Diversity metrics were updated, isolating data for 47 employees who completed the full recruitment process. Metrics compared the Commission’s workforce to

state demographics. Further updates will be provided at the June Commission meeting.

- Chair Hinkle thanked CFAO Rebello-Pradas, and his staff, for the work that they put into the material presented at the meeting.
- Commissioner Luma also thanked CFAO Rebello-Pradas and acknowledged the thoughtfulness and diligence that went into the work. She continued by stating that she would put a motion forward to vote on the budget.
- Commissioner Luma moved that they approve the fiscal year 2026 budget as proposed. Commissioner Talley seconded the motion.
- The motion was unanimously approved.

**5. Legal Update – Randall E. Ravitz, Annie E. Lee, and Elizabeth B. Smith**

- General Counsel Ravitz introduced Counsel Lee, who turned the floor over to Paralegal Smith for a presentation on the physical fitness and behavioral health of law enforcement officers.
- Paralegal Smith stated that she would begin by addressing questions asked by the Commissioners at the previous Commission meeting. She stated the following.
  - Her first response was to a question from Commissioner Talley regarding the difference in officers' health and fitness levels over time.
    - She stated that longitudinal studies revealed significant differences between officers' health and fitness levels at graduation and mid-career, with recommendations for mandatory annual fitness tests and more opportunities for exercise during work to mitigate this decline.
  - Next, she responded to Commissioner Baker's question regarding how the states presented during the November Commission Meeting were funding the testing mandates. She stated as follows.
    - In Connecticut, the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division's provides unit plans and allocates federal and state grants to support law enforcement agencies and their development;
    - In New Hampshire, officers were responsible for the cost of medical certification and physical fitness testing unless they were covered by their employer or another source; and
    - In Maryland, departments bore the responsibility to fund evaluations and provide additional mental health resources for officers.
  - Finally, she addressed a question asked by Commissioner Baker concerning collective bargaining agreements in the other states, and whether testing mandates were included in those agreements. She responded as follows.
    - Testing mandates were included in most collective bargaining agreements across states.
    - At least 42 states and the District of Columbia granted law enforcement officers the right to collectively bargain, while 7 states (Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, and West Virginia) did not explicitly recognize this right.
    - In states without governing statutes, the right to collectively bargain varied by local jurisdiction, and agreements often differed by town and department.

- She wrote a brief memo outlining this and offered to share it with the Commissioners if they were interested in seeing it.
- Commissioner Calderone thanked Paralegal Smith for her thorough responses to the Commissioners' questions and asked that she share the memo with the Commissioners.
- Commissioner Baker also thanked Paralegal Smith and asked that the memo be sent to the Commissioners.
- Paralegal Smith stated that she would share the memo with the Commissioners after the meeting.
- Commissioner Chrispin asked whether the existing statute on physical fitness standards, which most agencies have not implemented, would meet the Commission's current needs.
- Counsel Lee responded to this question by stating that the 1987 statute required civil service officers to take a physical abilities test around every 3–4 years, but that it was never enforced due to funding issues.
- She continued by stating that reviving enforcement of the law would require significant coordination and would be a complex and time-intensive process.
- Given the Commission's current timeline, Counsel Lee suggested focusing on what the Commission can mandate and leveraging MPTC resources as a more feasible approach.
- Commissioner Chrispin thanked Counsel Lee for her response.
- There were no other questions from the Commissioners. Paralegal Smith shared a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the survey that was sent to agency heads.
- She began with an overview of how the survey was conducted. She stated the following.
  - The survey collected information on resources and initiatives for physical fitness and behavioral health, challenges to maintaining these, and ideal standards and evaluations.
  - The survey was developed with input from the MPTC and Commission personnel.
  - It was sent to agency heads on November 6 and remained open until December 6, with all questions being optional.
  - 213 agencies participated, most of which were small to mid-sized agencies with 30–100 officers.
  - The survey was divided into two sections: physical fitness and behavioral health.
- She then began reviewing the results of the survey, focusing first on the physical fitness standards. She stated as follows.
  - Out of the 213 agencies that responded, 180 did not have physical fitness requirements, and 33 did.
  - She noted that the number of agencies without physical fitness requirements may be greater than reported as some agencies listed pre-employment and academy testing as physical fitness requirements.
  - The most common resources currently offered by agencies were on-site gyms or fitness centers, on-duty time to exercise, and reimbursement or a stipend.
  - Agency heads identified time, expense, motivation, and a lack of resources as the major challenges to maintaining physical fitness.
  - She then highlighted responses that were received regarding what agency heads think physical fitness requirements should be.



