

Ferguson Collaborative Monitor Survey

Please send all responses to fergusoncollaborative@gmail.com by Saturday, June 25, with the subject heading "Survey Response"

Questions may also be sent to the same email address.

Responding Team: EbevyYG Learning Solutions, LLC

1. Will your team be soliciting community input during the selection process or shortly after you are chosen, and (b) will you make your team available for community Q&A sessions during the selection process?

Response: The Learning Solutions Team did not solicit input from members of the Ferguson community during the selection process.

(b) The Team is available during the selection process.

2. Describe the methods your team will use to share information and solicit community input, especially from those most impacted by unconstitutional policing, during the process of implementing the consent decree?

Response: Where practicable, two members of the Monitoring Team will attend community meetings and require a time slot on a written agenda to report on the status of monitoring efforts and to receive feedback from community leaders. As an alternative and in the interest of time, Monitoring Team members will attend meetings and ask meeting organizers beforehand to provide concerns in writing from community residents to be addressed at an upcoming meeting. Monitoring team members will reserve the right to address urgent concerns by alerting appropriate parties prior to an upcoming meeting and will give a status update during the next scheduled meeting.

3. Who on your team will be specifically defined as a liaison to the community? (b) How would that person define his/her point of view on community policing, and the importance of the community's ability to guide local policing?

Response: The Project Team Director is the primary liaison between the Monitoring Team and the community. Community policing is a fundamental job task of every police officer. That task requires police officers to interact/communicate with residents, get to know the types of businesses in the sector where assigned, speak with residents, give legitimacy to the police profession by patrolling and enforcing laws without regard for race, ethnicity, or religious beliefs.

The Team understands policing the community and community engagement from a Community Oriented Police Problem Solving (COPPS) approach, with the emphasis on community. A COPPS approach integrates problem-solving methodology and assists in developing effective local policing practices. Long-term success results from receiving continual input from residents, business owners, community leaders, and the police. Why and how? When community leaders and police leadership meet, it must be to identify the issue, agree that it is a continuous concern and not a one-time occurrence, identify contributing parties and/or factors possibly creating or escalating a situation,

the issue, implement the strategy and evaluate if the strategy worked.

4. Describe your team expert's approach to problem-oriented policing, involving the partnership of police with other governmental agencies or social service organizations to solve specific community issues.

Response: The response to this question is similar to what we indicated in the previous question.

5. Describe your expert's approach to civilian oversight, and what types of models he/she has found to be most effective.

Response: Civilian Oversight requires commitment, training, guidance, and assessment. The Civilian Review Board must be established based on a model that has been successful in another jurisdiction. The Mission Statement must be clear and disseminated to Board members, embraced and practiced by leadership. Tasks and expectations that align with the mission statement must be clear and not confusing, with the understanding that tasks may change, but expectations remain the same. Training, regardless of skills, knowledge and abilities each board member possesses, must be ongoing. An assessment tool must be used periodically to determine if the Board is performing in conjunction with its mission. At the time this survey is being completed, the Team has not been able to speak with anyone from Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board in San Diego, CA or the Civilian Law Enforcement Review Board in Memphis, TN. However, follow-up is pending.

6. Will you advocate to the Court that Monitor status updates be held in open court, and will you develop a process to channel community feedback to the court as part of your status reports?

Response** Provisions within the negotiated Consent Decree articulate this expectation for the Monitor when it comes to reporting. The one caveat this Team will incorporate into the reporting process is the requirement to include meeting minutes from community meetings. The provision already allows for community representation during monthly meetings that will be conducted with DOJ. Therefore, there is no provision disallowing or otherwise precluding minutes from community meetings implemented and conducted as a part of the Neighborhood Policing Steering Committee. Next, unless prohibited by law, meetings are open to the public unless the meeting goes into executive session, which then excludes public participation.

Therefore, the inference this Team draws from 'open court' is that individuals want the opportunity to listen to the Monitor's report and if possible state concerns in an open forum for all parties to hear will be pursued.

**(#440. "To facilitate this communication, the Monitor will conduct monthly meetings, which will include participation by, at a minimum, the Chief of Police, counsel for the City, FPD's Compliance Coordinator (described below), and representatives of DOJ.")