Memorandum

To: Human Services Committee Chair, Alderman Mark Tendam
Members of the Human Services Committee

From: Kimberly Richardson, Assistant to the City Manager
Aretha Barnes, Deputy Chief of Police

Subject: Community Feedback for Proposed of “Citizen Complaint Working Group”

Date: May 1, 2017

Recommended Action:
Staff recommends the Committee receive the following recommendations developed by community members regarding the creation of a Citizen Complaint Working Group following several community meetings.

Summary:

The meeting participants were tasked with answering the following questions:

1. What would be the goals, roles and responsibilities of the working group?
2. Who should select the members of the working group and why?
3. What should the makeup of the working group look like in terms of community partnerships, residents, CPAC, etc.? How do we ensure diversity?
4. How many people should serve on the working group, and why?
5. When should the working group report findings and recommendations to the Human Services Committee and why?

Recommendation:

1. **Goals:** Authentic and representative of community voices - New structure for oversight and how citizens are heard - Impartial oversight - Independent from government - Transparent process - Access EPD data/stats (legal only) - Constant and consistent communication between police and community through a variety of formats (town hall, email, etc.)

2. **Roles:** Community representative - Communicator - Researcher - Transparent process that respects confidentiality

3. **Responsibilities:** Research best police practices in other communities (including academic work) - Represent constituents - Reach out to ALL constituents -
Understand the police department - Educate themselves, the community, and police

4. **Group make-up/Diversity:** Experts and constituents -Someone from ETHS Someone from D65 - Social service agency - Ward representation- YMCA – YWCA- Latino Resource Group- NU student government –NAACP- Religious institutions –YOU- Moran Center -Open Communities- Police and/or union liaison as necessary Health care/hospitals

   **A. This group should look like Evanston:** Over policed communities- High crime communities -Black males/females/young -Brown males/females/young Victims of police misconduct -Latino community- LGBTQ+- Seniors -Students Renters- Home owners -Business owner- Unaffiliated community member.

5. **Member Selection:**
   A. **Task force.** Create an eight-member task force to coordinate and manage the member selection process for the Working Group. The task force members (Joan Hickman, Marie Babb-Fowler, Karen Courtright, Betsy Wilson, Rabbi Dov Klein, Carol Jungman, Jared Davis, and Bobby Burns). Members were selected by the meeting participants at the April 26 meeting.

   **Task Force Duties:**
   - Reach out to organizations identified by the under “Group make-up/diversity”. Those organizations would choose a representative for the Working Group.
   - Will coordinate and manage the selection process for the Working Group.
   - Task force nominates and the city council approves.

6. **Number of Members:** Range of 15-21 members, facilitator not included in the count.

7. **Working Group Report Back:** Six to nine months, which includes open meetings, public hearings and regular progress reports to HSC.

**Attachment:**
Facilitation Notes
Our goals for tonight are:
1. clarify your responses from our last meeting
2. to come to consensus on as many questions as possible

1. What would be the goals, roles, and responsibilities of the working group?
2. Who should select the members of the working group and why?
3. What should the makeup of the working group look like in terms of community partnerships, residents, CPAC, etc? How do we ensure diversity?
4. How many people should serve on the working group? Why?
5. When should the working group report findings and recommendations toe the Human Services Committee and why?
Coming to consensus

- Zero fingers- no way, terrible choice; I will not go along with this
- 1 finger- I have serious reservations with this idea, but I vote to move forward
- 2 fingers- I have some concerns, but I will go along with it
- 3 fingers- I support the idea
- 4 fingers- I like this decision
- 5 fingers- This is great! I will champion this idea
What would be the goals, roles, and responsibilities of the working group?

**Goals, Roles, Responsibilities**

Community voice - ongoing communication between community and police
Voice in process
Create a different structure for how citizens are heard
Impartial accountability
List what we are trying to resolve
Make police complaint process transparent

Define the problem
How the police interact with the public
This should be larger than police complaints and deal with the culture of the police

Recommendation to come up an ordinance or referendum to establish new oversight process
Study other community’s processes

**Roles**

constant communication with the public through a variety of formats (meetings, email, websites)
open meeting
townhall
engage with the community in many forms
two-way communication
Research best practices
Have easy access to EPD data and information
Education
Public
Police
Working group

**Responsibilities**

Understand the police department
Understand and reach out to constituents
What would be the goals, roles, and responsibilities of the working group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Authentic and representative of community voices</td>
<td>- Community representative</td>
<td>- Research best police practices in other communities (including academic work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New structure for oversight and how citizens are heard</td>
<td>- Communicator</td>
<td>- Represent constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impartial oversight</td>
<td>- Researcher</td>
<td>- Reach out to ALL constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Independent from government</td>
<td>- Transparent process that respects confidentiality</td>
<td>- Understand the police department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transparent process</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Educate themselves, the community, and police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access EPD data/stats-legal only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Constant and consistent communication between police and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through a variety of formats (town hall, email, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Is this answered by the next question?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission: Referendum or ordinance establishing new oversight process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of civilian complaint process and discovery of other areas requiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What should the makeup of the working group look like in terms of community partnerships, residents, CPAC, etc? How do we ensure diversity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Group Make-up/Diversity</strong></th>
<th><strong>This group should look like Evanston</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts and constituents</td>
<td>Over policed communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone from ETHS</td>
<td>High crime communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone from D65</td>
<td>Black males/females/young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service agency</td>
<td>Brown males/females/young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward representation</td>
<td>Victims of police misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Latino community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Resource Group</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU student government</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAACP</td>
<td>Renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>Home owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Center</td>
<td>Unaffiliated community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and/or union liaison as necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care/hospitals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should select the members of the working group and why?

- community groups
- interfaith organizations
- NAACP
- Schools
- Volunteers solicited by committee
- Professionals in the field
- Appointments
- Student organizations through questionnaires
- Organizations choose a representative

Only non-governmental people will decide who’s in the group.
Task force nominates and the city council approves.
Plan for April 26th

1. Decide which organizations in each category should be invited to the “table”
2. Who, from this committee, should form a subcommittee to manage the next step (called the Task Force)? How many people should be on that task force?

Other challenges
Application process for the general public- who will the process privilege and who will it deny?
How will this group make sure it’s not the usual cast of characters and really try to bring new and vital voices to the conversation?
Task Force Members
Joan Hickman
Marie Babb-Fowler
Karen Courtright
Betsy Wilson
Rabbi Dov Klein
Carol Jungman
Jared Davis
Bobby Burns
Groups organized by theme or purpose

- Experts (policy folks, constitutional law, researchers)
- Social justice organizations
- Restorative justice organizations
- Youth development organizations
- Senior groups
- Equity groups
- Mental health agencies
- Homelessness agencies
- Educational institutions (D65, D202, private schools)
- Northwestern students
- Faith communities
- Civil Right organizations
- Organizations that support those who are physically, cognitively, mentally disabled
- Staff or clientele or community
How many people should serve on the working group? Why?

Members with multiple perspectives
15-21
Facilitator who is not part of the 15-21

Agreement around capacity and connection and representative of the community
When should the working group report findings and recommendations to the Human Services Committee and why?

- 6-9 months
- Open meetings
- Public hearings
- Regular progress reports to HSC