



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

August 11th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair
David Gatian
Edwin Moore
Glenn Parker III
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator
Jessyca Watson, General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
Kevin Wynne, Investigator

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprrian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order** **Brandon Brown, Chair**
YouTube Timestamp: 0:00:01 – 0:17:27
1. **Member Brown called August 11th, 2026, hearing to order at 9:22 am EST.**
 2. **Roll Call**
 - a. Board Member Cyganovich had an excused absence.
 - b. A quorum was present.
 3. **Announcements & Agenda Changes**
 - a. **Agenda Changes:** Chair/ Vice Chair nominations added
Member Brandon Brown was just reinstated August 10th, 2026, as a Board Member. Every year the Board Vote for Chair and Vice Chair positions.
- **Chair Nominations**
 - Motion:** Nominate Brandon Brown for Board Chair
 - Motion By: Gatian
 - Seconded By: Sharp
 - Motion Status: Carried



Motion: Appoint Member Brandon Brown as Board Chair

Motion By: Moore

Seconded By: Miller

Roll Call Vote: All Board Member said “Aye”

- **Vice Chair Nominations**

Member Willis Ballot Statement: Willis stated that he is a Cleveland resident, a business owner, and a long-time community servant whose work in operating the largest minority-owned barbershop chain in Ohio is rooted in service to the community. He emphasized his commitment to fairness, justice, and supporting Cleveland residents, noting that although he is new to the Board, he is passionate about serving as a servant-leader and respectfully asked for support in his bid for Vice Chair.

Motion: Self- Nominated, Willis for Board Vice Chair

Motion By: Willis

Seconded By: Glenn Parker III

Member Miller Ballot Statement: Miller stated that he has served on the Board since 2021, originally joining as the youth representative for the Fifth District and the Glenville neighborhood, where he is a lifelong resident. He highlighted his background in public management, his community focused work introducing youth to public safety careers, and his commitment to strengthening relationships between young people and police officers. Member Miller noted that his experience on the Board and mentorship from City leadership have prepared him well for continued service in his second term.

Motion: Self-Nominated, Miller for Board Vice Chair

Motion By: Miller

Seconded By: Gatian

By majority Ballot Vote appointed **Member Miller as Vice Chair** of the CPRB Board.



II. Approval of Minutes

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 0:17:27 – 0:18:12

July 14th Meeting Minutes – In- person| City Hall

Motion: Approve July 14th, 2026, CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Second By: Willis

Motion Status: Carried

III. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:18:12 – 0:22:21

- Officer Commendation
 - Chair Brown noted the importance of publicly recognizing exceptional police work and read a commendation submitted by a community member praising Officer Martinez, #1346 and other Fourth District officers. The commendation described how the officers responded quickly and professionally when a nonverbal autistic child went missing, asking appropriate questions and helping ensure a safe outcome. The Chair emphasized that while the Board is responsible for accountability, it also values acknowledging officers who demonstrate exemplary service, and encouraged community members to continue submitting positive feedback for recognition at future meetings.
- No individuals were present for public comment

IV. Presentation of Investigations with Citizen Or CDP Subject Employee Present

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

Appeal

OPS2026-0084

Timestamp: 0:22:21 – 0:38:10

Complainant: Julie Jones-Fuentes

Presented by: SI Bowker

Appeal Summary: OPS administratively dismissed Complaint OPS2026-0084 after determining that the complainant's concerns involved school crossing guard conduct rather than misconduct by Captain Butler. OPS found that the complaint did not identify any policy violation or failure to act by Captain Butler, and that issues involving crossing guard behavior must be handled through internal reporting procedures outlined in GPO 1.07.05, including Form-1 submission to



a supervisor or Internal Affairs. OPS also noted that Internal Affairs had recently completed a related 2025 investigation and that the new concerns were forwarded to the School Crossing Guard Supervisor. The Law Department confirmed that the matter does not fall under OPS jurisdiction.

