



MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

May 18, 2026

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

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](#), by [St. 2023, c. 2](#), and by [St. 2025, 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 #76

May 21, 2026

8:30 a.m.

Remote Participation via [Zoom](#)

Meeting ID: 971 4975 5720

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Enrique A. Zuniga

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes
 - a) April 16, 2026
- 3) Executive Director Report – Enrique A. Zuniga, Eric Rebello-Pradas
 - a) Certification Update
 - b) General Update
 - c) Finance & Administrative Update
- 4) Agency Certification Standards – Randall E. Ravitz, Annie E. Lee
 - a) Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation Procedures
- 5) Matters not anticipated by the Chair at the time of posting
- 6) 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”;

84 State Street, Suite 200
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

TEL: 617.701.8401

mass.gov/orgs/post-commission

MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

- 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 matters relating to preliminary inquiries and initial staff review concerning whether to initiate such inquiries, and regarding certain criminal 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 prior Executive Session minutes.
- a) Division of Standards reports of Preliminary Inquiries in the following cases:
- i) PI-2025-049
 - ii) PI-2024-074
- b) Division of Standards request for approval to conduct Preliminary Inquiries and/or impose a suspension in the following cases:
- i) PI-2026-032
 - ii) PI-2026-033
 - iii) PI-2026-034
- c) Suspension Hearing in the Matter of Dylan Knox, Case No. 2024-034
- d) Approval of the minutes of the Executive Session of April 16, 2026

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
April 16, 2026
8:30 a.m.
Via Zoom

Documents Distributed in Advance of Meeting

- March 19, 2026 Public Meeting Minutes
- Executive Director Report
- Memo concerning the finance and administrative update
- POST Commission 2025 Annual Report
- Presentation concerning discipline and minor matters

1. Call to Order

- The meeting began at 8:35 a.m.
- Commission Chair Margaret R. Hinkle took a roll call of the Commissioners present. The roll call proceeded as follows:
 - Chair Hinkle – Present
 - Commissioner Lester Baker – Present
 - Commissioner Hanya H. Bluestone – Present
 - Commissioner Lawrence Calderone – Present
 - Commissioner Deborah Hall – Present
 - Commissioner Marsha V. Kazarosian – Present
 - Commissioner Charlene D. Luma – Present
 - Commissioner Clyde Talley – Present
- Commissioner Eddy Chrispin was absent from the meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

- Chair Hinkle asked for a motion to approve the March 19, 2026 minutes. Commissioner Talley moved to approve the minutes, and Commissioner Calderone seconded the motion.
- The Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the March 19, 2026 public meeting minutes.

3. Executive Director Report – Executive Director Enrique A. Zuniga, Chief Financial Administrative Officer Eric Rebello-Pradas

- Executive Director Zuniga began his report by reminding members of the public that the Commission does not take public comment during meetings and instead accepts written submissions through the posted contact channels.
- Executive Director Zuniga then provided an update on officer recertification.
 - The deadline for officers with last names I – P to submit recertification information is July 1, 2026.
 - The portal will open on May 1, 2026. About 5,000 officers are expected to submit applications for recertification.
 - About 515 officers in the I – P recertification cohort are not expected to apply for recertification due to retirement, resignation, or separation from their agency.
 - The certification period will continue to align with officers' birth month. Every certification will last at least three full years.

- The Commission will continue considering attestations from chiefs or the appointing authority.
- The Commission will offer training sessions to agencies during the recertification period.
- Negative attestations will be reviewed by the Division of Police Certification.
- In instances where a negative attestation is received, the Commission's Certification Division will review those cases.
- Officers will have an opportunity to respond to the negative attestation to show they possess good moral character and fitness for duty as a law enforcement officer.
- Officers on leave must still apply for recertification.
- Executive Director Zuniga reported that the Commission will also verify in-service training compliance for all officers statewide.
 - There are about 16,000 officers who are not part of this certification cycle but are required to comply with in-service training requirements.
 - The Commission and Municipal Police Training Committee ("MPTC") reminded agencies to report all compliance information in the Acadis system.
 - Pursuant to the statute, officers not in compliance with in-service training requirements will be administratively suspended.
- As part of recertification, the Commission will review all complaints and incident reports filed since each officer's last certification application.
 - Officers with pending investigations or adjudicatory proceedings initiated will be set aside for review pending completion to ensure the Commission does not certify an officer with unresolved matters.
- Executive Director Zuniga then provided an update on communications and general reminders sent to agencies.
 - Agencies are required to notify the Commission of any changes in officers' employment status by submitting an Officer Status Update Form.
- Executive Director Zuniga provided an update on the Commission's compliance reports. He reminded agencies to request an extension if they are unable to meet the deadline.
 - The report listed agencies with the most overdue internal affairs ("IA") investigations. Agencies in this list have IA investigations pending past the 90-day submission requirement and did not request an extension from the Commission.
 - The Boston Police Department had the most overdue IA investigations at 43. It also had the highest average days overdue at 191.
 - The Massachusetts State Police had the second highest number of IA investigations pending at 15.
 - There were 6 other agencies with 2 pending IA investigations and 24 agencies with 1 pending case.
 - The Commission periodically reminded these agencies of the time requirement and to request an extension, if needed.
- Commissioner Calderone expressed his appreciation for making public the average number of days agencies are past submission deadlines. He voiced concern over cases in Boston that go on for years and whether the Commission can initiate punitive action to ensure compliance with statutory requirements.

