The Monitor Team

Jeff Schlanger – Monitor and Project Lead
- Managing Director, and President of Exiger Advisory.
- 30 years of experience in law enforcement and PD monitoring.
- Deputy Monitor for the LAPD consent decree.
- Project Lead on Exiger’s Review of the UCPD’s Policies and Procedures.

Roberto Villaseñor – Deputy Monitor
- Former Chief of the Tucson, Arizona Police Department.
- Appointed by President Obama to the Task Force on 21st Century Policing.
- 35 years of professional law enforcement experience including 15 at the Chief level.
- Appointed to the DHS Committee on Ethics and Integrity for Customs and Border Patrol and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Denise Lewis – Chief Compliance Auditor
- Former LAPD Sergeant – Audit Unit Supervisor
- Assisted in the creation of the LAPD Audit Unit under Federal Consent Decree
- Member of the Detroit PD Monitoring team
- Trainer for police departments instituting internal audit functionality
Additional As-Needed SMEs

Charles Ramsey
Former Commissioner of both the MPDC & PPD

Sandy Jo MacArthur
Former Assistant Chief, LAPD. Established LEADS Training Program.

Nola M. Joyce
Former Deputy Commissioner of both MPDC & PPD.

Maggie Goodrich
Chief Information Officer for LAPD.

Mark Porter
Executive Director of Public Safety and Chief of Police at Brown University

John Thomas
Chief of the USC Office of Public Safety.

Beth Correa
Attorney/Risk management consultant to PDs.

Patrick Harnett
Former Chief of Connecticut Police, Police Management and Public Safety Consultant

James McShane
Vice President, Dept of Public Safety at Columbia University.
The Monitorship is a result of the University’s response to the Officer Involved Shooting of Samuel Dubose on July 19, 2015.

How an institution reacts to such crises becomes the measure of the accountability of that institution.

The reaction of the University and its police department has been exemplary throughout the process, which was evidenced by the voluntary nature of the monitorship. The University will be a model for police departments around the country.

Exiger is here because we are passionate about this subject matter and believe we can make a positive difference towards reform in the UCPD, and by example, throughout the country.
What is a Monitorship

- A monitor **independently** oversees the process of moving the UCPD towards operating in full accordance with its stated mission and values and is employing best practices to do so.

- Increases the level of trust and confidence in the organization through a process that is both transparent and collaborative.

- Includes making certain that best practices have been implemented, that protocols are in place to mitigate risks and ensure that the organization is operating according to the best practices.

- It is the **independence** coupled with the **oversight** and **public reporting** that gives stakeholders including the community, the confidence that reform is actually happening.

- A monitor can provide assistance to the police agency lending advice relative to best practices.

- A monitorship helps legitimatize the police agency
Exiger’s Initial Review – June 2016

- Findings Resulted in 276 Recommendations

  Example of Exiger Recommendation (“ER”):

  - **Finding 10:** Training Policies and Procedures are generic and out dated and do not meet the needs of UCPD.

  - **Recommendation 10A:** UCPD should draft and adopt consistent policies and procedures for the development and approval of all UCPD courses and ensure that all such courses are consistent with the mission and philosophy of the department.

- Assurance comes about through testing each ER 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.
Methodology and Timeline

1. The University decided to implement all Exiger Recommendations
2. Collaborative development of Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance (MADC).
3. On site visit, data collection interviews and inspections.
4. Fulfillment of data requests.
5. Assessment of each Exiger Recommendation utilizing MADC.
6. Production of a detailed Memorandum of Assessment for each ER assessed
7. On-going communication with monthly group meetings either in-person or via video conference.
8. Update to Audit and Risk Management Committee once every quarter
COMPLIANCE MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 6, 2017
REC. REF. NO.: 3.6.H
SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Exiger Finding
UCPD lacks a clearly defined method of investigating uses of force by its members.

Exiger Recommendation (“ER”)
UCPD should make the findings of an Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) public upon completion of the investigation.

MADC Definition of Compliance
Compliance with this provision will be achieved when the following is found:

1. UCPD has a policy which includes the making of findings of an Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) public upon completion of the investigation.
2. Documentation demonstrating dissemination of policy/plan/procedures internally to include all appropriate UCPD personnel.

