

REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Dorothy Ann David, City Manager

DATE: January 20, 2017

SUBJECT: Citizen Review of Police Complaints SS 2017-004

A. Introduction: The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a summary of the recommendations from the Police Complaint Working Group and to seek Council direction concerning the Police Department's processes for investigating citizen complaints and reviewing use of force incidents. The Police Complaint Working Group is recommending:

- The creation of a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission which would serve in an advisory capacity and assist the Community Relations Office in their review of Police complaint investigations, including the possible use of the HRC's subpoena power to obtain witness statements or evidence which would assist in the investigative process.
- The selection of a group of citizens who would attend the monthly internal Use of Force Review Board meetings, ensure the process is thorough, fair and sensitive to community concerns about police use of force, and provide recommendations to the Chief of Police.
- An increase in public outreach and communication, specifically regarding the police complaint process, the use of force review process, and the availability of more information and better citizen access through the City's website.
- The identification of community-based agencies and citizen advocate volunteers who could be trained to assist staff with public education and the intake of citizen complaints and police commendations.

B. Recommended Action: The Administration recommends that City Council accept the recommendations, to include directing staff to begin drafting an ordinance which would authorize the creation of a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission whose members would assist with reviewing complaint investigations and providing recommendations to the Chief of Police.

C. Prior Council Action:

- In December 1998 the City Council discussed the Police citizen complaint process.
- In early 1999 the City Council adopted Council Bill 99-066 amending the purpose of the Human Relations Commission to include auditing aggregate statistics on citizen complaints against the police.
- On July 27, 2007, City Council held a Study Session and reviewed a Report ([SS 2007-053](#)) by the Police-Community Relations Committee regarding a Police Review Board. Although Council directed staff to make some procedural changes, they also directed staff not to establish a review board.

- On December 8, 2009, the City announced several initiatives, one of which was focused on improving the police complaint process.
- On June 22, 2010, City Council held a Study Session and reviewed a Report ([SS 2010-044](#)). As a result of the Study Session, Council directed staff to implement changes to the police complaint process which were focused on how citizens could file complaints, offering mediation as an alternative, reporting the results of an investigation, and public education.
- On February 7, 2013, City Council held a Study Session and reviewed a Report ([SS 2013-007](#)) summarizing changes to the complaint process that were initiated by the Police Department.
- On April 26, 2016, City Council held a Study Session and reviewed a Report ([SS 2016-022](#)) which summarized the current processes for investigating citizen complaints and reviewing use of force incidents and provided an overview of the various models of citizen review, including those which incorporate subpoena power.

D. Summary:

- Following a Study Session (SS 2016-022) on April 26, 2016, Council directed the Chief of Police to form a working group to conduct a more in-depth study on the topic of citizen review of police complaints. In June 2016, Chief Anthony Cobb selected fourteen individuals to serve on a Police Complaint Working Group. The Police Complaint Working Group is made up of both community members and City staff.
- The Working Group was specifically tasked with gathering input and making specific recommendations for improving the existing complaint and use of force review processes.
- The Working Group held ten meetings between July 2016 and January 2017 during which they studied the Police Department's existing processes and the various models of citizen review and reviewed materials specifically related to potential improvements to the citizen complaint and use of force review processes.
- The Working Group also held three public meetings during which they gathered public feedback on the current complaint process and models of citizen review. At the final meeting on January 5, 2017, they presented their draft recommendations for public comment.
- The Working Group also found that through the internal Use of Force Review Board the Police Department already has a good process in place for evaluating use of force incidents to identify policy, training, tactical, and equipment issues and then make improvements.
- The Working Group concluded that any changes to the existing complaint investigation and use of force review processes should be focused towards building upon and enhancing those processes, not replacing them.
- The Working Group also concluded that the City and the Police Department need to do a better and more regular job of communicating with citizens concerning these processes and also how complaints can be filed.
- The Working Group is recommending that Council appoint a standing subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission which would be responsible for assisting the Community Relations Office with reviewing citizen complaint investigations and making recommendations to the Chief of Police.

- The Working Group is also recommending that the Chief of Police select a group of citizens to attend the Police Department's monthly internal Use of Force Review Board meetings. One or two citizens would attend each monthly meeting and they would ask questions, participate in discussions, ensure that the process is thorough, fair, and sensitive to community concerns about police use of force, and provide recommendations to the Chief of Police.