- Executive Director Zuniga said the Commission will begin issuing Notices of Noncompliance. The next step after a Notice of Noncompliance is suspending the certification of leadership for failing to submit required information.
- He recognized the time each investigation takes, especially those involving criminal charges, but reiterated the importance of compliance.
- Executive Director Zuniga provided an outreach and engagement update. He stated as follows.
 - On March 23, 2026, Executive Director Zuniga and Commissioners Hall and Talley attended a public meeting of the Human Rights Commission in Worcester. They presented an overview of the Commission and spoke with residents interested in creating a citizen review board.
 - Executive Director Zuniga attended a monthly meeting of the Massachusetts Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. He provided a brief overview of the upcoming training calendar and the model use of force policy approved by the Commission and MPTC.
 - Executive Director Zuniga is scheduled to present at the MPTC virtual town hall on April 30th and provide training to the Martha's Vineyard Law Enforcement Training Council at a conference in May.
- Chief Financial Administrative Officer Rebello-Pradas provided a financial and administrative update. He stated the following.
 - As of the end of March (Q3), the Commission has committed 66% of its FY26 budget. This is exactly where the Commission was at the same time last year.
 - The Commission aimed to be closer to 75% at this time but are expecting some reversions by the close of FY26.
 - With a better understanding of funding for FY27, the Commission will look to fill open positions.
 - The anticipated reversion remains unchanged at \$425,000 but will be more accurate closer to the end of the fiscal year.
 - On March 24th, the Chair, Treasurer, and Executive Director presented the FY27 budget before the Joint Ways and Means Committee. The Commission will continue to pursue its original request of \$9.6 million.
 - The Commission continues to make progress in its recruitment efforts and may onboard two new enforcement counsels within the next two weeks. The current headcount is 51 positions.
 - A final draft of the FY25 report was included in the meeting packet. It will be filed with the Legislature and sent to various stakeholders.

4. Legal Update – General Counsel Randall E. Ravitz, Counsel Gerald Cahill

- General Counsel Ravitz introduced Counsel Cahill to provide a legal update regarding potential amendments to the Commission's regulations.
- Counsel Cahill provided an overview of a regulatory review initiative concerning 555 CMR 1.00. He stated as follows.
 - 555 CMR 1.00 governs many of the procedures used by the Commission to process complaints, conduct adjudicatory proceedings, and impose discipline.
 - Although the regulations have functioned effectively, staff identified areas that may benefit from refinement or clarification based on the Commission's experience administering them.