Complainant Request Summary: The complainant requested a review of OPS2026-0084 because she believes OPS overlooked significant evidence and misapplied policy in dismissing her complaint. She reported long-standing safety concerns involving school crossing guards abandoning their posts, including two retired police sergeants whose conduct she documented with months of photographs and multiple community reports. She stated that despite providing detailed information to Captain Butler, no corrective action occurred, while she herself experienced heightened supervision and what she perceived as retaliatory treatment. She also expressed concern that OPS's dismissal letter inaccurately treated school crossing guards as governed by GPOs, conflicted with an active Internal Affairs investigation, and failed to address the broader safety risks to newcomer children she sponsors. For these reasons, she is seeking CPRB review of the administrative dismissal.

Julie Jones-Fuentes (Complainant) Statement: Ms. Jones-Fuentes stated that she has worked as a school crossing guard for nearly eleven years and wished to update the Board on her previously filed complaint while also offering a policy recommendation. She explained that the Division recently announced the implementation of the Workday mobile app with geofencing, which verifies crossing guards' attendance by requiring them to clock in within a designated digital boundary. She noted that the Plain Press published an analysis of the Cleveland police consent decree showing the City had not reached substantial compliance in nearly all examined goals, and emphasized that the crossing guard unit, responsible for protecting children, is supervised by the Bureau of Community Relations.

She urged the Board to consider recommending the creation of a civilian liaison position for the crossing guard unit, staffed by an individual with a business administration background and experience managing large groups. She stated that such a role could improve recruitment, retention, safety, and communication with schools, families, and guards, while providing consistent oversight and reducing favoritism. Drawing on her experience as a registered nurse caring for children with traumatic injuries, she stressed the importance of preventative safety measures, especially as school closures will increase pedestrian traffic. She asked the Board to formally consider her recommendation to strengthen accountability and better protect Cleveland's children.



Board Discussion Summary: The Board began by thanking the complainant for her long service to the community as both a nurse and a school crossing guard, acknowledging the importance of her work protecting children and her willingness to bring forward concerns. Members emphasized that her testimony and policy suggestion were taken seriously, even though the Board's authority in this particular case was limited. They clarified that because the matter involved an internal, officer-initiated complaint, disciplinary decisions fall under Internal Affairs rather than the CPRB, meaning the Board could not impose discipline on the underlying case. However, they stressed that this limitation did not diminish the significance of the issues she raised regarding oversight, accountability, and child safety.

The Board discussed her recommendation to create a civilian liaison position for the crossing-guard unit, noting that it was a thoughtful and well-supported idea. Members agreed that such a role could improve recruitment, retention, safety practices, and communication between crossing guards, families, and schools, while also reducing favoritism and ensuring consistent oversight. The Board expressed strong support for advancing this recommendation and explained that they have the authority to formally propose policy changes to both the Chief of Police and the Community Police Commission. They encouraged the complainant to attend CPC meetings if possible but assured her that the Board would still move the recommendation forward even if she could not attend.

Motion: OPS craft a Policy Recommendation to Cleveland Policy Commission (CPC) and Cleveland Department of Police Chief Todd for a citizen liaison for Crossing Guard Unit.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Uphold the OPS administrative dismissal of case OPS2024-0086