E. Background:

1. Formation of Police Complaint Working Group. Following the April 26, 2016 Study Session (SS 2016-022), Council directed the Chief of Police to form a working group that was to be tasked with a more in-depth study of the topic of citizen review. Chief Anthony Cobb selected fourteen members to serve and formed the Police Complaint Working Group in June 2016. The Working Group included representatives from the Human Relations Commission, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the North End Breakfast Club, the Ministerial Alliance, two University of Illinois professors, representatives of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Director of Human Resources from the City of Urbana. The Working Group was tasked with gathering public input and making specific recommendations for improving the existing complaint and use of force review processes. The formation of the Working Group facilitated consultation with community members and employees and allowed them opportunities to provide input prior to further consideration of this issue by Council. The names of the members of the Working Group are listed in Attachment A.

2. Police Complaint Working Group Process. The Police Complaint Working Group held ten meetings between July 2016 and January 2017. During these meetings, the Working Group carefully studied the Police Department's current processes for investigating citizen complaints and reviewing use of force incidents. The Working Group also studied the various models of citizen review and additional materials that might impact the implementation of citizen review in the City of Champaign, including but not limited to the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) Labor Agreement, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), the Open Meetings Act, the Peace Officer Bill of Rights, and subpoena power.

The scope of the Working Group's activities included the following:

- Reviewing the Police Department's history with regards to citizen complaints.
- Examining the current process for the intake, investigation, and review of citizen complaints and making recommendations for improving that process.
- Reviewing the Police Department's history with regards to the review of use of force incidents and making recommendations for improving the current process.
- Evaluating citizen review models in comparable communities and recommending whether elements of those models should be implemented. Elements considered included: defining the scope of citizen review; what types of employee conduct should be subject to citizen review; whether review should be conducted internally or externally and with volunteers or paid investigators/reviewers; at what stage in the process citizen involvement should occur, and; whether subpoena power should be included.

- Gathering public input about the police complaint process, the use of force review process, and citizen review models.
- Proposing a process for periodic reporting and evaluation of the complaint process.
- Determining whether or not some form of citizen review is appropriate at this time.

The Working Group also held community meetings on October 10, 2016 at Mount Olive Baptist Church, on October 13, 2016 at Centennial High School, and on January 5, 2017 at Booker T. Washington School. At the first two public meetings, Police Administration presented complaint and use of force data to community members, provided a summary of the Police Department's current processes for investigating citizen complaints and reviewing use of force incidents, and provided an overview of the various models of citizen review. Following those presentations, Police Administration and members of the Working Group gathered public feedback concerning those processes, specifically as it related to the consideration of citizen review.

At the third meeting on January 5, 2017, the Working Group presented information on the process they used to evaluate the citizen complaint and use of force review processes, they presented their conclusions resulting from those reviews, and they gathered public feedback concerning their recommendations.

A summary of the feedback received during the three community meetings is included in Attachment B.

The City also created a [webpage](#) specifically devoted to the Police Complaint Working Group and publicized their meetings through civic notices and social media posts. Throughout this process all meeting agendas, handout materials, and meeting minutes were posted on that webpage for public review.

3. Conclusions of the Police Complaint Working Group. After careful study, the Working Group reached the following conclusions:

- a. The Working Group found the Police Department's current process for investigating citizen complaints to be both thorough and objective.
- b. The Working Group determined that the Department has good internal processes in place to evaluate use of force incidents to identify policy, training, tactical, and equipment issues and then make improvements.
- c. The Working Group concluded that the City and the Police Department need to better and more regularly communicate with citizens concerning those processes.
- d. The Board believes that changes to the investigation of citizen complaints and the review of use of force incidents should be focused towards building upon and enhancing the existing processes rather than replacing them.
- e. The Board also believes that the credibility of existing processes would be enhanced, and the processes would be more transparent, if citizens were involved.