- The Commission is seeking feedback from Commissioners, law enforcement agencies, and members of the public during the early stages of the review process.
- The two primary areas currently under review are disciplinary regulations and regulations concerning minor matters.
- Counsel Cahill then shared a PowerPoint presentation and addressed potential revisions concerning discipline. He stated as follows.
 - The Commission's governing statute grants the Commission broad authority to impose discipline and act as the primary civil enforcement agency for violations of M.G.L. c. 6E.
 - Existing regulations principally address suspension, revocation, restriction, limitation, and conditioning of certification.
 - However, the governing statute also authorizes additional forms of discipline that are not expressly addressed in current regulations.
 - Potential additional disciplinary options discussed include reprimands, censures, fines, remediation, rehabilitation, counseling, and other corrective measures.
 - Counsel Cahill noted that some administrative agencies utilize statements of concern or similar actions that fall short of formal discipline.
 - The proposed review would consider whether the Commission's regulations should more explicitly authorize such disciplinary tools.
- Counsel Cahill addressed potential revisions concerning minor matters. He stated as follows.
 - Under the current regulatory framework, complaints determined not to be minor matters are forwarded to the Commission for review in addition to being addressed by the employing law enforcement agency.
 - Complaints determined to be minor matters are generally resolved within the law enforcement agency and ordinarily are not forwarded to the Commission unless specifically requested by the Commission.
 - The distinction between minor and non-minor matters significantly affects the Commission's level of review and involvement.
 - Staff have received questions regarding how the minor matter provisions should be implemented, including what conduct qualifies as a minor matter and how those determinations should be made.
 - Staff are considering whether revisions may be appropriate to further define minor matters and clarify reporting obligations.
 - Staff are also reviewing the role of credibility determinations in deciding whether complaints must be forwarded to the Commission.
 - The review additionally includes consideration of how agencies process complaints and when information regarding complaints should be reported to the Commission.
- Counsel Cahill stated that the Commission is in the early stages of evaluating possible amendments and invited comments and feedback from Commissioners, law enforcement agencies, and members of the public.
- Counsel Cahill concluded his presentation and invited questions from the Commissioners.
- Commissioner Talley commented that training should be considered as a potential disciplinary or corrective measure within the proposed regulatory framework.

- Counsel Cahill thanked Commissioner Talley and stated that his recommendation would be taken into consideration.
- Commissioner Calderone expressed support for including training as a corrective measure.
- He then stated that, before adopting additional regulations, the Commission should focus on enforcing existing requirements and imposing punitive measures on departments that have failed to comply with Commission requirements since the Commission’s inception.
- Commissioner Calderone asked whether staff had developed definitions for “minor matters” and “credibility” as part of the regulatory review process.
- Counsel Cahill stated that he would review the current regulatory language concerning definitions for “minor matters” and “credibility.”
- Commissioner Calderone clarified that he was requesting information regarding potential internal recommendations or proposed definitions currently under staff review.
- Counsel Cahill responded that staff are continuing to evaluate potential revisions and definitions but that those discussions have not yet reached a stage appropriate for formal presentation to the Commission.
- Commissioner Calderone expressed concern that the Commission and members of the public were being asked to provide feedback without staff first presenting the specific proposals under consideration. He questioned how the Commission could meaningfully respond to the initiative without additional detail on potential amendments.
- Executive Director Zuniga responded regarding minor matters. He stated the following.
 - The Commission has issued guidance regarding minor matters and is considering regulatory revisions to streamline the reporting process and reduce administrative burden associated with the current two-day reporting requirement.
 - Minor matters generally involve lower-level policy violations that agencies routinely address internally through supervisory action.
 - Allegations involving bias, excessive force, or a matter resulting in serious bodily injury or death are never considered minor matters under the Commission’s statute and therefore must be reported to the Commission.
 - Certain allegations, particularly those involving bias, may initially require reporting to the Commission but later result in findings that the conduct constituted only a minor policy violation.
 - Staff are considering ways to streamline the process while remaining consistent with statutory requirements.
- Executive Director Zuniga asked Commissioner Calderone whether that answered his question. Commissioner Calderone stated that it did, but that it also brought him to his next question.
- Commissioner Calderone then asked whether the Commission would independently review disciplinary decisions made by law enforcement agencies in matters involving allegations such as bias.
- He then expressed concern regarding the possibility of the Commission imposing different discipline after an agency investigation and disciplinary finding.
- Executive Director Zuniga responded that the Commission receives information regarding investigations and disciplinary outcomes and publishes sustained disciplinary findings in the public database.

- He further stated that the Commission does not necessarily take additional action in every matter and may determine that the discipline imposed by the employing agency is sufficient.
- Commissioner Calderone reiterated his view that the Commission should prioritize enforcement of existing requirements against agencies that are not already in compliance.
- He further stated that the Commission should receive additional information regarding potential definitions and proposed revisions before the concepts are presented publicly.
- General Counsel Ravitz explained that the Commission's typical process for regulatory review involves presenting draft proposals over multiple meetings, incorporating feedback, and proceeding through a formal public comment process before adoption.
- He then stated that staff elected to raise these issues at an earlier stage in response to requests for earlier notice and engagement regarding potential regulatory changes before formal proposals are developed.
- Commissioner Calderone thanked General Counsel Ravitz for his response.
- Counsel Cahill reiterated General Counsel Ravitz's statement that these issues were being raised at an earlier stage in response to feedback requesting earlier engagement regarding potential regulatory revisions.
- He then expressed appreciation for Commissioner Calderone's comments and stated that additional details and proposals will be presented to the Commission as staff continue to evaluate information and feedback received during the review process.
- Executive Director Zuniga noted that the Commission's statutory authority to impose fines could potentially be applied to agencies as an enforcement mechanism relating to agency compliance obligations.
- He stated that any such process would likely require additional regulatory development and stated that staff would return to the Commission with more concrete proposals at a later stage.
- Commissioner Bluestone raised the possibility that, in limited circumstances, an accommodation or environmental adjustment related to an identified physical or mental health limitation could be considered as an alternative to formal discipline.
- Counsel Cahill thanked Commissioner Bluestone for the comment and acknowledged the feedback for further consideration.
- Chair Hinkle thanked Counsel Cahill for his presentation and the Commissioners for their comments and questions.