- Paralegal Smith stated that there is no one answer for what the requirements should be, but most responses emphasized that physical fitness is just one part of being a good police officer, and that standards must be nuanced and fair.
- She then opened the floor to questions before moving onto her next section.
- Commissioner Calderone stated that he could not find the presentation in his packet, and asked if she could send it to him.
- Paralegal Smith stated that it was not added to the packet, but that she would share the slide deck after the Commission meeting.
- Paralegal Smith then continued her presentation with a discussion on the results relating to behavioral health. She continued as follows.
  - Out of the 213 agencies that responded, 127 did not have behavioral health requirements, 85 did, and 1 did not respond.
  - She noted that, similar to the section on physical fitness requirements, some agencies listed pre-employment and academy testing as behavioral health requirements.
  - 174 agencies reported offering referrals to the employee assistance programs, 173 agencies reported offering critical incident debriefing, and 86 agencies reported offering a co-response model.
  - Regarding the barriers to behavioral health participation, the most common answers were stigma, time, the POST Commission and police reform, and expenses.
  - The responses shared a common sentiment that behavioral health has historically not been a priority, and for that to change, there must be a change in the culture.
- Before Paralegal Smith went into detail regarding the recommendations that the Commission may consider as it moves forward with this process, Counsel Lee noted that the recommendations were informed by the answers received from the survey and from discussions with the MPTC.
- She continued by stating that a similar survey would be sent to union leadership, and that they would refine the recommendations as needed to reflect the results of that survey.
- Commissioner Chrispin asked whether there had been an attempt to look at the correlation between on-the-job injury rates and mental and physical fitness.
- Paralegal Smith stated that they would ask questions about that in a future survey.
- Commissioner Luma asked whether there were agencies or departments that felt that they were assessing physical fitness and behavioral health well, and if so, whether they recommended any best practices.
- Paralegal Smith stated that there was a question regarding what resources agencies have found useful, but that it was not shared in this presentation. She stated that she could share the information in a memo on a later date.
- Commissioner Bluestone praised the survey for its comprehensive feedback and emphasized the importance of prioritizing behavioral health for officers.
- She then expressed concern about relying solely on training or educational programs and urged the Commission to focus on expanding and strengthening practical, officer-centered resources.
- Paralegal Smith thanked Commissioner Bluestone for her input.
- Commissioner Luma addressed concerns about the stigma surrounding the disclosure of mental health issues by officers, particularly regarding decertification.

