Welcome

• Special Guests:
  Robert Richardson, Jr. Chairperson, UC Board
  Dr. Beverly Davenport, UC Interim President
  Anthony Carter, UC Chief of Police
  Maris Herold, UC Assistant Chief of Police
Questions & Answers Regarding Exiger Report

Jeff Schlanger, President, Exiger Advisory
Goals for Reform Effort

Dr. Robin S. Engel
Substantive Area #1

• Policies and Procedures
  – Goal: Review and update all UCPD policies and provide to the public
  – Process: Focus on constitutional policing; revise polices based on IACP, IACLEA and CPD
  – Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1-14
  – Team Lead: Director James L. Whalen
Substantive Area #2

• Training
  – *Goal*: Increase the quality and quantity of UCPD training
  – *Process*: ~80 hours additional training per officer
  – Substantive areas to include:
    • Use of Force—focusing on de-escalation
    • Internal investigations
    • Problem solving and community policing
    • Field training officer
    • Leadership/Executive management training
  – Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1-14
  – *Team Lead*: Colonel Maris Herold
Substantive Area #3

• Performance and Conduct Measures
  – Internal and External Accountability
  – Goal 1: Establish citizen compliant process, implement and monitor process & outcomes
  – Goal 2: Create an internal accountability system to include an early warning system, enhance supervision, inspections unit, & audit function
  – Process: Partner with community & experts to create system(s)
  – Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1-14
  – Team Leads: Captain Dudley Smith (internal) Dr. Robin S. Engel (external)
Substantive Area #4

• Diversity UCPD through Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion & Retention
  – Goal 1: Significantly increase the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the UCPD
  – Goal 2: Implement strategies to promote diversity for promotion and retention
  – Process:
    • Review existing recruitment process
    • Research best hiring practices; partner with UC & professionals
    • Identify multi-layered development & promotional process
  – Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1, 4 & 14
  – Team Lead: Chief Anthony Carter
Substantive Area #5

• Community Engagement
  – Goal: Work with our community to rebuild trust, and improve police-community relations
  – Process 1: Establish a Community Engagement Team
  – Process 2: Provide specialized training and outreach to community
  – Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1, 12 & 14
  – Team Lead: Director S. Gregory Baker
Substantive Area #6

- **Data Systems, Technology & Equipment**
  - **Goal:** Create centralized system for data collection and analysis
  - **Process:**
    - Continue development of Visual Analytic Dashboard
    - Train and monitor the use of data analysis
  - Exiger Report Fundamental Findings Addressed: #1, 4, 6, 7, 13 & 14
  - **Team Lead:** Dr. Robin S. Engel
External Monitorship
Fundamental Recommendation 2C: An Explanation of Monitorships

July 14, 2016
**Finding 2:** The UCPD currently has no internal audit, inspectional service or monitoring function.

- **Recommendation 2A:** UCPD should establish an internal audit or inspectional service that reports directly to the Vice President of Safety and Reform.

- **Recommendation 2B:** Critical areas and functions of the Department should be audited on a regular cycle, as memorialized in an annual audit plan.

- **Recommendation 2C:** In addition to the audits, a voluntary monitoring function, similar to that imposed in DOJ Consent Decrees, should be established to track each of the reforms outlined in the recommendations of this report and ensure that they are implemented according to the suggested or agreed upon schedule.
Why the Recommendations?

**Goal of the Recommendation:** To *independently* ensure that UCPD is operating in accordance with its stated mission and values and is employing best practices to do so, thereby increasing the level of trust and confidence in the organization.

This assurance comes about through testing to make certain that:

(1) appropriate policies and procedures have been developed;
(2) appropriate training on policies and procedures has been developed and delivered effectively;
(3) the operations mandated by the policies and procedures are being adhered to by those performing the relevant operations.
(4) appropriate remediation and/or discipline is utilized for transgressions.

An organization that is in steady state has developed the paradigm for this testing and assurance process. UCPD has a significant way to go both in terms of implementing best practices, and in developing that paradigm for testing and assurance.

Monitorships have evolved into not only strictly monitoring but, through the same experts, providing **Technical Assistance** to the entity being monitored.
What is the steady state?

The steady state is achieved when there is confidence that best practices have been enacted and trained on and are generally operating according to their design; and the structure and processes to test or assure that such is the case are in place.

Even when “steady state” is achieved a culture of “constant improvement” must continue.
What happens in the interim?

A monitorship **independently** oversees the process of moving from the current state to the desired steady state. This would include making certain that best practices have been implemented, that processes and protocols are in place to mitigate risks and ensure and that the organization is operating according to the best practices. It is the independence coupled with the oversight and public reporting that gives stakeholders the confidence that the process of best practice implementation is moving forward.

A monitorship may provide **Technical Assistance**, lending advice relative to the implementation of best practices.

Monitorships come about in a number of different ways all revolving around the need for organizational reform, usually borne out of crisis, for which there needs to be **independent** oversight to assure the public (and litigants, if there are any) that agreed upon reforms are being carried out:
How Does A Monitorship Come About

- DOJ Civil Rights Division Investigation Process
  - Investigation
  - Letter of Findings with Suggested Remediations
  - Settlement or Lawsuit
  - Settlement
  - Conditions of Settlement contained in Consent Decree, Consent Agreement, Collaborative Agreement
    - Conditions include all of the points of remediation
    - Imposition of a Monitor to oversee the reform efforts

- DOJ Criminal Investigation and/or Prosecution
  - In non police cases this can also happen through a Deferred Prosecution Agreement
How Does A Monitorship Come About

- Civil Suit with or without DOJ Intervention
  - Lawsuit
  - Settlement or Trial
  - Conditions of Settlement or Judge’s Order after trial contained in Consent Decree, Consent Agreement, Collaborative Agreement or Order of Court
    - Conditions include all of the points of remediation
    - Imposition of a Monitor to oversee the reform efforts

- Voluntary Undertaking of Monitorship
  - Crisis of confidence
  - Decision to build trust
  - Reporting to stakeholders on state of progress
    - Public
    - Board of Directors or Board of Trustees
    - And in the case of UCPD, the CAC, in what amounts to a form of civilian oversight.
Advantages of a Voluntary Monitorship

- Indicates self-awareness and desire to reform which in turn, in and of itself, provides an additional level of trust.

- Eliminates the delays and negative publicity that would be attendant to any of the other ways in which a monitorship would come about.

- Allows for a more orderly road to implementation of reforms.

- Allows for civilian oversight of the Department that under the ordinary non-voluntary imposition of monitorships would not occur.
Remarks and Discussion

Judge West

Robert Richardson Jr., Chairperson, UC Board of Trustees

Dr. Beverly Davenport, UC Interim President
Follow Our Progress

http://www.uc.edu/safety-reform