5. Matters Not Anticipated by the Chair at the Time of Posting

- There were no matters not anticipated by the Chair at the time of posting of the meeting notice.

6. Executive Session

- The Chair raised the issue of moving into executive session, in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(1), to discuss the discipline or dismissal of, or complaints or charges brought against a public employee, a public officer, or an individual; under 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;

and 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.

- Chair Hinkle stated that:
 - The Commissioners will be considering reports of preliminary inquiry in four cases.
 - They will be considering the request to enter a voluntary decertification, suspension, or disposition agreement in two cases.
 - They will be discussing an update regarding a preliminary inquiry in one case.
 - They will be considering requests from the Division of Police Standards to approve a preliminary inquiry and or to impose a suspension in eight cases.
 - They will be considering a suspension hearing in the matter of Sean Kennedy.
 - They will also be addressing approval of the minutes of the March 19, 2026 executive session.
- Chair Hinkle asked for a motion to enter executive session. Commissioner Baker moved to enter executive session, and Commissioner Kazarosian seconded the motion.
- Chair Hinkle took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion unanimously carried.
- She then informed members of the public that the Commission would not reconvene its public meeting after the executive session.
- Chair Hinkle thanked the staff members who presented and helped prepare for the Commission meeting and expressed appreciation to members of the public for their interest in the Commission's work.
- The public meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.

Summary of Matters Voted on by the Commission

- Approval of minutes of March 19, 2026 meeting.
 - The Commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes included in the meeting packet.

3.



Executive Director Report

May 18, 2026

POSTC-comments@mass.gov
www.mapostcommission.gov
617-701-8401



Agenda

1. Certification Update
2. State Department - Consular Notification
3. Outreach & Engagement
4. Finance & Administrative Update

Certification Update



Upcoming Deadline for Recertification: July 1, 2026

- Portal Opened May 1 (deadline for BLA's June 30)
- Four Training Sessions (April 29, April 30, May 6 and May 7)
- Approximately 70 – 80 in the first two sessions, and ~200 participants total (out of ~800 approved portal users)
- Questions about process (wait until all requirements are met – i.e., in service training) or input earlier?
- Enter information in “batches”
- Positive feedback of portal functionality

Certification Update



Preliminary Certification Numbers (as of May 18)

- Anticipated numbers to be certified: 5,095
- Business License Applications Submitted: 1,282
- Outstanding applications: 3,813
- Chief attestations received: 76 or 110

Certification Update



Officers Retired-Working Details & Police Powers

- POST has consistently maintained that to have police powers an officer must (1) be certified by POST and (2) be employed by an LEA
- “Retired working details” and in LEA roster, need to be certified if carrying police powers and firearm or weapon
- POST will ask Chiefs to periodically confirm this requirement, identify anyone not certified and not carrying police powers and attest they have no police authority, nor carry a firearm or weapon
- Attestation will be deployed in the coming weeks

Consular Notification



U.S. State Department Training Video Re: Consular Notification

- Given upcoming FIFA World Cup events, officials anticipate many foreign visitors in and around host cities
- Law Enforcement Agencies are required to notify foreign consulates in the event of an arrest of a foreign national
- State Department contacting POST's and other offices, asking to provide these reminder
- POST has made available a training video (provided by State Department) to law enforcement agencies to remind them of this requirement

Outreach & Engagement



Recent:

- May 8 – Boston Municipal Court Spring Conference
- May 12 – Martha's Vineyard Law Enforcement Training Council
- Four portal training sessions (between April 25 – May 7)
- May 14 - IADLEST Northeast POST Directors spring meeting

Finance & Administrative Update



F&A Update



FY26 Activity

- Maintaining reversion estimate of \$425K
- IT Contract renewals may impact
- ICP & ICC underway

FY27 Budget Development

- House Amendment Activity & Outreach
 - *Restoring Funding*
 - *De Novo Review*
- Senate Ways & Means & Final Senate Budget: \$9M
- Next Step: Conference Committee

F&A Update



Human Resources

- Staff Promotion
 - Alexa Hyde, Data Analytics Manager
- Welcome New Members:
 - Keeley Rice, Enforcement Counsel
 - Kathleen Veneri, Enforcement Counsel
- Open/Posted Positions:
 - Information Management Counsel & Records Access Officer
 - Intake Coordinator #6
- Headcount: 53



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

4a.