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

New Case

OPS2025-0019

Timestamp: 0:38:10 – 0:55:27

Complainant: Kristina O'Neal

Presented by: Lampkin



P.O. Daniel Sherlock, #1569

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 3, 2021, Kristina O’Neal reported that after a three-vehicle collision at E.93rd and Kinsman a driver who struck her vehicle was allowed to leave the scene without being questioned, without license or plate information being obtained, and without a completed OH-1 crash report. The complaint named P.O. Daniel Sherlock #1569 and alleged that the officer’s handling of the scene caused Ms. O’Neal and her young child to seek medical attention and that required investigative and reporting steps were not completed.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from P.O. Sherlock at both scene locations, traffic crash and OH-1 records, public records responses, the complainant’s recorded interview, and the officer’s recorded WCS interview. The WCS shows Sherlock speaking with the other driver, confirming the other driver and passenger were okay, and allowing them to depart while Ms. O’Neal and family continued to ask about the other vehicle and expressed difficulty reading the plate; the officer did not inform the family that the other driver had been permitted to leave. The officer later acknowledged on camera that he trusted the other driver too soon, allowed them to go, and failed to submit a complete incident report. OPS also confirmed the OH-1 documentation was incomplete or not retained in accessible records due to retention limits, and EMS was dispatched because the complainant’s child, who was undergoing chemotherapy, required attention. Taken together, the WCS evidence, the officer’s admission, and the missing or incomplete OH-1 support a finding that required investigative steps and documentation were not completed in accordance with Manual Sections 4.03 and 4.18 and GPO 8.1.02.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for Lack of Service/Insufficient Service against P.O. Daniel Sherlock #1569, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officer permitted the other driver to depart before obtaining full identifying information and failed to complete required crash documentation. Because the complaint was filed more than six months after the incident, Article 7 of the collective bargaining agreement limits disciplinary action; the member may be required to respond to the investigation but is not subject to discipline under that provision.

Kristian O’Neal (Complainant) Statement: The complainant explained that the incident occurred several years earlier and has been emotionally difficult to revisit because the family member involved has since passed away. She stated that she felt failed by the process after being involved in a car accident in front of the Fourth District, noting that she had never experienced anything like this before. She described doing most of the investigative work herself, photographing the vehicle, obtaining the license plate number, and attempting to file a report in Shaker Heights, where the vehicle was registered. She explained that the driver initially refused to provide his information and only did so later to a third-party insurance representative. She also contacted hit-skip detectives and provided details about where the vehicle owner worked, but she said no meaningful follow-up occurred. When she later contacted the hit-skip unit, she was told they were two years behind, past the statute of limitations, which contributed to her decision to file a complaint with OPS.



The complainant further stated that she struggled to file the complaint because she did not have a case number and was repeatedly redirected when seeking assistance. She recalled asking officers at the Fourth District for help immediately after the accident but said no one stopped to assist her, and she ultimately had to call 911 to get an officer to respond. During this period, she was also caring for her three-year-old daughter, which made it difficult to manage the complaint process. She eventually spoke with a police official who advised her to file with OPS and meet with OPS staff, but she did not receive updates afterward and felt lost in the process.

In response to Board questions, the complainant clarified that she began attempting to file the complaint in early 2024 but delays, confusion, and repeated corrections to the incident report caused her to give up temporarily before ultimately submitting the complaint in 2025. She expressed frustration that she was never notified when the report was completed and believed that the lack of timely action prevented accountability. She stated that she felt unsupported throughout the process and hoped the Board's review would acknowledge the failures she experienced.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case summary and complainant's statement.

***Additional Information to Note:** The complaint was submitted outside the six-month window required by the collective bargaining agreement, which prevents any disciplinary action even though the allegation is sustained. Members emphasized that the officer was found at fault based on the investigation, acknowledging the complainant's concerns while explaining the limits of their authority. As a result, the Board did not assign a group level for the sustained finding.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Daniel Sherlock, #1569	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 4.03, 4.18, and General Police Order 8.01.02.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Sherlock Officer Sherlock did not take proper care to obtain information from all parties at the scene of the accident. The officer also did not properly assess the accident to determine fault before allowing one of the people involved in the car accident to leave the scene.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried



V. Presentation of Investigations

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

Appeals

OPS2024-0202

Timestamp: 0:55:27 – 1:18:41

**Complainant: Taunee Smith
Nicole Smith**

Presented by: SI Bowker

Appeal Summary: OPS administratively dismissed Complaint #2024-0202 after determining that both subject officers, Detective Jeffrey Yasenchack and Detective Donald Kopchak, were no longer employed by the Cleveland Division of Police at the time OPS attempted to investigate the complaint. The complainant alleged excessive force, improper procedure, and improper search stemming from a 2011 incident, but OPS found it lacked jurisdiction because Det. Yasenchack retired in April 2023 and Det. Kopchak resigned in April 2026. Under OPS Manual §703(a), complaints involving individuals who are no longer CDP employees are eligible for administrative dismissal. OPS noted that no further investigative action could be taken and advised the complainant of his right to request CPRB review.