4. Current Citizen Complaint Process. The complaint process was last modified in 2013. At that time, Police Administration implemented changes in an effort to enhance Police accountability and to increase public transparency throughout the process. This was primarily accomplished by including the Community Relations Office in the complaint intake, complainant interview, and investigative review processes. The current complaint process is summarized below:

- a. Complaints can currently be filed in person at either the Police Department or at the Community Relations Office. Written complaints can be dropped off at or mailed to either location. Complaints can also be filed online through the City’s website. Though it is not preferred, complaints can also be filed by telephone.
- b. Each citizen complaint is investigated under the authority of the Office of Professional Standards. That office is staffed by a lieutenant and managed by a deputy chief. The Deputy Chief of Professional Standards is responsible for the coordination and review of all complaint investigations, but the vast majority of investigations are conducted by the lieutenant assigned to the office.
- c. Each complaint, regardless of where it originates or how it is filed, is ultimately directed to the Professional Standards Lieutenant. When a complaint is received, the Professional Standards Lieutenant promptly reports it to the Community Relations Office so that it can be recorded and tracked.
- d. Although the Office of Professional Standards retains responsibility for the complaint investigation, the investigation itself and all related materials are continually available to the Community Relations Office. This allows the Community Relations Office to serve in an advisory role throughout the process.
- e. The Community Relations Manager is afforded the opportunity to be present during interviews and/or re-interviews with complainants.
- f. Prior to the onset of a citizen complaint investigation, the Professional Standards Lieutenant consults with the Community Relations Manager concerning the steps to be taken during the investigation. This allows the Community Relations Manager an opportunity to provide input into the investigative process.
- g. Complaint investigations are occasionally centered upon complex legal issues involving search, seizure, and/or arrest. In such cases, those investigations are also forwarded to the City Attorney’s Office for an expert opinion. Other complaint investigations hinge on legal issues which are, at least to some extent, open for interpretation. As an example, an investigation might be focused upon the “reasonableness” of an officer’s use of force during a given situation. In such a case, an expert opinion would not only be helpful during the investigative phase, but also during the disciplinary phase should discipline result from the investigation.

- h. At the conclusion of each citizen complaint investigation, a copy of the complete investigation is forwarded to the Community Relations Manager for review. If the Community Relations Manager disagrees with the complaint findings or has concerns with the investigation, then a review committee is convened to discuss the complaint investigation and final disposition. Although such a committee has never been convened, if one were to be convened it would include the investigating supervisor, the police administrators who reviewed the investigation, and the Community Relations Manager. After discussing the case, the review committee would then recommend findings or additional investigative steps to the Chief of Police for consideration.
- i. At the conclusion of each investigation, both the complainant and the officer who was the subject of the investigation are informed of the disposition of the complaint in writing.
- j. A complainant who disagrees with the disposition or classification of a complaint has the right to appeal the classification and/or investigative findings to the City Manager.

5. Recommended Additions to the Complaint Process. The Working Group believes that it is appropriate to retain all current steps in the intake, investigation, and review of citizen complaints but also recognizes that the process would be more credible and transparent if citizens were to have a role somewhere in that process. To that end, the Working Group believes that the community would best be served by a hybrid model of citizen review which does not replace the current process but instead builds upon its strengths.

The following recommendations represent a conceptual framework for Council to consider. The exact details of each of these recommendations can be worked out in accordance with direction from Council.

- a. **Creation of a Subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission.** A standing subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission would be created to assist the Community Relations Office with the review of citizen complaints. Their review would take place prior to a finding by the Chief of Police. The subcommittee would certify the completeness of the investigative process, have the ability to ask questions and/or request additional information, and recommend whether the Chief of Police accept or reject investigative findings.

The Community Relations Manager would continue to work closely with the Police Department's Office of Professional Standards, serve as the staff liaison to the subcommittee, and act as a conduit between the two entities. This arrangement would help to ensure that the subcommittee retains its independence.

Members of the subcommittee would be appointed in the same manner as members of the Human Relations Commission through the Board and Commission appointment process. In making those appointments, the Working Group recommends that consideration be given to members of community who have expertise in the law or experience in investigations, human rights, or community relations. The Mayor could look to the

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Ministerial Alliance in seeking people with such expertise.

The subcommittee would be subject to the Open Meetings Act and the Freedom of Information Act.

- b. Use of Subpoena Power.** Because the City can already compel officers to cooperate with the investigative process through their employment, subpoena power is unnecessary for officer statements and evidence. However, since the Human Relations Commission already possesses subpoena power under the Municipal Code, in the event that the subcommittee believes that some evidence or testimony is necessary in the investigation of a citizen complaint and a witness/citizen declines to cooperate in the investigative process, the subcommittee could make the HRC aware of that fact and request that the HRC issue a subpoena. Subpoena power would remain under the discretion of the HRC and be focused towards members of the public who will not voluntarily cooperate in the investigation of a citizen complaint.
- c. Public Access.** Efforts should be made to increase the ease and accessibility of filing citizen complaints or commendations for officers. In an effort to improve the fairness and thoroughness of the process, the subcommittee would have the ability to provide input and make suggestions concerning the manner in which the Police Department accepts and investigates citizen complaints.