LAW
ENFORCEMENT
AGENCY (“LEA”)
CERTIFICATION

Annie E. Lee, Counsel

May 2026



AGENDA

1. Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation Procedures – revisions and preliminary approval
2. Next Steps



INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND OFFICER COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Process:

- January 2026 – Initially presented to Commission
- February 2026 – Feedback from MPTC
- March 2026 – Revisions presented to Commission
- April 2026 – Further feedback from MPTC

Key elements:

- Key principles
- Reporting
- Review and screening
- Management
- Records retention
- Conflicts of interest
- Referrals
- Communications
- Tracking and analysis
- Internal inspection and auditing
- Training



INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND OFFICER COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Process:

- January 2026 – Initially presented to Commission
- February 2026 – Feedback from MPTC
- March 2026 – Revisions presented to Commission
- **April 2026 – Further feedback from MPTC**

Key elements:

- Key principles
- Reporting
- Review and screening
- **Management**
- Records retention
- Conflicts of interest
- Referrals
- Communications
- Tracking and analysis
- Internal inspection and auditing
- Training



MANAGEMENT

Proposed Revisions:

Set forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the management of an internal affairs investigation, including requirements addressing

...

2. Assignment, which shall be to an investigator employed by the agency or to an outside investigator retained by the agency who, when staffing, resources, and circumstances reasonably permit or dictate, is not responsible for imposing discipline, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00 and 2.03(5);

...

7. Validation of investigative findings;

....



PROCESS

Phase I: Design

- Standards
- Compliance

Phase II: Implementation

- Assessment
- Maintaining compliance
- Re-assessment
- Waivers

Phase III: Enforcement

- Procedures
- Sanctions



STATUTORY MANDATE

M.G.L. c. 6E, § 5(b) calls on the Commission to certify LEAs in accordance with “minimum certification standards,” including:

- (1) Use of force and reporting of use of force;
- (2) Officer code of conduct;
- (3) Officer response procedures;
- (4) Criminal investigation procedures;
- (5) Juvenile operations;
- (6) Internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures;
- (7) Detainee transportation; and
- (8) Collection and preservation of evidence



PROCESS

Phase I: Design

- ✓ Standards
- Compliance

Phase II: Implementation

- Assessment
- Maintaining compliance
- Re-assessment
- Waivers

Phase III: Enforcement

- Procedures
- Sanctions



KEY POLICY QUESTIONS

Phase I: Design

- Compliance

- Should the Commission also take into consideration the LEA's past compliance with other laws, rules, and regulations?



Massachusetts POST Commission

84 State Street, Suite 200, Boston, MA 02109

To: 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

From: Annie E. Lee, Counsel

Re: Law Enforcement Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer
Complaint Investigation Procedures

Date: May 14, 2026

Under Massachusetts General Laws chapter 6E, section 5(b), the Commission is directed to develop agency certification standards in at least eight areas, of which “internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures” is one.

The standard regarding internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures was first presented to the Commission during its January 2026 meeting. Following that meeting, Commission staff sought feedback from the Municipal Police Training Committee (the “MPTC”); that feedback was provided during the MPTC’s February 2026 meeting. The feedback resulted in proposed revisions, which were presented to the Commission during its March 2026 meeting. Following that meeting, Commission staff once again sought feedback from the MPTC during its April 2026 meeting. The MPTC did not have any further feedback on the revisions presented to the Commission but did, at Commission staff’s request, provide general feedback on a concept proposed for inclusion in the standard.