Note: Dissemination will be tested under 3.1.A for all ERs to be included in the UOF policy.

UCPD Proffer of Compliance
“The Internal Investigations and Complaints policy provides for making the findings of an Officer Involved Shooting public upon completion of the investigation in Subsection X, page 14 (see attached). This provision is also included on pages 23-24 of the Use of Force policy (also attached), wherein the Use of Force Review Board findings will be made available to the public including the findings regarding officer-involved shootings. No officer-involved shootings have occurred during the voluntary mentorship. If such an incident should occur during the three-year monitoring period, the mentor will be notified and provided evidence of public release of the investigation findings as soon as practical.”

Data Reviewed
1. Internal Investigations and Complaints Policy 4.2.100
2. Use of Force Policy, SOP 7.1.100

Current Assessment of Compliance

In Compliance

The Monitor’s review of the finalized versions of both the UCPD’s Use of Force (UOF) and the Internal Investigations and Complaints policies found that the policies do in fact specifically...
Overview of Assessment to Date: 158 of the 276 ERs

Assessment Status

- **Assessed**
- **Under Assessment**
- **Unassessed**

The chart shows the assessment status of different categories:

1. Fundamental Findings: 16 assessed, 4 under assessment, 6 unassessed
2. Stops: 5 assessed, 3 under assessment, 8 unassessed
3. Use of Force: 8 assessed, 3 under assessment, 14 unassessed
4. Policies and Procedures: 6 assessed, 2 under assessment, 12 unassessed
5. Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion: 7 assessed, 3 under assessment, 12 unassessed
6. Training: 7 assessed, 5 under assessment, 8 unassessed
7. Accountability: 8 assessed, 0 under assessment, 13 unassessed
8. Community Engagement: 11 assessed, 1 under assessment, 13 unassessed
9. Mental Health Concerns: 10 assessed, 1 under assessment, 10 unassessed
10. Equipment: 11 assessed, 1 under assessment, 11 unassessed
11. Technology: 10 assessed, 0 under assessment, 13 unassessed
12. Data Collection and Usage: 16 assessed, 4 under assessment, 6 unassessed
Overall Compliance Achievements

- Assessed 158 of 276 Exiger Recommendations (ER)
  - 125 in 1st bi-annual period (Jan – Jun 2017)
    - 33 in Q3
  
  Note: 33 currently being assessed in Q4

- Substantial Compliance with 147 of the 158 ERs assessed:
  - 86 in 1st bi-annual period
  - 61 in Q3

- Partial Compliance (PC) with 27 ERs
  - 22 in 1st bi-annual period  (4 remain PC not yet reassessed, all 18 others in compliance)
    - 5 in Q3 (3 to be reassessed in Q4, 2 to be reassessed in Q5)
  
  PC = Significant progress made towards substantial compliance

- Determination Withheld for 20 ERs
  - 19 in 1st bi-annual period  (all 19 now in compliance)
    - 1 in Q3 (to be reassessed in Q4)
  
  DW = Not able to complete compliance determination at this time
Overview of Compliance by Topic of 158 ERs Assessed

Compliance Status

- **Non Compliant**
- **Partial Compliance**
- **Determination Withheld**
- **Compliant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Non Compliant</th>
<th>Partial Compliance</th>
<th>Determination Withheld</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Findings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Force</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Usage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Development to Several Key Policies

- Mission Statement and Core Values
- Bias Free Policing
- Mental Health Response
- Training and Professional Development
- Appropriate Patrol Response Levels
- Traffic Enforcement
- Body Worn Camera

- Use of Force
- Taser *(included in UOF policy)*
- Internal Investigations and Complaints
- Police Training Officer Program
- Recruitment and Hiring
- Promotion Policy
Overview of Compliance – Q3: 67 Total ERs Assessed

Compliance Status

- **Non Compliant**
- **Partial Compliance**
- **Determination Withheld**
- **Compliant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non Compliant</th>
<th>Partial Compliance</th>
<th>Determination Withheld</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fundamental Findings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of Force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accountability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Engagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mental Health Concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Data Collection and Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>