In addition, the Police Department's website should be updated to include professional profiles and contact information for upper command officers (lieutenants and above). The Police Department's online complaint form should also be modified to allow citizens to upload digital media such as videos and/or photographs at the time a complaint is submitted.

- d. Public Education and Outreach.** The subcommittee would participate in public outreach and education about the complaint process. Additionally, it would be appropriate to solicit community volunteers who could be trained to assist City staff in guiding citizens throughout the complaint process.
 - e. Reporting Requirements.** The subcommittee and the Community Relations Manager would provide joint quarterly updates and an annual report to the Human Relations Commission summarizing their activities. These reports would include geographic information, demographic (gender, race, and age range) information for both officers and subjects, be made available to the public, and be discussed at open meetings of the Human Relations Commission where citizen input can be provided.
- 6. Current Use of Force Review Process.** Police Administration currently reviews each and every incident involving any force which exceeds the simple handcuffing of a compliant subject. These comprehensive internal reviews are conducted pro-actively, not in response to citizen complaints.

The current process for reviewing use of force incidents includes the following steps:

- a. A supervisor immediately responds to the scene of any use of force incident. The responding supervisor is required to identify and gather physical evidence, identify and interview potential witnesses, and ensure that medical aid is promptly administered to anyone in need.
- b. Each use of force incident is, at minimum, reviewed by a Sergeant, a Lieutenant, and a Deputy Chief. These reviews are primarily focused upon determining whether or not an officer's use of force was reasonable and consistent with Department policy and they typically involve a review of all police reports and all available video and/or audio evidence.
- c. Each use of force incident is also reviewed by a Use of Force Review Board. The Board, which meets on a monthly basis, is comprised of command officers of each rank as well as members of the Defensive Tactics, Firearms, and Field Training Cadres. The Use of Force Review Board reviews each use of force incident in much the same manner described above, but they are primarily focused upon policy, training, tactical and equipment issues. As examples, the Board recently recommended that the Chief of Police direct the Defensive Tactics Cadre to prepare lesson plans which focused on the use of "verbalization" skills during arrest activity and also discouraged officers from making arrests by themselves absent exigent circumstances.
- d. On an annual basis, the Deputy Chief of Operations completes a use of force analysis which is focused upon identifying trends that the Department may need to address.

7. Recommended Additions to the Use of Force Review Process. The Working Group determined that the Police Department has a good internal process in place to evaluate use of force incidents to identify policy, training, tactical, and equipment issues. Furthermore, the Working Group believes that the community would best be served through additions which build upon the current strengths of that process, not those which would replace it.

- a. **Citizen Participation on the Use of Force Review Board.** The Chief of Police should select a group of citizens to attend the monthly meetings of the internal Use of Force Review Board. One or two citizens would attend each monthly meeting; as such, they would serve independently and not constitute a group or board. They would have the ability to ask questions and participate in discussions; they would focus on ensuring that the process is thorough, fair, and sensitive to community concerns about Police use of force, and; they would provide recommendations concerning those issues to the Chief of Police.
- b. Citizen participants on the Use of Force Review Board would be expected to have a demonstrated prior active interest in promoting positive police-community relations; have served as community leaders or advocates; have knowledge, expertise, or experience in law or policing, or; have other expertise that would enhance the Review Board process. The Chief of Police could also look to community organizations such as the National

Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Ministerial Alliance in identifying and seeking volunteers to serve on the Use of Force Review Board.

- c. Citizen participants on the Use of Force Board would be expected to undergo training designed to expand their expertise in police operations. Training would include the review of relevant policies, the completion of police ride-alongs, and scenario-based use of force training (i.e. use of force simulator).
- d. Because some of the cases reviewed by the Board would involve active investigations, citizen participants would likely be required to sign a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement. Their access to some information might also be limited to preserve the integrity of the criminal investigation process.
- e. The findings from the Use of Force Review Board's monthly meetings should be posted on the Police Department's website. In addition, Police Administration should provide quarterly updates and an annual report on the Use of Force Review Board's activities to the Human Relations Commission.
- f. The Police Department's Annual Use of Force Analysis should include the same demographic and geographic information that the subcommittee and the Community Relations Manager would be including in their annual report.

