The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

Welcome/Review Agenda
Mr. Clopton welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda.

Overview of Commission Meeting Structure & Flow
Dr. Williams provided an overview of meeting structure and flow, as well as previewed the ground rules for the public comment period.

Co-Chairs Report
Mr. Clopton delivered the Co-Chairs Report
- RFQ Facilitator: The position will be posted for 10 days. Kathy, Mario, and Rhonda will score. After going through a city approval process, the City Finance Director will offer the contract to the Commission’s choice.
- CCPC Executive Director: Shared who is on the CPC review team and summarized the process.
- Commissioner Vacancies: Shared the co-chairs will write a letter saying we are ready to have these seats filled.
- Providing May meeting reminders, including the PRB/OPS Work Group meeting, the Full Commission Meeting date.
- Shared that Peter Whitt will serve as facilitator for the Commission’s forthcoming retreat.

Commissioners’ Questions:
- Rev. Yvonne: asked if a letter describing the review and hiring process for the CCPC Executive Director gone out yet. Answer: Sylvia sent an email. Check email for more details.
- Rev. Yvonne suggested that in the letter regarding Commissioner vacancies, that we state that the Commission would like to have its new commissioners on board in time to be a part of the retreat.

Use of Force Update
- Mr. Clopton announces that the Use of Force Investigations and Reporting Policy work product deadline was met on May 10th. He explained how to read the report and highlighted each section.
Mrs. Clopton summarizes Use of Force general police order work product. He also described some of the changes incorporated into, as of the meeting, the DRAFT Use of Force GPO prepared by the Cleveland Division of Police (and still in process).

- The most significant change is there is a general policy and then sub-policies on de-escalation, intermediate weapons (less than lethal weapons, e.g. ASP batons, bean bag guns, Taser, pepper spray, etc.
- Some of the Commission’s recommendations were echoed in the new DRAFT policy. A fuller assessment needs to be done here.

OPS/CPRB Ordinance Work Group

Dr. Williams provided an update on where we are on the ordinance development process. The report as written and read in entered into the record. (See below in italics.)

_CPRB/OPS, May 11, Report to the Full Commission_

1. **TIMELINE:** Targeted introduction of the first draft of the charter amendment – early June.
2. CCPC needs to provide comments and recommendations to Councilperson Matt Zone by May 23, 2016
3. The Commission’s recommendations will take the form of a grid that outlines the CCPC’s proposed revisions, the DOJ’s proposed revisions, and the City’s proposed revisions – indicating where we are on the same page, where we differ, and what issues remains unresolved.
4. The City still prefers to focus on Section 115-2 – which focuses on the makeup of the CPRB and who does the appointing.
5. The CCPC still prefers to take a more holistic approach and look at all four sections of the charter and propose amendments for each.
6. This week, I talked with reps from the DOJ about the feedback they provided to the CCPC in February. It was a good conversation, with some concrete suggestions for consideration.
7. We are on the same page regarding considering a more holistic look at the charter amendment:
   a. That is, on the need for looking at all the sections of the charter provision that deals with OPS and CPRB, and
   b. Doing this in a way that either provides additional language that defines and/or clarifies:
      i. the duties and responsibilities of the two entities,
      ii. the appointment and selection process for the CPRB, and
      iii. the overall expectations of the citizen complaint process and the players involved
   c. This is important in order to provide enough language in the new charter amendment so that reforms will outlast administrations and signal the kinds of changes that are discussed in the Consent Decree, and proposed by the community.
8. We are also in agreement on some of the specific proposed changes as well:
   a. The need to clearly and succinctly define OPS in Section 115-1.
   b. The need to indicate appropriate, adequate training in Section 115-3.
   c. Revision of one section to provide for the inclusion of other complaints uncovered in
      the course of an investigation – as per the Consent Decree.

9. In addition, as this drafting occurs, we also had a discussion about what level of detail should
   go into the charter amendment, which is harder to change, versus a manual of rules/operations,
   which could provide greater flexibility.

10. We also received some feedback from two independent persons from NACOLE, including its
    current president. So we will review their feedback, discuss, and decide what elements we will
    propose moving forward.

11. This is what we will be focusing on in the Work Group meeting on Monday, May 16th.
    a. We will examine each section 115-1-4

Monitor Update: Community Survey
Ayesha Hardaway discussed the community survey the Monitor Team will release on the CDP Mission
Statement, and then took questions from the audience.