That concept concerned the bifurcation of investigation and discipline responsibilities in an internal affairs investigation. Specifically, the MPTC was asked to provide feedback on the notion that the individual who conducts an internal affairs investigation should be different from the individual who ultimately imposes discipline at the conclusion of an internal affairs investigation. Some members of the MPTC were hesitant at the prospect of including such a concept, expressing concerns about the economic feasibility and political repercussions of articulating such an expectation. That hesitancy appeared to be shared among MPTC members from small- and mid-size agencies, who expressed that their agencies may not have the staffing

and resources to bifurcate such responsibilities in all cases. At least one member of the MPTC, however, expressed support for such a concept, stating that the bifurcation of such responsibilities would reduce the potential for bias and bolster the integrity of internal affairs matters and, in particular, disciplinary decisions.

The draft enclosed for the Commission's review includes two revisions that attempt to incorporate the bifurcation concept as a matter of best practice while accounting for the MPTC's feedback. Those revisions are as follows:¹

- Assignment of an Internal Affairs Investigation. The draft proposes elaborating on a provision concerning the assignment of an internal affairs investigation. Specifically, the draft proposes that an internal affairs investigation will be assigned to “an investigator employed by the agency or to an outside investigator retained by the agency who, when staffing, resources, and circumstances reasonably permit or dictate, is not responsible for imposing discipline.” This proposed revision attempts to clarify the bifurcation of investigation and discipline responsibilities already implied in the Commission's regulations at 555 CMR 1.00 and 2.03(5), while acknowledging that agencies may face budgetary, resource, and circumstantial constraints that prevent them from accomplishing the bifurcation in every internal affairs matter.
- Validation of Investigative Findings. The draft also proposes adding a provision concerning the “validation of investigative findings.” This proposed provision is meant to ensure that investigative findings are sound and bias-free so that any consequential discipline is similarly sound and bias-free.

While these specific revisions were not before the MPTC during its April 2026 meeting, these revisions were crafted with the benefit of the MPTC's general feedback on the concept of bifurcation. The MPTC did not otherwise have any feedback on this standard. Therefore, this standard is presented to the Commission for preliminarily approval in its draft form.

Recommendation: The Commission preliminarily approve the internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures standard, as discussed and presented today, as a draft.

¹ The proposed revisions described in this memorandum do not include non-substantive revisions made to clarify or reorganize the standard, or to conform this standard with other standards that have been preliminarily approved by the Commission.

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

555 CMR 13.00: LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY CERTIFICATION STANDARDS

Section

- 13.01: Purpose and Scope
- 13.02: Definitions
- 13.03: Standards
- 13.04: Compliance
- 13.05: Assessment
- 13.06: Maintaining Compliance
- 13.07: Re-Assessment
- 13.08: Waiver
- 13.09: Enforcement and Disciplinary Action
- 13.10: Severability

13.02: Definitions

Agency. A Law Enforcement Agency as defined in M.G.L. c. 6E, § 1.

Commission. The Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission, established pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 2.

Domestic Violence. Action that violates M.G.L. c. 265, § 13M.

Officer. A Law Enforcement Officer as defined in M.G.L. c. 6E, § 1.

Sexual Misconduct. Conduct of a sexual nature or conduct based on sex or gender that is nonconsensual or has the effect of threatening, intimidating, or coercing a person. Sexual misconduct can include sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and retaliation related to any of the foregoing.

13.03: Standards

Each agency shall develop and implement written policies on the following topics in accordance with the following standards:

[RESERVED FOR STANDARDS ON OTHER SUBJECTS]

- (7) Internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures. An agency's professional standards, internal affairs, and officer complaint investigation procedures policy shall:
 - (a) Emphasize officers' duty to, at all times, act professionally and ethically, in accordance with the agency's code of conduct policy developed pursuant to 555 CMR 13.03(3);

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

- (b) Emphasize officers' duty to, at all times, be worthy of the public trust and the authority given to officers, in accordance with the agency's code of conduct policy developed pursuant to 555 CMR 13.03(3);
- (c) Emphasize officers' duty to uphold transparency, accountability, and responsibility principles, in accordance with the agency's code of conduct policy developed pursuant to 555 CMR 13.03(3);
- (d) Require the agency to accept all reports, whether positive or negative, regarding the agency and/or any of its officers, including, but not limited to, reports concerning or alleging:
 - 1. Conduct in the field;
 - 2. Conduct in the workplace;
 - 3. The extent of compliance with the federal or state Constitution, M.G.L. c. 6E, any rule or regulation promulgated by the Commission, or any other applicable federal or state law, rule, regulation, policy, or court or regulatory order;
 - 4. The extent of compliance with any agency policy, sub-policy, provision, rule, or regulation;
 - 5. Bias, harassment, or discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, national origin, immigration or citizenship status, limited English proficiency, accent, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, mental or physical disability, genetic information, ancestry, pregnancy or a condition related to said pregnancy, status as a veteran, marital status, parental status, public assistance reciprocity, socioeconomic level, education level, professional level, or neighborhood of residence;
 - 6. Conduct that involves untruthfulness or is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
 - 7. Conduct that brings discredit to the officer and/or the agency or impairs the efficient and effective operation of the agency;
 - 8. Use of force;
 - 9. Sexual misconduct;
 - 10. Domestic violence;
 - 11. A conflict of interest;