8. Consultation with the Fraternal Order of Police. Police Administration has generally discussed the proposed recommendations with FOP leadership. Mandatory subjects of bargaining include pay, benefits, hours or work, and conditions of employment. Because the recommendations of the Police Working Group merely add a public review component to the existing complaint process, the recommendations, if accepted by Council, would not change the working conditions or the disciplinary process itself. Because the terms of the current Labor Agreement would remain in effect, staff does not believe that it would be necessary to negotiate the proposed recommendations with the FOP. The FOP has not yet demanded to bargain over the recommendations; they have, however, asserted their intent to reserve the right to make a final determination until this process is complete.

9. Next Steps/Timeline. If Council accepts the Working Group's recommendations, staff will need to draft an ordinance which authorizes the creation of a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission. That process is expected to take approximately 90 days. While the ordinance is being drafted, the Chief of Police can solicit and select individuals to serve on the Use of Force Review Board. Staff believes that process can be completed by the time the draft ordinance is prepared for Council consideration and input.

While the ordinance is being drafted, City staff will also simultaneously:

- Begin working to update the Police Department's website to include biographical and contact information for command staff.

- Begin modifying the online complaint form so that photographs and other digital media can be uploaded and submitted through the Department’s website.
- Begin the process of surveying local service agencies concerning their willingness to provide police complaint packets to citizens, serve as points of intake, and provide employee volunteers who would be used to assist City staff in guiding citizens throughout the complaint process.
- Develop an internal policy which addresses the criteria and process for selecting citizen members of the monthly Use of Force Review Board.
- Assign appropriate Police staff to develop a training curriculum for those citizens who would be selected to participate on the monthly Use of Force Review Board.

F. Alternatives:

1. Direct staff to implement the recommendations of the Police Complaint Working Group, to include drafting an ordinance which would authorize the creation of a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission.
2. Do not direct staff to proceed as proposed and provide further direction.

G. Discussion of Alternatives:

Alternative 1 – Direct staff to implement the recommendations of the Police Complaint Working Group, factoring in Council input, and to begin drafting an ordinance to authorize the creation of a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission whose members would assist the Community Relations Office in reviewing complaint investigations and providing recommendations to the Chief of Police prior to the final disposition of citizen complaints.

a. Advantages

- Builds upon and enhances the Police Department’s existing processes.
- Allows for the implementation of a model of citizen review which is tailored to the specific needs of the Champaign community.
- Increases transparency during the investigation of citizen complaints and the review of use of force incidents.
- Allows citizens to make recommendations to the Chief of Police prior to an investigative finding and provides the Chief of Police with another perspective to consider in rendering decisions about citizen complaints.
- The inclusion of subpoena power has the potential to provide additional evidence for consideration during the investigation and review of citizen complaints.
- Allows for citizen participation during the administrative review of use of force incidents.
- Has the potential to give citizen complaint investigations and the review of use of force incidents greater credibility than completely internal reviews can provide. It also has the potential to reassure the public that citizen complaint investigations and the review of use of force incidents are both thorough and fair.

- The implementation of citizen review may provide another avenue for citizens to express their concerns.
- May provide new opportunities for public outreach, public education, and citizen engagement.

b. Disadvantages

- Providing staff support to the subcommittee increases the commitment of City resources and staff time for those who are involved in the complaint process.
- Citizen review may not fully resolve community concerns, lack of trust in the Police Department, or lack of confidence in the process.
- It may prove difficult to find individuals willing to make the time commitment to serve on the subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission and/or participate in the monthly Use of Force Review Board meetings.
- Does not provide for a totally independent investigation, which some citizens will continue to advocate for.
- The implementation of citizen review and citizen participation on the Use of Force Review Board may be viewed by some police employees as a lack of community support and may cause concerns about the confidentiality of information related to their employment.