Complainant Request Summary: The complainant, through legal counsel, requested CPRB review of the administrative dismissal on the grounds that OPS closed the case without investigating the merits of his excessive force and improper procedure allegations. Counsel argues that OPS's years long delay allowed both detectives to leave the Division, and OPS then used their separation as the basis for dismissal, despite the complaint being filed while both were still CDP employees. The appeal asserts that OPS did not gather or review the underlying facts as required by its manual, improperly treated a discretionary dismissal as mandatory, and failed to meet accountability obligations under the consent decree. Counsel further states that the dismissal prejudices the complainant, who is incarcerated and pursuing post-conviction relief, and requests that the Board reverse the dismissal and direct OPS to complete the investigation and issue findings.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board began by noting that the appeal centered on a misunderstanding about timing, as the complainant believed OPS waited for the officers to resign before dismissing the case. Members clarified that this was not accurate; the officers had already separated from the Division before OPS completed its review, and the Board emphasized that it does not delay investigations or dismiss cases simply because an officer leaves employment.



They also explained that the appeal referenced criminal matters unrelated to CPRB jurisdiction and reiterated that the Board can only hear cases involving current CDP employees. Because both officers in this case had resigned or retired, the Board had no authority to proceed with discipline or further adjudication.

Board members then engaged in a broader discussion about the implications of dismissing cases solely due to officer separation. Several members expressed concern that when a case is administratively dismissed without a finding, nothing is added to the officer's personnel file. They noted that this creates a potential accountability gap, particularly if a retired or resigned officer later seeks reemployment with CDP or another agency, because there would be no record indicating whether the complaint had merit, was unfounded, or was sustained. Members referenced past discussions about this issue and stressed that leaving cases unresolved could create a loophole that allows officers to avoid documented review of misconduct allegations simply by resigning.

Multiple Board members voiced support for changing current practice so that OPS and the Board would still review and issue findings on cases involving separated officers, even when discipline is no longer possible. They argued that this approach aligns with best practices in law enforcement oversight and ensures that personnel files accurately reflect the outcomes of investigations. OPS leadership agreed, noting that this concern has already been identified as an area for improvement and that recommendations to update the OPS manual will be forthcoming. The Board concluded by reaffirming the need to close this loophole and ensure that all cases receive a full review based on their merits, regardless of an officer's employment status.

Motion: Uphold OPS Administratively Dismissal of case OPS2024-0202.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Case Updates

OPS2023-0140

Timestamp: 1:18:41 – 1:46:50

Complainant: Lars St. John

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

P.O. Anthony Rice, #1886

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service - EXONERATED



Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct - SUSTAINED

Case Updates: The Chief reviewed the memorialized record and the Hearing Officer's recommendation and accepted the recommendation to dismiss the disciplinary specification against Patrol Officer Anthony Rice, #1886. The Chief concluded that the officer's non-verbal request for a complainant to lower a face covering did not rise to discourteous conduct and that the officer appropriately de-escalated the encounter by having another officer speak with the complainant. Although the Civilian Police Review Board had sustained the allegation and recommended Group I corrective action, the Chief issued a formal departure from the Board's recommendation and recommended that the specification be dismissed.

From Chief's Dismissal Letter: The case timeline shows the matter was presented to the Board in August 2024, with the Board issuing a findings letter on August 15, 2024, recommending the unprofessional conduct allegation be sustained and Group I discipline. A pre-disciplinary hearing before the Chief was held on July 28, 2025, at which the Hearing Officer recommended dismissal; the Chief accepted that recommendation. The Board reviewed the Chief's departure at a panel meeting on November 11, 2025, and reaffirmed its sustained finding; the Board issued an amended findings letter on May 20, 2026, reiterating its recommendation for corrective action.