- She emphasized the need for more education to clarify that mental health struggles alone would not lead to decertification.
- Paralegal Smith stated that she agreed with Commissioner Luma’s concerns.
- Paralegal Smith then responded to Commissioner Bluestone’s comment and acknowledged that the suggestions are a step toward a more formal recertification process, noting that the next round of recertification is in July 2025.
- She agreed with Commissioner Bluestone that a systemic change is needed and also noted the need for timeliness and sensitivity to costs.
- Commissioner Bluestone acknowledged the challenges but stressed the need for more progress within the timeline.
- Paralegal Smith noted that 30% of chiefs favored annual wellness checks over training, highlighting the preference for in-person, one-on-one support.
- Commissioner Calderone expressed concern about rushing the recertification process, emphasizing the importance of considering union input and ensuring that decisions are in the best interest of rank-and-file officers.
- Executive Director Zuniga responded, clarifying that no implementation would happen before July 2025.
- He also mentioned a plan to migrate officers to a new certification cycle based on their birth month, which would help manage the certification workload more effectively.
- Paralegal Smith thanked Commissioner Calderone and Executive Director Zuniga for their comments.
- Paralegal Smith shared recommendations for mandatory wellness visits, noting they would allow officers to build relationships with mental health providers, though participation would be voluntary in terms of disclosure.
- She then clarified that these ideas were still in the discussion phase and not up for a vote.
- Paralegal Smith continued by describing the recommendation that officers keep an up-to-date list of personal behavioral health resources, so that they can access them if needed.
- Commissioner Bluestone responded, acknowledging the intention behind the recommendations but cautioned that requiring officers to keep an updated list of behavioral health resources could discourage officers from seeking help.
- Counsel Lee responded to Commissioner Bluestone, suggesting that officers could attest to having completed a list of behavioral health resources for their own records, rather than providing the Commission with a personalized contact sheet.
- Counsel Lee acknowledged the need to reduce barriers for officers seeking behavioral health support, raise awareness, and reduce stigma without making the process punitive.
- Commissioner Bluestone asked the question of how one would feel if they were being asked as part of their job to provide a list of their behavioral health resources.
- She stated that she recognized the good intentions here, but that she felt strongly that moving forward with this suggestion would work against the Commission’s goals.
- Counsel Lee acknowledged Commissioner Bluestone’s concerns and stated that the idea behind listing behavioral health resources was similar to the concept of a primary care provider in health insurance.
- Executive Director Zuniga suggested the discussion be tabled for future meetings, as the current focus was on presenting the survey results, not policy implications.

- Commissioner Calderone agreed with Executive Director Zuniga but stated that he wanted the record to be clear that he strongly agrees with the points made by Commissioner Bluestone.
- Paralegal Smith thanked Commissioner Calderone and stated that these recommendations were preliminary and that they were not asking the Commission to currently vote or make any decisions.
- Paralegal Smith then ended her presentation and turned the floor over to Counsel Lee for a PowerPoint presentation on the law enforcement agency certification standards.
- She began with her presentation on the proposed revisions to the use of force and reporting standards. She stated as follows.
  - After the August Commission Meeting, the Commission sought feedback from MPTC staff and consultant Eric Daigle, from Daigle Law Group, which resulted in revisions aimed at better aligning the standards with officers' field realities.
  - Following the September Commission Meeting and preliminary approval, further concerns from the MPTC staff led to additional revisions, which were discussed with MPTC and State Police staff.
  - Specific changes were made, particularly in the definitions of de-escalation and de-escalation tactics, ensuring consistency between the two and incorporating expanded definitions to include critical thinking, trauma-informed approaches, and cultural relevance.
- Commissioner Calderone asked whether the meeting with the Massachusetts State Police included the State Police Colonel head's leadership union organization.
- Counsel Lee responded by stating that the State Police was represented by a member of their Legal Team as well as 2 officers who were involved in their training academy.
- Commissioner Calderone asked why the meeting was with the State Police and no other stakeholders.
- Counsel Lee stated that the State Police was brought in by the MPTC. She stated that the MPTC has its own set of comprehensive policies and that the State Police is one of the largest agencies in the state.
- Commissioner Calderone stated that he appreciated that the State Police is the largest agency in the Commonwealth but stated that he felt more stakeholders should have been involved.
- Counsel Lee stated that a regulation would go through the public comment and notice period giving ample opportunity for law enforcement and civilian stakeholder participation and input.
- Commissioner Calderone stated that he appreciated Counsel Lee's explanation, but that he was concerned that many stakeholders did not have knowledge of the meeting and would feel left out of the conversation.
- Executive Director Zuniga stated that the MPTC was implicitly representing all other agencies because their relationship with the academies is through the MPTC. He said the Commission will follow up and make sure that they receive additional input from stakeholders.
- Counsel Lee continued her PowerPoint presentation, and discussed the revisions made to the use of force and reporting standards. She noted the revisions were just for discussion and she would not be requesting a vote for approval. She summarized as follows.