Alternative 2 – Allows Council to provide other direction to staff on how to improve the existing process for investigating citizen complaints, reviewing use of force incidents, and addressing citizen concerns regarding those processes.

a. Advantages

- Would depend upon the direction provided by Council.
- Council may opt for processes which require fewer City resources and less staff time.

b. Disadvantages

- May not allow for citizen input by those who wish to provide it.
- Some members of the community may remain frustrated and continue to lack confidence in the current process.

H. Community Input: The ten meetings that Police Complaint Working Group held were open to the public and public comments were allowed at the conclusion of each of those meetings. In addition, the Police Complaint Working Group held three community meetings during which citizen input and feedback were specifically sought. The City created a webpage specifically devoted to the Police Complaint Working Group, they publicized the meetings through civic notices and social media posts, and throughout this process all meeting agendas, handout materials, and meeting minutes have been posted for public review. This topic has been a standing agenda item and has been regularly discussed at the monthly Human Relations Commission meetings. The public will also have an opportunity to provide input at the Study Session on this topic.

A summary of the feedback received during the three community meetings that the Working Group held is included in Attachment B.

I. Budget Impact: If City Council directs staff to implement the recommendations of the Police Complaint Working Group, costs to support the changes to the process can be absorbed within existing operational budgets for Police and the Community Relations Office.

J. Staffing Impact: To date, staff estimates that they have spent more than 200 hours on research, discussion, meeting attendance, and report preparation. Staff expects to spend approximately 50 hours drafting an ordinance for Council to consider if the Police Complaint Working Group's recommendations are accepted. The Chief of Police is expected to spend approximately 25 hours soliciting and selecting volunteers to serve on the Use of Force Review Board. Staff will likely spend 20 or more hours developing a training curriculum and drafting an internal policy which addresses the criteria and process for selecting citizen members of the monthly Use of Force Review Board. The Community Relations Manager is expected to spend 5-10 hours each month working with the subcommittee, but the amount of time actually required will largely be driven by the number of citizen complaints that are filed. The Use of Force Review Board collectively spends approximately 60 hours each month reviewing use of force incidents, and that amount of time will increase, at least slightly, with citizen involvement. Staff also expects to spend approximately 40 hours training the citizens who are selected to participate on the Use of Force Review Board.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

Jon Swenson
Deputy Chief of Police

Anthony Cobb
Chief of Police

Attachment: Summary of Community Input from October 10, 2016, October 13, 2016, and January 5, 2017 Community Meetings.

Attachment A
Members of the Police Complaint Working Group

- Rev. Larry D. Lewis (Chairman) – Bethel AME Church / Ministerial Alliance
- Bruce Brown (Vice-Chairman) – North End Breakfast Club
- Alissia Young – Human Relations Commission / Ministerial Alliance
- Michelle Cooper – National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- Pastor Keith Thomas – Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
- Dr. Travis Dixon – Professor, University of Illinois
- Dr. Michael Schlosser – Professor, University of Illinois / Police Training Institute
- Todd Rent – Human Resources Director / City of Urbana
- Dorothy David – City Manager
- Rachel Joy – Community Relations Manager
- Chief Anthony Cobb – Police Department
- Deputy Chief Jon Swenson – Police Department
- Officer Brian Greear – Police Department
- Officer Will Cowan – Police Department

Attachment B
Summary of Community Input
Police Complaint Working Group Community Meetings

- October 10, 2016 meeting at Mount Olive Baptist Church
 - 14 people attended
 - 8 attendees listed an address in Champaign
 - 6 attendees listed an address in Urbana (one was a City of Urbana employee who was there for employment reasons)

- Feedback
 - There was a question concerning the increase in use of force incidents over the past 2 years. (Explanation – due in large part to new reporting requirements).
 - There was a suggestion that it might be appropriate to have a representative from CRO participate on the Use of Force Review Board.
 - There was a request to make the findings of the Use of Force Review Board available to the public.
 - There was a suggestion the CRO prepare a separate annual report summarizing their role in the citizen complaint process and explaining their findings.
 - There was a suggestion that the department put together a flowchart so that the complaint process is more understandable for members of the community.
 - Only 3 people indicated that they felt they were thoroughly familiar with the complaint process.
 - There was a request to see use of force numbers broken down by demographics (officer, offender, and district) in the Annual Use of Force Analysis.
 - There was a suggestion that the lack of complaints was a reflection of the public’s lack of trust in the current complaint process.
 - There was a suggestion that CPD provide more public information on the complaint process.
 - There was a question as to whether or not CPD made any effort to educate students on how they should interact with the police. (Explanation – The SROs do provide instruction on this topic to all Unit 4 HS students).
 - There was a suggestion that the City/CPD train community members as volunteers who could be used to assist citizens throughout the complaint process.
 - A question was asked concerning CPD’s level of preparedness to respond to CFS involving the mentally ill. (Explanation – CPD participates in a county-wide Crisis Intervention Team and has access to specially trained officers on each/every shift).
 - A citizen inquired as to whether or not it was possible for citizens to give CPD information concerning family members who may be suffering from mental illness. (Explanation – citizens currently have the ability to do so and instructions for doing so were given in response to the question).
 - Patricia Avery spoke on behalf of the NAACP. She indicated that the NAACP believes that the Type 1 model of citizen review most closely resembles the model which the National NAACP advocates.
 - A citizen expressed concern that Citizen Review does nothing to build bridges and facilitate relationships between a PD and the community it serves.

