

Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time	21 November 2025 09:00 PST	Meeting type	Zoom
Organiser	Mr. Rupesh	Client	Citywide

Attendees (Internal)

- Rupesh
- Kuldeep
- Jaspreet
- Kapil
- Rahul
- Akash

Attendees (Client Side)

- Teresa, Matt

Agenda

- **Discussions on the following:**
 - PSSP Issues Review
 - Shift Editing – Name Disappearing Issue
 - Rejected Shifts Not Showing on Officer DAR
 - Rejected Reports – Visibility & Notifications
 - Overtime Calculation Logic
 - User Tracking – Mapping with Shifts
 - Mobile App – Offline Mode Requirements
 - Mobile App – Unnecessary Modules & Feedback
 - Sprint Priorities & Sub-Prioritization
 - PSSP Implementation Priorities
 - Scheduling – Publish Shifts Enhancement

The following things are discussed:

1. PSSP Issues Review:

a. Officers Showing as Inactive Incorrectly

- i. Issue: Officers appear **inactive** despite submitting reports within minutes.
- ii. Current logic (explained by Jaspreet):
 1. The system checks the last activity within the **previous hour**.
 2. If no activity in the past hour → marked inactive.
- iii. Problem:
 1. Officers become inactive even after **10 minutes** of no reporting.
 2. PSSP uses the Active/Inactive indicator as a directive.

b. Need for Improved Threshold Logic

- i. Suggestions from client:
 1. Introduce a **configurable inactivity threshold** (e.g., 10m, 20m, 30m).
 2. Should consider both:
 - a. **Report submissions**, and
 - b. **GPS movement / tracking pings**

c. Linking Activity Status With GPS

- i. Teresa's requirement:
 1. If the GPS pin moves outside the **200-foot radius**, officers should show **active**, even without reports.
 2. If the officer stays within radius beyond the threshold → show **inactive**.
- ii. The current system only uses **report saving** for activity.
- iii. Kuldeep's response:
 1. Can add threshold logic.
 2. Can link status with **GPS movement**.
 3. For patrol officers:
 - a. 200-foot radius unsuitable → too many pins.
 - b. Suggestion: 1-mile threshold for patrol beats.

d. Beat-Based Threshold

- i. Teresa suggested different thresholds by **beat**:
- ii. Agreement:
 1. Add **threshold value in Beat onboarding**.
 2. Standing officers → global threshold.
 3. Patrol officers → beat-specific threshold.

e. Role Settings Issue After Last Build

- i. Problem:
 1. Role settings revert to the officer's **primary role** instead of the role tied to the **assigned shift**.
- ii. This behavior changed after the recent build.
- iii. Team confirmed:
 1. Will check and fix.

f. “Received By” Column

- i. Need a new column in the Calls table:
- ii. Should appear in:

- 1. Open calls
 - 2. Past calls
 - iii. Searching is enough; filter not required.
- g. Search Fix in Past Calls**
 - i. Current issue:
 - 1. Searching for the exact call type (e.g., "Traffic Stop") shows no results.
 - 2. Partial search ("Traffic") returns results.
 - ii. Team to fix the full keyword search.
- h. Auto-Attach Responding Officer**
 - i. When dispatch enters a call as "Radio" and selects the caller:
 - 1. The system should **auto-select that officer** in the responding officer list.
 - ii. Only on-duty officers make radio calls → no need for exception handling.
- i. Holding Reports Until Approved**
 - i. **Client Requirement**
 - 1. Do not send reports to clients until **all reports** for the site in last 24 hours are **approved**.
 - 2. Prevents managers receiving missing reports because one major report is pending.
 - ii. **Discussion**
 - 1. Teresa prefers giving **site-level options**, e.g.:
 - a. "Send approved only"
 - b. "Hold until ALL approved"
 - 2. Jaspreet is concerned this may cause confusion if nothing is sent.
 - 3. Teresa clarified:
 - a. If reports aren't received, companies can be notified it's due to pending approvals.
 - b. Better than sending incomplete sets.
 - iii. **Decision:**
 - 1. Add **options** for partial vs full report approval logic.
- j. Officer Still Being Scheduled on Approved Leave**
 - i. **Issue:**
 - 1. Officers are being scheduled during their approved leave period.
 - ii. **Jaspreet noted:**
 - 1. Leave has time-based rules; mismatch in timing may cause edge cases.
 - iii. **Teresa's example:**
 - 1. The officer requested leave for 21–25.
 - 2. Officer still scheduled on the **23rd**, which should not be possible.
 - iv. **Action:**
 - 1. Team to review scenarios and fix any logic breaks.
 - 2. Teresa sent a video recording.
- k. Leave Request UI Enhancements**
 - i. **Full List View Needed**
 - 1. Current behavior:

- a. Only shows current date's leave requests unless filtered.
- 2. Client request:
 - a. Default view = full list of all leave requests from start.
 - b. After clearing filters → return to full list view.
- 3. The team acknowledged and will update the UI behavior.

I. Payroll Module – Sorting Enhancements

- i. **Issue:** Payroll currently sorts officers alphabetically by first name only.
- ii. **Client Request:** Add an option to sort by **last name**.
- iii. **Discussion:**
 - 1. Jaspreet asked if both sorting types could be supported.
 - 2. Kuldeep highlighted:
 - a. Sorting by last name affects the entire system, not only one screen.
 - 3. Teresa mentioned earlier discussions where the team decided to stick with first name → last name.
 - 4. Possible solution proposed: radio button to choose sorting preference.
- iv. **Conclusion:**
 - 1. The team will internally discuss feasibility and impact.
 - 2. Not as simple as it appears due to system-wide name usage.

m. Reopening Previous Shifts – Attendance Impact

- i. **Issue:** When officers reopen previous day or previous shift reports, the system:
 - 1. Removes their checkout
 - 2. Reopens/extends the shift
 - 3. Causes inflated shift hours (e.g., 27-hour shift appearing)
- ii. **Client Requirement:**
 - 1. Reopening previous shift reports should NOT affect attendance or alter punch records.
- iii. **Team Response:**
 - 1. Jaspreet will review existing shift reopening code logic.
 - 2. Ravinder asked if check-in is impacted → Teresa confirmed only checkout is removed.
- iv. **Workflow Issue:**
 - 1. Officers often fix previous reports during their next shift.
 - 2. Client wants to **disconnect** the reopening of old reports from attendance logic.
- v. **Action:** Team to provide a solution after code review.

n. Officers Unable to Clock In / Clock Out

- i. Problem often linked to:
 - 1. Previous shifts left incomplete
 - 2. Old punch records not properly closed
 - 3. Historical double-table attendance data issues
- ii. Teresa scenario:
 - 1. If admin manually clocks an officer in, the officer:
 - a. **Cannot clock out** later
 - b. Buttons do not appear because system expects a self clock-in
- iii. **Team Notes**

1. Jaspreet explained historic issues with dual attendance tables.
2. Some older shifts may still have mismatched entries affecting new punches.
3. Needs backend cleanup of older records.

iv. Required Fix

1. When admin clocks someone in:
 - a. The system should still display a clock-out button for the officer.
2. Officers should not be blocked because of old clock-out issues.
3. **Action:** Team to check affected accounts (including Waltering's login) and clean remaining inconsistent data.

o. Previous Clock-Out Verification Message

- i. Officers get a message asking to verify previous clock-out even when they DID clock out.
- ii. Caused by:
 1. Past issues with incomplete entries in one of the attendance tables.
- iii. Client Expectation:
 1. Once the admin fixes the clock-out → the officer must not receive the message again the next day.

iv. Action:

1. Team to run cleanup/fixes during low-traffic hours (7 AM EST / 4 AM IST).
2. Client approves this window.

p. Ability to Lock Approved Punches

i. Client Requirement

1. Need a **permission-based locking system** for attendance punches.
2. Features requested:
 - a. Ability to **lock** a date range of shifts (previous dates only).
 - b. Once locked:
 - i. No edits allowed to punches.
 - ii. Only users with elevated permission can unlock.
 - c. Locking should:
 - i. Allow copying & pasting shifts.
 - ii. Disable drag & drop on locked shifts.

ii. Team Clarification

1. Jaspreet asked if drag-and-drop should be disabled → **Yes**.
2. Copy/paste → **Allowed**.

iii. Action:

1. Introduce a new permission: "**Lock/Unlock Shifts**"
2. Restrict locking to **past** shifts only.

q. Minor Payroll & Employee Status Requests

i. Projected Hours – Default Filter

1. Requested that the "Projected Hours" filter in payroll should default to All.

ii. Terminated Employees in Payroll Reports

1. Issue:

- a. Terminated employees disappear from payroll reports.
 - b. Requires un-terminating → entering time → re-terminating (not ideal).
2. Client Requirement:
 - a. Deactivate → remove system access only.
 - b. Termination → employees still visible in historical payroll reports.

iii. Team Confirmation:

1. Any historical work must continue to appear on all reports.

r. Shift Publishing Issues

i. Edits Not Reflecting After Publish

1. When editing a published shift:
 - a. If only time/note is changed → should reflect after officer refresh.
 - b. Team unable to replicate issue; works correctly on their side.

ii. Editing Assigned Officer

1. If user removes Officer A and assigns Officer B:
 - a. Currently published immediately.
2. Discussion:
 - a. Teresa prefers making such changes **unpublished** to allow reviewing before publishing.
3. Conclusion:
 - a. If assigned person changes → shift should move to **Unpublished** status.

iii. Action: Update publishing logic accordingly.

s. Scheduling – Payroll Report Error

i. Payroll Report Not Showing All Employees

1. When selecting All in the Payroll Scheduling Report:
 - a. Errors occur due to employees with missing or incomplete punches.
2. Client Expectation:
 - a. Same behavior as existing report:
 - i. Include those with hours
 - ii. Exclude those without
 - iii. But report should not fail

ii. Action: Team to inspect error handling and ensure stable output.

t. Dropdown Default Values

i. Request:

1. All dropdowns with record limits (10, 25, 50, 100) should:
 - a. Default to maximum allowed, OR
 - b. Provide infinite scroll.

ii. Concerns:

1. The client asked whether loading max data each time would slow the system.

iii. Team Response:

1. Will start by implementing on major screens and observe performance.

u. Attendance – Call-Out Documentation Visibility

- i. **Current behavior:**
 - 1. Officer disappears after call-out marking.
 - ii. **Client requirement:**
 - 1. Need call-out to be **visible/documentated**, not removed.
 - iii. **Resolution:**
 - 1. The ERM module will handle call-out stamping.
 - 2. The client is satisfied with the ERM-based solution.
- v. Geofence Clock-In Behavior**
- i. **Issue:**
 - 1. Some officers receive message:
 - a. “You are outside the geofence. Do you still want to clock in?”
 - 2. The system currently does not allow clock-ins outside geofence.
 - ii. **Client Concern:**
 - 1. Some officers appear able to clock in anyway.
 - iii. **Action:**
 - 1. Team to test geofence logic to confirm:
 - a. No bypass is allowed.
 - b. Investigate any environments where it's not behaving correctly.
- 2. Shift Editing – Name Disappearing Issue**
- a. Teresa reported that during shift edits (changing time or officer), the officer's name sometimes disappears and shows only the ID/number.
 - b. The team attempted replication but could not reproduce it consistently.
 - c. The issue may have been related to previous glitches or loading problems.
 - d. **Action:** Ravinder to check the issue on the specific instance shared by Teresa using test data.
- 3. Rejected Shifts Not Showing on Officer DAR**
- a. Rejected reports are **not appearing on the top of the DAR**, forcing officers to browse through the full date range manually.
 - b. Status updates were previously not functioning correctly.
 - c. **Action:** Team to verify if fixes made during report conversion are already deployed.
 - d. **Note:** Fixes will be available in the next production build.
- 4. Rejected Reports – Visibility & Notifications**
- a. Agents should receive a **notification** when a report is rejected.
 - b. Clicking the notification should take the agent to their reports page, with the rejected report **pinned on top**.
 - c. The team discussed whether sorting/filtering could be used.
 - d. **Action:** Introduce a filter option to show only *Rejected* reports for easier visibility.
 - e. Improvements will be part of the upcoming build containing report conversion fixes.
- 5. Overtime Calculation Logic**
- a. Current system: calculates overtime based on shifts created within the month and marks only the latest shift as OT when the threshold is passed.
 - b. Teresa clarified the correct rule:
 - i. Overtime must be based on **actual sequence of worked days**, not creation date.

