Memorandum

To: Wally Bobkiewicz, City Manager
From: Richard Eddington, Chief of Police
Subject: EPAC and CPAC
Date: December 29, 2016

During the Human Services Committee meeting there was a request for explanation of the two civilian boards that review complaints regarding the conduct of police personnel.

A memorandum (attached) dated November 29, 2005 and authored by then-police chief Frank Kaminski, documents inception of the Evanston Police Advisory Committee (EPAC). I am pleased to report that two of EPAC’s original members currently serve on the four-person committee, having continued to review complaints since 2005. This continuity of experience is valuable in the evaluation of how the department handles complaints against police, and in affording equity to officers in these matters.

A second memorandum (attached), dated November 19, 2007, establishes the formation of the Citizens Police Advisory Committee (CPAC). At minimum, nine members (one from each ward) staff CPAC. Membership is by mayoral appointment. In 2007 I approached members of EPAC and asked them if they wanted to volunteer to be included in the Citizens Police Advisory Committee. They declined, preferring to maintain their autonomy as consultants to the chief of police. As a result of their decision I am able to avail myself of independent input from both these groups while arriving at decisions regarding adjudication of complaints against police officers. Also included are a flow chart depicting the complaint process and a chart of potential complaint-dispositions.

Should you have any additional questions regarding this matter, please contact me at your convenience.

Richard Eddington

kmt
attachments (4)
CITY OF EVANSTON  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM  

November 29, 2005  

To: Human Services Committee  

From: Frank Kaminski, Chief of Police  

Subject: COMPLAINT REVIEWS  

At the last Human Services Committee, I indicated that I was going to pilot test an additional review process for citizen complaints. I would like to explain the pilot process that I have implemented.  

First, I presented this issue at the September meeting of my Advisory Board. I asked the Board for volunteers that would be interested in reviewing citizen complaints before they went to the Human Services Committee. Approximately ten people volunteered to participate in this pilot program. I advised them that I would randomly contact three people to serve on the review panel. At the review session, I would present them with a summary of the complaint. This summary would contain all the information about the case, but it would not identify officers or citizens by name. The review panel would not have access to the reviews completed by the supervisors. Their charge was to do an independent review of the complaint based on the facts of the case. In addition, at the review session, a member of the Office of Professional Standards would be available to answer any questions about the investigation.  

On November 3, 2005, I held the first review session. Three board members participated in the review session. Two complaint reviews were given to the group. Prior to the review session, the panel received training on the investigative process for complaints as well as the disposition classifications. They reviewed each complaint separately and then discussed it as a group. A member of the Office of Professional Standards was available to answer their questions. The review of the two complaints lasted about two hours.  

In summary, I thought the process went very well. The reviews were thorough and they asked many questions. The members of the review session requested that their names not be included in any report.
November 29, 2005

To: Human Services Committee

From: Frank Kaminski, Chief of Police

Subject: COMPLAINT REVIEWS

The two complaints you will review tonight went through the process. The panel's comments are included.

Also, as usual, I've included complimentary letters about the Department. There are 124.

Frank Kaminski
Chief of Police

FK/srd
Attachment
CITY OF EVANSTON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

D-R-A-F-T – REVISED 11-30-07

Date:      November 19, 2007
To:        Human Services Committee
From:      Richard Eddington, Chief of Police
Subject:   CITIZENS’ POLICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Following is a conceptual outline for the Citizens’ Police Advisory Committee (CPAC),
based on the points of agreement shared by Madelyn Ducre, Betty Sue Ester, Peter
Gibbs, Loretha Henry, Bennett Johnson, Judith Treadway and the chief of police.

The aldermen of the Human Services Committee are advised that this proposal is viewed
by the residents as an interim solution, i.e. as a bridge to an eventual fully-empowered
citizens’ review board that is authorized by city ordinance. In the view of the chief of
police, however, this proposal can be a permanent solution.

CONCEPT OUTLINE – CITIZENS POLICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This proposal outlines the duties and responsibilities of the CPAC membership,
consisting of no less than four to not more than nine residents of the community, with no
more than two (2) citizens coming from any one ward, selected and appointed by the
Human Services Committee. Advisory in nature to the chief of police, the group will meet
monthly, or on a timeline acceptable by mutual agreement between the committee and
the chief of police. The purpose of the CPAC is to review all complaints against
police officers. Complaints will be presented in the same format as they are presented to the Human Services Committee. The CPAC review process will occur prior to the review by the Human Services Committee.

**Human Services Committee**

A procedural change significant to both the CPAC and the Human Services Committee is that, effective January 2008, both formal and informal complaints will be reported. Currently only formal complaints (CRs) are reported to the Human Services Committee.

The goals of the CPAC are:

- To provide the chief of police with the community’s perspective on disciplinary matters
- To aid in assuring that citizens are provided redress when they have complaints regarding police department employees
- To ensure that all complaints are thoroughly investigated
- To ensure transparency and accountability of the police department to the community
- To convey to the community a more positive perspective of the police department
- To convey to the police department a more positive perspective of the community
- To recommend constructive changes in police conduct, quality of service, and policy
Due to its advisory nature, the CPAC’s activities and dialogue with the chief of police will not preclude its members from approaching the Human Services Committee as concerned citizens to discuss in that venue complaints against police personnel.

The citizens’ group and the chief of police concur that the following items can be accomplished in short order, with minimum cost.

1. All complaints will be documented and investigated. One complaint form will be used for all complaints.

2. The complaint protocol will be disseminated throughout the community so citizens will know the procedures for filing complaints against police department personnel.

3. Envelopes will be provided so that complaints can be submitted in confidence directly to the Office of Professional Standards. Complaint forms and envelopes will be available at the Civic Center, the police department, and community centers.

NOTE: Complaint forms currently are available. Envelopes will be added upon implementation of the program.

4. The police department will notify members of the CPAC of all complaints received. (The logistics of this issue remain in the discussion stage. The citizen group wants daily notification. The chief of police prefers monthly notifications.) The citizen filing a complaint against a police officer has the right to discuss the final decision of the chief of police with the CPAC. The CPAC will make recommendations to the chief of police regarding future training needs, so as to avoid incidents of misconduct.
## Citizen's Police Advisory Committee “CPAC”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Ward</th>
<th>2nd Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lytle</td>
<td>Tim Higgins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Ward</th>
<th>4th Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Wiggins</td>
<td>Aleksandr Granchalek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5th Ward</th>
<th>6th Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Wells</td>
<td>Robert R. Egan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3rd Ward
Rebecca Biller

8th Ward
Marie Babb-Fowler

9th Ward
Harriet Sallach
What happens after my complaint has been filed?
Disposition Classifications

"Pending"
Still under investigation or administrative review

"SOL (Unresolved)"
The complainant failed to cooperate further

"Unfounded"
The allegations were proven false or not factual

"Sustained"
The allegation was supported by sufficient evidence to justify a reasonable conclusion of guilt

"Withdrawn"
The complaint was withdrawn by the complainant

"Not Sustained"
There was not sufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations

"Exonerated"
The incident occurred, but was lawful and proper

"Not City Related"
The complaint was not related to any official conduct and was outside the jurisdiction of the Evanston Police