- Sanctity of life and bodily integrity were added as key principles to guide officers in their use of force. This decision was based on best practices outlined by the Police Executive Research Forum.
- The Commission received feedback that terms such as “dignity”, “respect”, and “fair and unbiased,” were clarified to reflect concepts in the draft code of conduct standard, which draws from the International Association of Chiefs of Police (“IACP”) standards of conduct and code of ethics.
- De-escalation was fully integrated into the use of force standard, removing the need for a separate sub-policy.
- The Commission received feedback that enumerating de-escalation tactics could lead officers to believe that they are required to attempt all listed de-escalation tactics before using force, even when doing so could jeopardize their own health or safety. The feedback also suggested that an enumerated list of de-escalation tactics could be construed as exhaustive, rather than illustrative. The enumerated list was removed to avoid potential misunderstanding concerning de-escalation tactics.
- The Commission received a lot of concerns about the feasibility requiring officers to attempt to make a determination of whether an individual’s apparent negative reaction or lack of compliance is a deliberate attempt to resist. The revisions focused on simplifying the assessment of non-compliance by introducing broader categories like mental or physical conditions, language or cultural differences, and the legacy of policing.
- She noted that these changes aim to guide officers in tailoring their responses to better understand people’s needs and resolve encounters safely.
- The standards were revised to give allow agencies develop sub-policies or include provisions in their use-of-force standards to address topics like use-of-force devices and mass demonstrations.
- Members of law enforcement noted that there are many situations in which officers are called on to draw their weapons, such as when approaching a vehicle late at night. When officers do so, their weapons are kept at the “low ready position”, which may be low risk. The standard was revised to omit the drawing of use-of-force devices.
- The standard was revised to account for the delay between processing new information and officer response times. The word “unreasonable” was added to direct officers to stop using force without unreasonable delay.
- The responsibility to conduct periodic use-of-force reviews was shifted to agencies. These reviews are important to identify effective tactics and behaviors and areas for improvement.
- Two substantive revisions were made to the reporting of use-of-force standard. Language regarding public complaints was adjusted to allow individuals to raise concerns or request follow up on a use-of-force incident. The revisions were made based on feedback to increase transparency about use-of-force. The word “complaint” was changed based on feedback that “complaint” carries negative connotations and may have a chilling effect on those who wish to file a complaint.
- The last revision directs agencies to provide records and evidence concerning use-of-force reports and complaints in accordance with applicable law or investigative

demand. This is intended to facilitate the investigations of use-of-force incidents by a third party.

- Counsel Lee ended her presentation and asked whether there were any questions.
- Commissioner Luma inquired about resources available to support agencies that lack the capacity or resources to develop sub-policies or provisions, and whether such assistance comes from the MPTC or the Commission.
- Counsel Lee responded by explaining that 555 CMR 6.00, the Commission’s use-of-force regulations, require both the Commission and the MPTC to provide a model policy on use-of-force.
- Counsel Lee then presented on the revised code-of-conduct standard. The standard was first presented to the Commission in September. She summarized the key sections as follows.
  - Affirmative obligations was divided into two categories: priorities and values, and compliance.
    - The priorities and values section was designed to reflect the principles outlined in the Commission’s enabling legislation, governing statute, and the IACP’s Code of Ethics and standards of conduct.
    - In this section, agencies are instructed to articulate certain priorities and values in their codes of conduct.
    - The compliance section emphasized officers’ ongoing responsibilities to comply with federal and state laws, rules, regulations, policies, and orders. Agencies should include officer compliance with constitutional obligations, equal employment opportunity requirements, training and certification mandates, organizational policies, and judicial or regulatory orders in their code of conduct policies.
  - The negative obligation section was described as prohibitions to address behaviors that have historically resulted in complaints against law enforcement officers. Agency code of conducts should prohibit officers from engaging in criminal activity, sexual misconduct, prohibited associations and visitations, retaliation, actions prejudicial to the administration of justice, neglect of duty, abuse of authority or position as an officer, and conduct unbecoming.
  - The final section instructs agencies to require that officers adhere to the code-of-conduct standard when executing official duties and interacting with the public, in the workplace with their colleagues, and, where permissible, in officers’ private lives. This section is consistent with the IACP code of ethics and standards of conduct.
- Counsel Lee concluded her presentation and stated that the MPTC reviewed the code-of-conduct standard during their public meeting, and that it did not offer any further feedback or revisions.
- She then asked the Commission for preliminary approval of the code-of-conduct standard as presented and discussed as a draft.
- Commissioner Baker stated that actions that constitute “conduct unbecoming” could differ by agency, and that should be something to consider moving forward.
- Counsel Lee stated that she used “conduct unbecoming” as shorthand, but that the draft standard mirrored the Certification Subcommittee’s approved definition of “conduct unbecoming.”