In the Chief's August 4, 2026, disposition, the decision to dismiss was finalized, with the Chief citing the Hearing Officer's recommendation and noting contractual and procedural constraints that affected the imposition of discipline. The Chief's dismissal therefore reflects both a factual determination about the officer's conduct during the encounter and the practical limits imposed by applicable timelines and procedures.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board began by acknowledging that any change to OPS or CPRB manuals requires a formal process, but members emphasized that the discussion about improving procedures, particularly regarding cases involving officers who resign or retire during investigations, should begin immediately. Several members noted that the Board has a strong appetite for revising current policy, which currently directs OPS to dismiss cases when officers separate from the Division. They stressed that this practice may no longer serve the public interest and could create gaps in accountability.

Members then debated whether OPS2023-0140 should be reopened and investigated despite the officers' separation. Some argued that reopening the case would have limited practical value because one officer is permanently unemployable due to a felony conviction, and the other—though technically eligible for rehire—was unlikely to return. Others pointed out that the current dismissal practice is rooted in efficiency rather than legal requirement, and that failing to investigate such cases prevents OPS and CPRB from identifying trends, sustaining allegations, or accurately evaluating data. They warned that repeated dismissals distort the Division's understanding of misconduct patterns.



A major portion of the discussion focused on the broader implications of dismissing cases without findings. Board members emphasized that citizens who file complaints deserve full adjudication regardless of an officer's employment status. They noted that unresolved cases deny complainants closure and transparency and create a loophole allowing officers to avoid documented review of misconduct allegations simply by resigning. Members cited real-world examples of officers who were rehired elsewhere despite prior concerns, underscoring the need for complete investigative records in personnel files.

The Board also discussed the practical challenges of investigating older cases, including missing evidence, unavailable officer statements, and difficulty locating records. OPS leadership acknowledged these challenges but agreed that best practice is to complete investigations to their conclusion, even when discipline is no longer possible. They confirmed that this issue has already been identified for future manual revisions and that recommendations will be brought forward to strengthen investigative continuity and close the loophole created by officer separation.

Finally, the Board shifted to the timeliness issues surrounding OPS2023-0140. Members reviewed the timeline of the sustained finding, the chief's hearing, and the subsequent departure letter, noting that delays—both by the chief and the Board—may have pushed the case outside the 60-day discipline window required by the CBA. They discussed the need for better internal tracking, including alerts to ensure the Board is aware of approaching deadlines. After initially voting to table the case, members reconsidered due to conflicting dates and ultimately debated whether to rescind the vote or gather more information. OPS committed to developing time-tracking tools to prevent similar issues in the future.

Motion: Table discussion of OPS 2023-0140 until September CPRB Meeting to obtain a clear timeline of events.

Motion By: Chair Brown
Seconded By: Sharp
Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Rescinded the act of tabling the case while still requiring OPS to report back with the confirmed timeline and verification of the chief's departure rationale the last motion.

Motion By: Sharp
Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller
Motion Status: Carried

Opposed: Gatian- By rescinding the previous motion to table the case, the board might risk missing a procedural window or deadline for the chief's dismissal.