- ii. If earlier shifts are added later (e.g., a shift on 3rd added after the 20th), the overtime threshold should be recalculated from the first working day.

c. **Decision:**

- i. Overtime calculation will use **chronological shift order** and recalculate if backdated shifts are added.

6. User Tracking – Mapping with Shifts

- a. Current Issue: User tracking is **not mapped with shift IDs**, making it unclear which tracking corresponds to which shift.

b. **Decision:**

- i. Add shift selection option:
 - 1. User selects a date/user → system fetches all shifts.
 - 2. Users can select **one shift** to view tracking (needed for play/pause feature).
 - 3. If no shift is selected → show all points for the day.

- c. Teresa agreed this solution is ideal, especially with upcoming play/pause functionality.

7. Mobile App – Offline Mode Requirements

- a. Discussion on which modules should support offline mode.

- b. Teresa clarified:

- i. Offline capability should apply to **all modules used by stationary/patrol/mobile officers**.
- ii. Admin modules do not need offline support at this stage.
- iii. Leave applications should also support offline saving (if accessible to officers).

- c. **Action:** Team to implement offline-first logic for all officer-facing modules.

8. Mobile App – Unnecessary Modules & Feedback

- a. Some items shown in the mobile build (e.g., violations listing) confused Teresa.

- b. Jaspreet clarified:

- i. Violations were visible in V1 and permissions determine visibility.

- c. Vishesh is preparing a detailed explanation covering:

- i. Why certain modules appear
- ii. Their use cases
- iii. Advantages

- d. **Action:** Jaspreet to send the detailed email to Teresa.

9. Sprint Priorities & Sub-Prioritization

- a. Teresa had added top-level priorities only.

- b. Tom suggested **sub-prioritization** within each major priority group.

- c. Jaspreet requested updated sub-priorities for Priority 2 and onward.

d. **Decision:**

- i. Team 1 → Priority 1 items
- ii. Team 2 → Priority 2 items
- iii. Team 3 → Priority 3 items

- e. **Action:** Teresa to update sub-priorities today; Jaspreet to adjust sprints accordingly.

10. PSSP Implementation Priorities

- a. Several PSSP-related change requests need alignment with current sprint planning.

- b. Teresa confirmed PSSP items should also be treated as priority, especially those blocking operations.
- c. **Action:**
 - i. Teresa to share the updated priority sheet.
 - ii. Jaspreet to categorize:
 - 1. Items doable quickly
 - 2. Items requiring more time
 - iii. Sprint planning to include quick-win PSSP items.

11. Scheduling – Publish Shifts Enhancement

- a. Ravinder suggested adding the option to **publish shifts per site or per date range** instead of publishing all shifts at once.
- b. Teresa agreed this is useful but **not a high-priority requirement**.
- c. **Decision:**
 - i. Features to be considered for future enhancements.
 - ii. Implement only if it aligns with ongoing scheduling work.