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

12. The extent of attendance at or completion of required training;
 13. An attempt to prevent any individual, including another officer, who seeks to make a report or participate in an internal affairs investigation against the agency and/or any of its officers, from doing so;
 14. An attempt to convince any individual, including another officer, who has made a report against the agency and/or any of its officers, to withdraw or abandon such a report;
 15. Actual or perceived retaliation;
 16. Conduct that reflects positively on the agency and/or any of its officers; and
 17. The agency's policies, sub-policies, provisions, rules, regulations, practices, and customs;
- (e) Require the agency to establish easily accessible methods, to the extent possible, by which reports regarding the agency and/or any of its officers may be filed, including:
1. At the agency;
 2. Over the phone, which may include text messages to a phone number designated by the agency for the submission of reports regarding the agency and/or any of its officers, if utilized by the agency;
 3. Over the internet, which may include messages to an official agency e-mail address and/or completion of a form available on the agency's website, if utilized by the agency;
 4. By mail;
 5. Orally;
 6. In writing;
 7. Anonymously or via a third party; and
 8. In languages other than English;

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

- (f) Require the agency to make available to the public information about how an individual may follow up on, commend, raise concerns about, or make a report against the agency, and/or any of its officers, including by providing such information on the agency's website and on agency premises;
- (g) Prohibit the agency and its officers from engaging in any conduct for the purposes of discouraging, intimidating, or retaliating against an individual because that individual seeks to make or has made a report against the agency and/or any of its officers, including by taking any of the following steps for such a purpose:
 - 1. Requiring any such individual to make their report under oath or penalty of perjury;
 - 2. Conducting a criminal background check of any such individual;
 - 3. Conducting a warrant check of any such individual;
 - 4. Conducting an immigration check of any such individual; and
 - 5. Requiring any such individual to waive any rights that may be provided to such individual by law;
- (h) Require the agency to make available to the public information about how an individual may follow up on, raise concerns about, or make a report against the agency, and/or any of its officers with the Commission;
- (i) Encourage the agency to allow the prospective reporter the opportunity to review a copy of their report for completeness and accuracy, when time and circumstances reasonably permit;
- (j) Require the agency to screen all reports regarding the agency and/or any of its officers for the purposes of:
 - 1. Determining the agency's obligations under 555 CMR 1.00; and
 - 2. Determining whether to initiate an internal affairs investigation;
- (k) Set forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the management of an internal affairs investigation, including requirements addressing:
 - 1. Initiation, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00 and 2.03(2);

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

2. Assignment, which shall be to an investigator employed by the agency or to an outside investigator retained by the agency who, when staffing, resources, and circumstances reasonably permit or dictate, is not responsible for imposing discipline, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00 and 2.03(5);
 3. Supervision, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00 and 2.03(5);
 4. Investigation, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00;
 5. Collection, preservation, and use of evidence, including, where feasible, audio- and/or video-recordings, consistent with the agency's collection and preservation of evidence policy developed pursuant to 555 CMR 13.03(8), and 515 CMR where applicable;
 6. Recommended time limits, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00, with internal progress reporting and accountability;
 7. Validation of investigative findings;
 8. Adjudication;
 9. Resolution, in accordance with 555 CMR 12.03(5);
 10. The appropriate administration of discipline;
 11. Documentation, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00;
 12. Case file maintenance, in accordance with 555 CMR 1.00, 12.03(1)(d), and 12.03(3)(b); and
 13. Confidentiality, in accordance with each applicable federal or state law, rule, or regulation, including, but not limited to, M.G.L. c. 4, § 7(26), M.G.L. c. 66A, M.G.L. c. 268A, and 555 CMR 1.00;
- (l) Set forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the appeal of any decision or action resulting from an internal affairs investigation by the officer who is the subject of the internal affairs investigation;
- (m) Include a sub-policy or provision concerning the retention of records associated with an internal affairs investigation that shall comply with the requirements of M.G.L. c. 4, § 7(26), M.G.L. c. 30, § 42, M.G.L. c. 66, M.G.L. c. 66A, 555 CMR 12.03(1)(d) and 12.03(3)(b), other associated regulations, and the Massachusetts Statewide Agency Records Retention Schedule or Municipal Records Retention Schedule, as applicable, developed by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation Procedures (DRAFT)