CDP Internal Affairs Involvement Cases



OPS2025-0086 (B)

Timestamp: 1:46:50 – 2:46:27

Complainant: Michelle Knop

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Harassment – Off-Duty Conduct

Allegation C: Improper Procedure- Failure to Activate WCS

Allegation D: Improper Procedure- Personal Cellular Phone

Allegation E: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation F: Improper Procedure- Failure to Activate WCS

Allegation G: Improper Procedure- Personal Cellular Phone

Allegation H: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation I: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct – False Statement

Lt. Albert Oliver, #8586

Allegation J: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Michelle Knop alleging unprofessional conduct, harassment, and multiple procedural violations by P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks #1598 following a theft call at her residence on April 18, 2025, and a related allegation of insufficient follow-up by Sgt. Albert Oliver #9220. Ms. Knop reported that Officer Jones-Parks obtained her phone number during the field response, later contacted her from his personal cell under the pretense of investigative follow-up, and allowed the conversation to become personal with comments about her appearance and repeated messages and calls. She said the officer later drove to the area of her home after his shift, which caused her to feel unsafe and to block his number and secure her residence. Ms. Knop also alleged Sgt. Oliver failed to follow up after she reported the officer's conduct.

OPS conducted an independent review of the Internal Affairs investigation and the underlying evidence, including WCS recordings from the scene, cellular call and text records, AVL data, screenshots provided by the complainant, and interviews with the complainant, Officer Jones-Parks, and Sgt. Oliver. The combined record shows Jones-Parks used contact information obtained during the call to initiate off-duty, personal communications from his personal phone, did not activate his WCS during the investigative follow-up call, and later drove to the area of Ms. Knop's residence before leaving without making contact. Internal Affairs identified additional similar contacts and administrative violations; OPS reviewed those materials and corroborated the phone and message exchanges and the absence of WCS for the follow-up contacts.



Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommended sustained findings for multiple allegations against P.O. Jones-Parks: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, Failure to Activate WCS, Use of Personal Cellular Phone for Official Business, and related unprofessional conduct and false-statement specifications; OPS recommended the harassment-by-visiting allegation be Unfounded because there was no evidence he approached the residence. OPS also recommended Exonerated for Sgt. Oliver on the lack-of-service allegation, finding he promptly referred to the complaint to Internal Affairs. OPS concurred with Internal Affairs' sustained specifications were supported by the evidence and forwarded the combined findings for adjudication.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board began its deliberation by working carefully through each allegation to ensure accuracy before making any motions. Members first clarified that Allegation J: Insufficient Service allegation was incorrectly attributed to Officer Parks and should instead be assigned to Lieutenant Oliver. Because the case involved numerous allegations across multiple officers, the Chair paused to confirm the correct alignment of each allegation with the corresponding conduct. This included distinguishing between communication-related allegations, harassment allegations, lack of service allegations, and improper procedure allegations, all of which stemmed from different interactions and different complainants.

The Board then examined Allegation A, which involved the officer's inappropriate personal cell phone communication with the complainant. Members confirmed that the officer-initiated contact under the guise of gathering investigative information but then steered the conversation into personal territory. Allegation B, labeled as harassment, prompted deeper discussion. The complainant did not know the officer had driven past her home; this fact was discovered only through Internal Affairs. Board members debated whether the conduct met the threshold for harassment, ultimately concluding that although the officer's behavior was inappropriate and "creepy," harassment requires awareness or contact by the complainant. Because the conduct occurred but did not meet the legal elements of harassment, members agreed it should not be classified as "unfounded," which implies the conduct did not occur, but instead as "exonerated" or folded into unprofessional conduct findings.

The Board continued reviewing each allegation to ensure they were not duplicative and were properly categorized. They distinguished between allegations involving failure to activate WCS, improper use of a personal cell phone for official business, and inappropriate communications with a second female complainant. Members noted that several allegations mirrored earlier misconduct but involved different individuals and dates. They also reviewed the pornography-related allegation, confirming that the officer viewed explicit content on his personal phone while on duty and later minimized the behavior during his interview. The false-statement allegation was also clarified: the officer had claimed he contacted only one complainant, but evidence showed he contacted a second woman as well.

Throughout the discussion, Board members emphasized the importance of accurately labeling allegations so that motions and findings would be clear and defensible. They noted that some allegations originated from Internal Affairs specifications rather than directly from the complainant, which required careful interpretation. Members also stressed the need to



consolidate certain behaviors under broader categories such as unprofessional conduct, rather than forcing them into ill-fitting labels like harassment. The Chair reiterated that the Board must evaluate the conduct itself, not merely the complainant's awareness of it, and ensure that findings reflect what actually occurred.