- “Conduct unbecoming” was defined as action that demonstrates a problem with the officer’s integrity, honesty, moral judgement or character, and brings discredit to the agency, or impairs the efficient and effective operation of the agency.
- Commissioner Chrispin agreed with Commissioner Baker’s comment.
- Chair Hinkle asked Counsel Lee if she was hoping to get preliminary approval on this draft standard. Counsel Lee responded affirmatively and clarified that this was not a vote to promulgate the standard.
- Chair Hinkle then asked if there was a motion to that effect.
- Commissioner Chrispin made a motion to accept the draft, both on a code of conduct and the use of force, as preliminary.
- Counsel Lee clarified that she was only asking for preliminary approval on the code of conduct standard.
- Commissioner Chrispin amended his motion to accept the code of conduct standard as a preliminary draft. Commissioner Kazarosian seconded the motion.
- The Chair then took a roll call vote on the motion proposed by Commissioner Bluestone. The Commissioners voted as follows.
  - Commissioner Baker – Yes
  - Commissioner Bluestone – Yes
  - Commissioner Calderone – Yes
  - Commissioner Chrispin – Yes
  - Commissioner Hall – Yes
  - Commissioner Kazarosian – Yes
  - Commissioner Luma – Yes
  - Commissioner Talley – Yes
  - Chair Hinkle – Yes
- The motion was unanimously approved.
- Chair Hinkle thanked the Legal Division for the work they presented at the Commission meeting and asked General Counsel Ravitz if he had any further comments.
- General Counsel Ravitz welcomed the public to access the packet on physical fitness and behavioral health that was circulated to the Commissioners before the meeting. He stated that it would be available on the Commission's website.
- He also thanked Counsel Lee for her thorough work in developing the code of conduct standard and invited stakeholders to continue providing feedback.

**Matters Not Anticipated by the Chair at the Time of Posting**

- The Chair indicated that she did not believe there were any matters not anticipated at the time of the posting of the meeting notice.

**8. Executive Session**

- The Chair raised the issue of moving into executive session in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(5), in anticipation of discussion regarding the investigation of charges of criminal misconduct; under M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7), combined with M.G.L. c. 6E, § (8)(c)(2), and to the extent they may be applicable, M.G.L. c. 6, §§ 168 and 178, in anticipation of discussion regarding the initiation of preliminary inquiries and initial staff review related to the same, and regarding certain criminal offender record information; M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7), combined with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 22(f) and (g), in anticipation of discussion and approval of the minutes of the prior executive session.
- The Chair stated that:

- The Commissioners will be considering reports of preliminary inquiries in five cases.
- They will be considering the request to enter into voluntary decertification or suspension agreements with regard to one case.
- They will be considering requests from the Division of Police Standards to approve preliminary inquiries in four cases.
- They will also be hearing a motion to approve the minutes from the December executive session meeting.
- Commissioner Kazarosian moved to enter into executive session. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote to enter executive session. The Commissioners voted as follows.
  - Commissioner Baker – Yes
  - Commissioner Bluestone – Yes
  - Commissioner Calderone – Yes
  - Commissioner Chrispin – Yes
  - Commissioner Hall – Yes
  - Commissioner Kazarosian – Yes
  - Commissioner Luma – Yes
  - Commissioner Talley – Yes
  - Chair Hinkle – Yes
- The motion unanimously carried.
- The Chair informed members of the public that the Commission would not reconvene its public meeting after the executive session.
- Executive Director Zuniga reminded the public that they can send comments and find contact information through the POST Commission website.
- Chair Hinkle thanked the staff members who presented at the Commission meeting and thanked the public for their interest in the Commission’s work.
- The public meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

3.