- CPD needs to do a statistical analysis which will show the disparities that actually exist so that there is a concrete picture of interaction/engagement.
 - A citizen questioned how many times the City of Urbana's process for Citizen Review has actually been utilized. (City staff was unable to respond to that question).
 - There was a general suggestion that CPD actively listen to community concerns/feedback and then respond accordingly. (Words heard = implementation).
 - There is a strong need for education in the community.
- October 13, 2016 meeting at Centennial High School
 - 6 people attended
 - All 6 attendees listed an address in Champaign
- Feedback
 - On a scale of 1-10, there was a feeling that the group was only a "2" in terms of their familiarity with CPD's processes and history.
 - Confidence in CPD's data ranged from "5" to "10." (2 respondents).
 - The attendees were generally impressed with the thoroughness of the current process as well as the existing system of "checks and balances."
 - The attendees were all in favor of increased police-citizen communication.
 - The attendees were generally unaware that citizens can currently appeal complaint findings to the City Manager, but they like that process.
 - The attendees were generally unaware of CRO's role in the complaint process but like it and think it should continue.
 - There were mixed opinions as to whether or not Citizen Review is necessary at this time. Some see the need, others do not.
 - If some form of Citizen Review is implemented, those who are in favor of it are not fans of the Type 4 (Auditor) model.
 - Citizens were happy to hear that Unit 4 students are receiving instruction on "The Law and You." They want that to continue and also suggested that CPD may want to examine ways to educate young adults who have not been exposed to the curriculum through Unit 4.
 - CRO involvement in the use of force review process might be beneficial, but also may not be seen as being fully independent.
 - It is important for citizens to better and more fully understand the job that police officers do, and the Citizen's Police Academy and the Youth Police Academy are important in that regard. Both help to build trust and end the cycle of fear. May be helpful to more actively take demos/discussion into the community.
 - The PD is not solely responsible for fixing these problems, the community must assist.

- January 5, 2017 meeting at Booker T. Washington School
 - 22 people attended (not including staff or Council members)
 - The majority of attendees resided in Champaign
- Feedback
 - There was a request for more detailed information concerning the process that the Working Group used to assist them in forming the recommendations that they will be presenting for Council consideration.
 - There was a question about which agency-specific models of citizen review were studied and used to help formulate the Working Group's recommendations.
 - The President of the Ministerial Alliance indicated that although there are 2 members of the Ministerial Alliance represented on the Working Group, she wished that she would have been contacted personally and allowed some input into the selection of those representatives.
 - There was a question concerning the process through which members of the subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission would be selected if Council were to accept the Working Group's recommendations.
 - There was a suggestion that an effort be made to include representatives of organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Ministerial Alliance on the subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission should Council accept the Working Group's recommendations.
 - In regards to future meetings on this topic and other topics of community concern, one citizen suggested that the Police Department utilize community members who are highly active on social media to assist them in notifying the public about upcoming meetings.
 - One citizen asked how and how often the HRC utilizes its subpoena power, and was also curious as to how and how often staff anticipated the subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission would be utilizing the subpoena power currently vested in the HRC.
 - Several citizens expressed general appreciation for the time and effort that the Police Complaint Working Group spent studying this topic and forming their recommendations. However, two citizens expressed concern that complaint investigations will still be conducted by police personnel if Council accepts the Working Group's recommendations. Those two citizens had a strong preference to have complaints investigated by non-police personnel.