- Community member expressed that at least 50% of low-income households don’t have access to
  on-line service, so other forms of outreach need to be considered for the survey and ongoing.
  Options emerged during discussion. These included: canvassing door-to-door; placing materials
  in police districts, the library, recreation centers.
- Community member asked what was the process that the draft work products go through after
  the Commission delivers their first draft and before the City and/or Cleveland Division of Police
  finalizes them and implements?
  ○ Ayesha Hardaway describes an iterative process with the CDP Mission Statement work
    product as the focus. The CDP surveyed and the CCPC also did some surveying. As a
    result of that, and with the Department of Justice’s input and feedback, a current draft
    was developed. That is the work product or “deliverable.” After the Monitor Team’s
    community survey, then the Monitor will make a recommendation to Judge Oliver about
    whether the output meets the Consent Decree.
- A followup question: Is this the template for all other future work? The answer was: Yes.
- Community member expressed that he thinks the mission statement is an important document,
  but people are more concerned with the behavior of the Cleveland Police. Currently, “comply or
  die nigger” is what is being followed according to him. How will a document change the actual
  behavior?
- Det. Hampton, of the Cleveland Police and a Commissioner, stated his belief that it is critical for
  police officers to understand and know the importance of a mission statement. He stated it
  gives you a path for reform so that you know where you are going and feeling good and
  comfortable about what you are least trying to do and go. He stated that all of officers should
  know the mission statement and it should be reaffirmed during the yearly training. He stated
  that he didn’t know how to test officers on it, but that somehow it needs to be incorporated and
some innovative approach used so that it is clear officers are internalizing it and responding to it.

Community Outreach and Engagement Committee
Rev. Conner gave an update on the Mission Statement Best Practices report, and indicated that the Commission is led to understand that the mission statement will have other documents with it, for instance, goals, value statements, objectives, etc.

Mr. Clopton began discussion of the forthcoming mandate to develop a Community Engagement Assessment Initial Work. He shared that he reached out to Seattle to get a glimpse of their process. Fe Lopez, the Executive Director of the Seattle CPC, responded and was happy to help and provided some initial documents. She did mention that it was difficult to develop a methodology that will resonate with all members, and will take more than a few weeks. He shared that the Cleveland CPC could focus on community engagement through various lens:

- recruitment, hiring, and engagement
- how and whether the police are engaged in community
  - Park and walk
  - Touch-points not district headquarters

As part of this initial work, Mr. Clopton reached out to but had not yet reached Commander Johnny Johnson, who heads Community Policing, to discuss and identify what the baseline is. Where is the Division right now. Det. Hampton also suggested Officer Deion. McCauley. Other suggestions included: a town hall, reach out to Community Relations district reps, tapping into Neighborhood Connections, contacting Councilperson & Ward leaders, getting announcements broadcasted, e.g., through TV20. Contacting the Community Relations Board and Blaine Griffith was also mentioned. Anyone under the umbrella of community-police engagement should work together to identify and collate this baseline information.

Rev. Conner asked whether this will this be something that is ongoing for us? This tool?

Cleveland Division of Police Staffing Levels
The need to begin gathering information to produce this deliverable was discussed. Commissioners raised some questions and offered some comments to begin thinking about as the work starts. These included:

- Kathy Clegg asked whether there is baseline data about staffing levels? That would be a good place to start.
- Det. Loomis stated that the CDP can’t do community-policing with the kind of staffing that exists now.
- Commissioner stated that an assessment of personnel should also include the dispatchers, some of whom have had to work mandatory overtime.

Training Review Committee
The TRC held orientation meeting on Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at the Division of Police Academy, Room 731 at 0900 hours.

The TRC is a requirement of the Consent Decree. Per the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement, the Division will be restructuring the Training Review Committee (from the old In-Service Training Review Committee, GPO 1.1.35).

Paragraph 270 of the Settlement Agreement states, “The Training Review Committee, headed by the Commander responsible for Training, will include Training Section staff members, the District training coordinators, union representatives, and members of the Commission.”

TRC was asked to provide your policy recommendations for IST instructors (In-Service Training)

IST Training Instructor recommendations as well as IST Training Plans were submitted May 4th

May 4th the TRC was made aware that we were going to assess Vendors for the establishment of an electronic system to deliver and track training. That assessment will be later in the month.

Public Comment Period

Meeting Adjourned.  8:36 p.m.