

Board of Police Commissioners/Office of the Chief Investigator

Case Management System RFP Requirements

This document is a Request for Proposal (“RFP”) for a Case Management System. The Board of Police Commissioners’ (BOPC) Office of the Chief Investigator (OCI) is seeking proposals for a case management system and associated implementation services for OCI to provide improved automation capabilities, including access to information, accuracy of data, and reporting, supporting their mission of fairly, effectively, and objectively receiving, investigating, and making recommendations regarding complaints concerning the Detroit Police Department (DPD). Solutions considered will include either hosted or in-house/premised-based installations. The contract term desired is for the initial implementation and system maintenance and support for two (2) years, with an option to renew for an additional two (2) year maintenance and support period. Proposals for hosted solutions may require differing fixed terms.

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Police Commissioners has supervisory control and oversight of the Detroit Police Department or DPD. The Board shall receive and resolve any complaint concerning the operation of the Detroit Police Department or DPD and forward all allegations of criminality to the appropriate internal or external law enforcement agency for further investigation. The Board shall appoint a Chief Investigator and such additional staff of investigators as it deems necessary.

Complaints concerning the Detroit Police Department filed anywhere in the Department shall be forwarded immediately to the Board Secretary. Copies of the complaint shall be made available to each member of the Board, the Chief Investigator, and the Chief of Police. The Chief Investigator for the Board shall investigate a complaint immediately and file a report of findings with the Board within sixty (60) days. Within thirty (30) days of receipt of a complaint by the Board Secretary, the Board shall send written communication informing the complainant that their complaint has been received, the guidelines on how the complaint will be handled, and the timeline on when the complainant shall receive a disposition on their complaint. The Board Secretary shall keep and post on-line, a public docket of complaints and the disposition of each complaint after investigation. The docket shall not contain information that identifies or can reasonably lead to the identification of the parties.

If a complaint is not resolved as a result of the investigation to the satisfaction of the complainant, the respondent employee, or a member of the Board of Police Commissioners, either the complainant, the respondent employee, or the Board member may request the Board to hear or review the matter. The Board may, at its option, when it determines that a hearing or review is warranted by the evidence, hear or review the matter itself or refer the matter to a fact finder. When a matter is referred to fact finding, the secretary to the Board and the respondent employee shall attempt to agree upon a person to act as a fact finder. The fact finder must be an attorney. If the parties fail to agree on a fact finder, they shall request a recognized arbitration association as designated by ordinance, to propose the names of five (5) attorneys who could act independently and impartially as a fact finder in the matter. In the presence of a person authorized to take oaths, each side, acting in turn with the employee beginning, shall indicate a name to be struck from those proposed until both sides have struck two (2) names. The person whose name then remains is the fact finder. The fact finder, in the conduct of the hearing, may subpoena witnesses, administer oaths, take testimony, and require the production of evidence. To

enforce a subpoena or order for the production of evidence or to impose any penalty prescribed for failure to obey a subpoena or order, the fact finder shall apply to the appropriate court. The cost of the fact finder shall be borne by the city. After a hearing, the fact finder shall, within thirty (30) days, submit findings of fact to the Board. The Board, upon receipt of the report of the fact finder shall, within thirty (30) days, determine any discipline to be imposed. It shall then make the report and its action public. The decision of the Board is final. Any employee against whom a complaint is filed is presumed innocent and shall not forfeit any pay or seniority rights pending final action by the Board, except with the concurrence of a two-thirds (2/3) majority of members of the Board. All pleadings filed and all hearings before the Board and the fact finder shall be public. The parties to any hearing are the complainant and the respondent employee. Each has a right to counsel. The complainant's case may be presented by the complainant or the complainant's counsel. Any probative evidence may be admitted.

A. Description of Existing Technology

Currently, the Office of the Chief Investigator uses a custom-designed Microsoft Access database case management system. Complaints are submitted in person, online, or by phone and entered into the DPD's Management Awareness System (MAS). Once approved by a supervisor, each complaint is imported by the Import Database, and then manually assigned to an investigator by administrative staff. Upon assigning, the complaint is imported into the Complaint Database. All of the investigative work for the complaint happens outside of the database – retrieval and review of reports and videos, writing the investigative report in Microsoft Word, interviews, etc. Updates to the progress of the complaint are made in the database and compiled as a significant event log. Apart from the original complaint and the significant event log, no other complaint case file documents are stored in the database.

Microsoft Access limitations have led to issues in improving our investigatory process that a more specialized and robust case management software may resolve. Some of the issues identified are below:

- Limited Reporting & Analytics: Provides limited reporting on the data elements stored, limiting management's and other stakeholder's ability to derive insight on investigation progress and outcomes through the analysis and visualization of key metrics.
- Data Storage Limitations: Not well-suited for large-scale case management systems due to data housing limitations that can slow down the system as the database grows and limit us from storing certain large files.
- Lack of Workflow Automations: Access does not have built-in workflow automation capabilities, requiring customer development support to create and manage automated workflows
- Limited Mobile Access Capabilities: Investigators go out into the field to collect statements and other required information.

B. Project Objectives

Solutions proposed by the vendor must support the following objectives and measurable outcomes:

1. Improve capture of and access to information about complaint investigations - Provide OCI with more timely, accurate and complete case information to perform investigations and prosecutions, as measured by:

- a. Improved access to management information – Decrease time to access management information after the introduction of a case management system
- b. Improved information accuracy and consistency – Reduce reliance on hand counts and separate systems required to support functions not currently available
2. Improve the quality of the information provided to stakeholders – Respond more accurately and timely to ad hoc requests for information required by stakeholders, e.g., Board of Police Commissioners, Detroit Police Department, Public Stakeholders:
 - a. Improved access to management information – Decrease time to access management information after the introduction of a case management system
 - b. Improved information accuracy and consistency – Reduce reliance on hand counts and separate systems required to support functions not currently available
 - c. Improved reporting – Provide reports that identify hidden trends, patterns and relationships among cases and parties to these cases
 - d. Reduced time to perform functions – Identify time to perform functions before and after the introduction of a case management system
 - e. Reduced duplicate data entry – Perform functions once, eliminating duplication of effort

C. Project Scope

The project includes a system that supports:

1. Initiate case
2. Evaluate case
3. Investigate case
4. Leadership review/approval
5. Commissioner review/approval
6. Response to complainant
7. Complaint Appeal process
8. Document management
9. File retention

The project does not require a system that supports:

1. Financial management
2. Human resource management
3. File archiving

The State Bar will consider either hosted or in-house/premised-based solutions meeting these objectives that support the technical and other specifications in this RFP.

Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Vendors are required to respond to these requirements. Any proposal not meeting these minimum qualifications, will be deemed non-qualified and will not be considered. All proposed solutions meeting these minimum mandatory requirements must complete a response.

1. Length of software use – The proposed application software is currently in use and has been for a minimum of two years in public sector organizations similar in size and complexity when compared to OCI.
2. Multiple case types – The proposed application software can support different processes, information and work flow for each case type that OCI processes.
3. Software must meet all Department of Innovation and Technology minimum security and system requirements.

All proposals not meeting these minimum qualifications, will be deemed non-qualified and will not be evaluated.