Additional Information to Note:

- *Allegation J: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service was listed incorrectly on the agenda. Allegation J should be against Lt. Albert Oliver, #8586 instead of P.O. Brandy Jones-Parks, #1598.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 5.01.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>Officer Jones-Parks used improper communication with the complainant on his personal cell phone device under the guise of business activities but eventually pivoted those conversations to non-business in both voice calls and inappropriate text messages.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Group Level: III- Misuse of Company Time, Dereliction of Duty, & Conduct Unbecoming, conduct that Diminishes Esteem of Division Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Harassment Off-Duty Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure- Failure to Activate WCS

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.06.04.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>During these calls that were allegedly business-related to the complaint, Officer Jones-Parks failed to activate his WCS.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Improper Use of WCS Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried
---	---	--

Allegation D: Improper Procedure- Personal Cellular Phone

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.06.12.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>Officer Jones-Parks used his personal cell to allegedly conduct business affairs, but seemingly not his ultimate goal.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: II- Unauthorized User/ Access to Enterprise, Use of Personal Phone for Business Conduct, Disparage the Esteem of Division Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation E: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 2.14, 5.01, and Civil Rule 9.10.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>Officer Jones-Parks engaged inappropriate communication with a civilian (different from complainant), using his position to communicate with them. During the call Officer Jones-Parks changed the conversation from business to personal.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Group Level: III- Election of Duty, Diminishing the esteem of the division Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



Allegation F: Improper Procedure- Failure to Activate WCS

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.06.04.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> During the phone call to civilian mentioned in Allegation E, intended to conduct business or investigation of some sort during working hours, Officer Jones-Parks did not activate WCS	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Improper use of WCS Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation G: Improper Procedure- Personal Cellular Phone

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.06.12.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> Officer Jones-Parks reached out to the second civilian (mentioned in Allegation E & F) using his personal cell phone device for some sort of investigation or business purpose, therefore this was an improper use of a cellular phone.	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I-Conduct unbecoming, Improper use of Cell Phone/Electronic devices, Diminish the Esteem of Division Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation H: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 2.14 and Civil Rule 9.10.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried Group Level: III- Engaging in Sexual Activities on Duty, Dereliction of Duty, Conduct Unbecoming, Diminishing the



	<i>Explanation: Officer Jones-Parks was observing pornography on his personal cell phone on his shift</i>	esteem of Division, Gross Immorality Violation Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried
--	--	--

Allegation I: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct- False Statement

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 3. 12.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Jones-Parks stated during his pre-disciplinary interview that he had not contacted anyone else in the same manner as the complainant; however, the investigation showed he had engaged in similar inappropriate communications with another civilian, as detailed in Allegations E, F, and G.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried Group Level: III- Dishonesty, False statement, untruthfulness during disciplinary procedures Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Make recommendation for Termination of P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598 to Chief Todd.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Failed

Motion: Amend the Group Level III motion of Allegation I: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct and impose a termination as recommended discipline, due to dishonesty in pre-disciplinary interview and multiple aggravating factors.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Allegation J: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



Lt. Albert Oliver, #8586	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 1.07.05.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried
--	--	---

Motion: Tabled remaining cases: 2025-0182, 2024-0072, 2024-0170, 2024-0185, 2024-0197, 2023-0012, 2024-0052, 2025-0123, 2026-0063, 2023-0085, 2023-0101, 2024-0283, 2023-0229, 2024-0266, 2025-0014, 2025-0028, 2025-0035, 2025-0037, and 2025-0039 of the agenda due to time restraints until Aug 26th, 2026, Special Virtual CPRB meeting.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

VI. Executive Session

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 2:46:27 – 5:29:21

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in Law Department Counsel, Human Resources representatives, OPS Administrator Wenninger, and OPS General Manager Watson

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Roll Call Vote: All Present Board Members said “Yes”.