# Executive Director Report

January 16, 2024

[POSTC-comments@mass.gov](mailto:POSTC-comments@mass.gov)  
[www.mapostcommission.gov](http://www.mapostcommission.gov)  
617-701-8401



# Agenda

1. Certification Update – In Service Training
2. Administrative Suspensions
3. Completion Time of Certain On-Line Courses
4. Finance & Administrative Update

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training Requirements

- Certified officers are required to complete 40 hours of in-service training every “Training Year” (ending June 30).
- MPTC provides 26 hours (in person or on-line), 8 hours firearms, 6 hours CPR
- Agencies with an MPTC-approved academy (MSP, State Police) provide all 40 hours
- All agencies are required to report compliance with in-service training to MPTC by September 30 (3 months after end of Training Year)

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training Requirements

- Commission shall Administratively Suspend individuals for failure to complete in-service training (M.G.L. c. 6E section 9 (5)(b))
- Exemptions for injury or physical disability, leave, documented hardship
- Certification is reinstated upon completion of training requirements

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training - Compliance

- POST has access to MPTC training records, including in-service
- POST and MPTC coordinate updates to data and do outreach to agencies to corroborate compliance, timely reporting, and remind agencies of training requirement
- POST and MPTC individually contact agencies about instances of non-compliance prior to administrative suspension

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training – Training Year 24 Update

- 9/30/24 POST began reviewing records marked unfulfilled
- 10/16/24 356 officers showing unfulfilled requirement
- 10/24 – 12/31 Outreach, reminders and notices
- 1/10/25 14 officers with discrepancies
- 8 officers working to resolve discrepancies
- **6 officers have been administratively suspended**
- MSP and Boston handled separately, given reporting timing

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training – Discrepancy in Course Timing

- In November 2024, MPTC ascertained discrepancies in completion time in some on-line courses (segments)
- Discrepancies are limited to on-line segments (exclude firearms and CPR)
- Agencies have discretion to conduct learning on-line or in person
- Segments have a “Projected Time” (with a brief “buffer”) and on-line system counts the “Actual Time”
- MPTC analyzed discrepancies for TY23, TY24 and TY25

# Certification Update

---



## In Service Training – Discrepancy in Course Timing

- MPTC asked agencies to review any officer who had any discrepancy in timing. This total was 487 officers over the last three years (TY23, TY24, TY25)
- For TY25 many officers with discrepancies have been locked out of completing the course(s) on-line and will have to take the course in person
- Many cases have a reasonable explanation: discrepancy is de minimis, inadvertent or technology issues
- Some of the above, officer will take course/segment again
- Approximately 5% - 10% of instances will require follow up and may result in discipline and/or administrative suspension



# Finance & Administrative Update



# Financial Activity

---



## FY25 Q2

- 48% of Budget is Committed
- Continue to realize significant savings in payroll due to fluctuations in onboarding and hours
  - Also seeing savings in office operations and legal services

## FY26 Next Steps

- Governor Filing Budget next Wednesday
- JWM Maintenance Exercise
- Prepping for Budget Testimony

# F&A Update

---



## Hiring

- Pending Offer for IT Support Specialist
- Open/Posted Positions:
  - DPC Deputy Director
  - Intake Coordinator
  - IT Data Analyst
  - Legal Intern



---

Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards & Training  
POSTC-comments@mass.gov  
www.mapostcommission.gov  
617-701-8401

---



## MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

### MEMO

**TO:** Commissioners  
**FROM:** Finance & Administration  
**CC:** Charlene Luma; Enrique Zuniga  
**DATE:** January 16, 2025  
**RE:** FY25 Q2 Update

---

#### **FY25 Q2**

December 31<sup>st</sup> closed the second quarter of the fiscal year. Similar to Q1, all major categories of spending continue to remain under budget for the Oct-Dec period (see attached *Treasurer's Report: FY25 Q2*).