- (n) Prohibit the investigated officer from attempting to convince the reporter to withdraw or abandon their report, or retaliating against the reporter;
- (o) Include a sub-policy or provision concerning the management of conflicts of interest in an internal affairs investigation that:
 - 1. Prohibits an officer, regardless of rank, from conducting an internal affairs investigation, in whole or in part, that involves a member of the officer’s family or an individual with whom the officer has a close personal or business relationship;
 - 2. Sets forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the internal reporting of a potential or actual conflict of interest to the prospective conflicted officer’s supervisor, superior, or appointing authority;
 - 3. Sets forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the agency’s evaluation of the reported conflict of interest for the purposes of determining whether an actual conflict of interest exists;
 - 4. Sets forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning measures the agency will take to prevent the conflicted officer from interfering with the internal affairs investigation;
 - 5. Addresses the circumstances under which the internal affairs investigation will be referred to another body because the agency cannot adequately manage the conflict of interest; and
 - 6. Complies with any applicable law, rule, regulation, policy, or judicial or regulatory order, including M.G.L. c. 6E, § 12, M.G.L. c. 149, § 185, M.G.L. c. 268A, and 555 CMR 1.00, 2.03(5), and 6.07;
- (p) Set forth specific and comprehensive requirements concerning the referral of a report against the agency and/or any of its officers to third parties, including:
 - 1. Any federal or state prosecuting authority, civil enforcement agency, or law enforcement agency of competent jurisdiction for prosecution as a criminal matter, commencement of a civil enforcement action, or initiation of an administrative agency proceeding; or

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation Procedures (DRAFT)

2. Another body or individual because the original agency and its officers have a conflict of interest that cannot be adequately managed;
- (q) Set forth specific and comprehensive requirements and/or restrictions concerning communications about an internal affairs investigation, including communications regarding the steps in the internal affairs investigation process listed in 555 CMR 13.03(7)(l), to the extent appropriate, with:
1. The investigated officer, their immediate supervisor, the head of their agency, and/or the head of their collective bargaining unit, , which shall address whether and when such information will be communicated to such persons;
 2. The reporter, which shall address whether and when such information will be communicated to such a person;
 3. The Commission, in accordance with the requirements of 555 CMR 1.00 and 12.00;
 4. A local civilian oversight board of competent jurisdiction, if one exists; and
 5. The public, which may include communications on the agency’s website and social media and with media outlets;
- (r) Require the agency to collect, track, and analyze reports, whether positive or negative, regarding the agency and/or any of its officers on at least an annual basis to:
1. Identify trends in reports regarding the agency and/or any of its officers over time;
 2. Identify officers who have:
 - a. Been involved in a disproportionate share and/or high frequency of reports against the agency and/or any of its officers; and
 - b. Allegedly engaged in a recurring pattern or practice, regardless of whether reports against the agency and/or the officer alleging such a pattern or practice are sustained;

for the purposes of determining whether intervention would be beneficial to improving the officer’s behavior and practices, and

Agency Certification Standards – Internal Affairs and Officer Complaint Investigation
Procedures (DRAFT)

intervening to improve the officer’s behavior and practices or pursue disciplinary action when that is determined to be potentially beneficial;

3. Identify patterns, practices, or customs that are at issue in a disproportionate share and/or high frequency of reports against the agency and/or any of its officers, for the purpose of determining whether a change in any agency policy, sub-policy, provision, rule, or regulation would be beneficial, and making such changes when that is determined to be potentially beneficial;
 4. Identify best practices that should be replicated; and
 5. Issue to the public an annual summary of reports, whether positive or negative, submitted to the agency and/or any of its officers, which shall be maintained on the agency’s website and available on agency premises for inspection;
- (s) Include a sub-policy or provision concerning the internal inspection and auditing of the agency’s completed internal affairs investigations for the purposes of determining whether a change in any agency internal affairs policy, sub-policy, provision, rule, regulation, patterns, practices, or customs would be beneficial, and making such changes when that is determined to be potentially beneficial; and
- (t) Ensure that all officers are trained on the agency’s internal affairs and officer complaint investigation procedures policy in accordance with all applicable training requirements.