Board Members: Brown, Gatian, Miller, Moore, Parker III, Sharp, and Willis.

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 12:15 p.m. EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 2:51 p.m. EST

VII. OPS Status Report

Jessyca Watson

YouTube Timestamp: 5:34:23 – 5:39:23

OPS General Manager

A. OPS Status Updates

- June 2026
 - In June, OPS received a total of 28 new complaints. One OPS case was administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of 27+ cases for the month.
- July 2026



- In July, OPS received a total of 32 new complaints. One OPS case was administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of 31+ cases for the month.

B. OPS Staff Updates

- Two new investigators positions were posted in July 2026
- Two new employees started in June 2026

VIII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:49:30 – 5:49:42

A. OPS Staff Matters

i. LR3 resolution

Motion: Sustained all charges outlined in the amended LR3 sent August 7th, 2026, against Employee ID: 2013853.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Board's Rationale: The Board sustained the charges because the employee failed to report their March 2025 arrest as required under City policy and then attempted to deceive a police officer by presenting identification from a department they no longer worked for. During the disciplinary process, the employee provided inconsistent and misleading explanations about why they retained the University Heights PD identification, how they returned department property, and why they used the identification during the traffic stop. The Board found these actions violated Civil Service Rule 9.10 and HR policies governing criminally charged employees and progressive discipline and concluded that the employee's repeated dishonesty undermined the integrity of the disciplinary process. For these reasons, the Board voted to sustain all charges listed in the amended LR-3.

Motion: Sustained all charges outlined in the amended LR3 sent August 7th, 2026, against Employee ID: 2013853.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Board's Rationale: The Board moved to terminate the employee due to the seriousness of the misconduct and the significant damage it posed to public trust. Members emphasized that the employee's position carried a high level of responsibility, and their actions, deception during a traffic stop, failure to report an arrest, and repeated dishonesty throughout the disciplinary process, demonstrated a disregard for ethical standards and transparency. The Board concluded that the employee's conduct compromised the credibility of the office and that termination was necessary to protect the integrity of the



department. Considering the progressive discipline policy and the totality of the findings, the Board determined that continued employment was not appropriate.

B. OPS Admin handled disciplinary

Motion: Delegate CPRB's supervisory duties over the Office of Professional Standards, including personnel and disciplinary actions, to OPS Administrator Wenninger.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Board's Rationale: Board members noted that CPRB is a part-time body and cannot manage OPS operations day-to-day. Delegating authority to the Administrator ensures continuity, efficiency, and proper oversight while preserving the Board's ability to intervene or modify the delegation when necessary.

IX. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:39:42 – 5:44:44

A. Hire OPS Investigators

Motion: Hire Applicant ID: 60642702 as a new OPS investigator

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Hire Applicant ID: 39279294 as a new OPS investigator

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

B. New OPS Job Postings

Motion: Authorize the posting of the OPS positions Senior Investigator and Executive Coordinator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

C. OPS 2026-0123 Subpoena Request



Motion: Issue an administrative subpoena to Progressive Field to obtain video footage relevant to OPS2026-0123.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

D. OPS 2026-0125 Subpoena Request

Motion: Issue an administrative subpoena to JACK Casino to obtain video footage relevant to OPS2025-0125.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

E. Special Virtual CPRB Meeting August 26th, 2026, at 9 a.m. EST.

F. The Civilian Police Review Board has a vacancy that needs to be filled, specifically a representative from the 3rd Police District.

X. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:44:44 – 5:45:48

No individuals were present for Public Comment

XI. Adjournment

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 5:45:48 – 5:45:53

Motion: Adjourn August 11th, 2026, CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB August 11th, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 3:07 pm EST.
- The next Special Virtual CPRB Meeting will be on August 26th, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. EST.
- The following CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on September 8th, 2026, at 9:15 a.m. EST.