- Forty-eight percent of the Commission's budget is now committed at the halfway point.
- As expected, we are still seeing significant savings in the payroll category due to fluctuations in onboarding and worked hours. Moreover, several unfilled positions are also contributing to the savings. Altogether payroll is close to 6% under projections.
- Office operational expenses are approximately 20% under budget. This is mostly due to reserving funds for a document/case management system. The IT Division is working with the other divisions to ascertain need and scope. Similar to last year, this project might be moved to next fiscal year.
- Legal Services are roughly 30% under original projections. This comes as no surprise due to the expansion of the Legal Division.
- Spending and commitments within the information technology category are right on budget. The audio/visual build-out in the Ellison Room has been completed and final billing should be processed within the next 30 days. The other major IT project – DCJIS integration - commences next month, and is expected to take 8-10 weeks at a one-time cost of \$85K.

#### **Hiring Status**

As we have been projecting for several months, the Commission is still on schedule to have 53 positions filled by June 30<sup>th</sup>. Interviews for the IT Support Specialist have concluded, and an offer is currently pending. Interviews are ongoing for the fourth Intake Coordinator, and applications are coming in for the recently posted Deputy Director of Police Certification. The final unfilled position is for an IT Data Analyst which is expected to be posted this Spring. And, recruitment efforts are currently underway for another Legal intern. Currently, the Legal Division has one intern and two fellows.

#### **FY26 Budget Development**

The Governor will be filing her FY26 Budget Recommendation next Wednesday. While numbers are not yet finalized, we are expecting funding to be lower than the Commission's requested figure of \$9.5 million. At this point F&A is working on a maintenance submission for the Joint Ways & Means Committee due at the end of the month. In addition, we are beginning to assemble budgetary testimony. While the Commission has not yet been scheduled to testify, hearings typically take place throughout February and March.

84 State Street, Suite 200

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

TEL: 617.701.8401

[mass.gov/orgs/post-commission](https://mass.gov/orgs/post-commission)

# Treasurer's Report: FY25 Q2

	FY25 FIN SP	DECEMBER			ANNUAL
	BUDGET	YTD EXPENDED	YTD INCURRED (open enc amt)	YTD COMMITTED	PROJECTED EXPEND TOTAL
EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION (AA) TOTAL	6,407,238	2,801,626	10,000	2,811,626	6,045,941
EMPLOYEE TRAVEL (BB) TOTAL	25,000	4,760	0	4,760	4,760
CONTRACT EMPLOYEES (CC) TOTAL	130,800	33,986	0	33,986	105,986
PAYROLL TAX/FRINGE (DD) TOTAL	127,225	45,937	0	45,937	99,661
OFFICE SUPPLIES/POSTAGE/SUBSCRIPTIONS (EE) TOTAL	201,531	41,443	119,652	161,094	161,094
FACILITY OPERATIONS (FF) TOTAL	40,000	8,905	27,095	36,000	36,000
OFFICE SPACE LEASE (GG) TOTAL	631,157	301,160	314,714	615,873	615,873
CONSULTANTS/LEGAL SERVICES (HH) TOTAL	151,840	25,623	70,932	96,555	96,555
SUPPORT/AUXILIARY SERVICES (JJ) TOTAL	73,707	13,989	22,011	36,000	36,000
OFFICE FURNITURE/FIXTURES/EQUIPMENT (KK) TOTAL	3,000	-	0	0	0
OFFICE EQUIPMENT LEASE (LL) TOTAL	4,264	935	3,311	4,246	4,246
OFFICE MAINTENANCE/REPAIRS (NN) TOTAL	20,000	5,200	11,415	16,615	16,615
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (UU) TOTAL	931,714	109,143	261,344	370,486	958,558
<b>Grand Total :</b>	<b>8,747,476</b>	<b>3,392,706</b>	<b>840,474</b>	<b>4,233,180</b>	<b>8,181,289</b>