

These recommendations will cover truth and reconciliations, accountability, integrity, mental health, citizens with disabilities, and the history of the CDP reform policies.

Chief's Vision

This vision is vague and repeated. Commander Johnson did not cover the connection with the goal of wellness. There is no specific information in this message. Commander, Johnson did not say what is needed in order for this to be accomplished. Where are the concepts? This whole CPOP Plan was difficult to follow. It needs to state the mission along with the vision. The vision should address the views of the citizens. There are no direct correct answers during this process. Connecting with the community is true, however, rewording recommendations as if they are questioning a person during an investigation will not accomplish the goal. For example, first paragraph needs to say all communities are not the same, what is an ideal community? Do we know? Can an expert with numbers signs data convince, a community about a perfect environment?

Concerning, the wellness model - we don't need metaphors. We need facts, clear measures. How do we measure success? With statistics? In order to get to the root of the problem a direct understanding has to be addressed. The CPOP plan here is not demonstrating issues. It is supplying information of what it should be.

Below are recommendations for the CPOP plan, from community members and families who have been affected by police excessive use of force, and misconduct.

The CPOP Plan was a requirement, based from the consent decree, which was approved by Judge Solomon Oliver in 2015. A commander and two sergeants, wrote the CPOP, during closed meetings with the monitors. With no communication with the public until a draft was brought to the attention of the Cleveland Police Commission, during monthly meetings. The CPC had hired consultants to administer the meetings, and had round table discussions for twenty minutes per month about the CPOP suggestions. The round tables consisted of residents and officers to engage about changes to the proposed plan. Then one person would be designated to keep notes. The monitors would walk around the tables to see if the citizens at the assigned tables were engaging in conversations about changes. The time constraints and formats meant that citizens did not have an opportunity to read and understand CPOP - meaning all of the components of it - so they could make a rational decision. Also, including police meant that some citizens were stifled or did not participate.

Recommendations and Findings for CPOP

The historical perception was created and mandated by the Cleveland Police Division, with total control and no accountability for the actions of officers when misconduct occurs. Due to the lack of responsibility of the city, who is responsible for training officers, the City of Cleveland has settled for millions of dollars because of the unaccountability problems.

The tax payers of this city, and the citizens, have suffered great financial losses - due to pay outs for police-related lawsuits and settlements - in education, jobs, housing, and massive cuts in services; this has affected the quality of life for residents in this community. These

recommendations allow the city to see that accountability needs to occur, and approachable measures are needed in order for this CPOP to be implemented and work.

The Cleveland Division of police has adopted practices and patterns that are viewed as acceptable acts by their peers, commanders and immediate supervisors; they have been getting rewarded, with commendations and money prizes to show that they are doing a good job. Who would dare challenge them, or file a complaint?

The historical concepts, when a citizen would file a complaint, the department would conduct a criminal background check - to establish a process of illumination; if a person had a past criminal record this would be used against the citizen who filed the complaint against the police then their complaint would not be creditable, the findings of the investigation would conclude to be unfounded, end of complaint.

Later the CDP came out with another entity, Office of Professional Standards, and the Cleveland Police Review Board both are still govern by CDP. The OPS a citizen can file a complaint, and it can be anonymous, the complaint can still be investigated by the investigators of OPS but how effective are their investigations? How far do they go to get the truth? How long does it take to conduct an investigation? Well, as it stands now, the OPS is over 300 complaints behind. Getting the information and details when a person first files a complaint is essential, waiting and prolonging the process tends to lead to loss of information for the investigations and from the witnesses.

One of the recommendations in the CPOP plan that we propose today covers the background and history of the police in the community. Boundaries means a line is drawn across the board to ensure the protection and safety of the residents in their communities.

The CDP has created the blue wall of silence and protection. If the CDP want to gain community trust they must stop the criticizing, stonewalling, and disrespect of citizens. If they want to maintain community trust they must avoid these types of behaviors. How do officers begin to break the blue wall of silence? The CPOP did not discuss how, or give suggestions on how an officer or officers can break cycle of the blue wall of silence. Here are some suggestions. If an officer sees their partner committing an offense, they have a right to arrest that officer, because under the Ohio OPOTA training, it states an officer has a right to arrest a person in a commission of a felony. Once that officer is committing an act which is considered criminal they are no longer a member of the CDP, their actions are no longer honorable. Their actions don't fit their badge; a written report needs to be made by the officer who witnesses what has occurred. This process needs to be done immediately. A preliminary investigation needs to be done within the shift that the incident occurred; no waiting period should be allowed.

All partners' concerns and roles are equal

Police and community members are equal partners in creating healthy, safe communities. One of the things this partnership requires is addressing the history of difficulties between the police and large segments of the black community. Some process for truth and reconciliation needs to happen. It should begin with a public acknowledgement by the Mayor, Public Safety Director and Police Chief that many people in the community feel pain, anger and fear related to the police. Further, that the City and police will use the consent decree process and the turn to community policing to begin a process to resolve some of these feelings. Some 3rd party mediation might be useful in this effort.

Whenever possible, women officers should deal with women who are witnesses, victims or detainees; this is particularly true for detainees.

Presently, many officers display different treatment of citizens based on race and economics; this has to end.

Building Community Trust and Confidence

CDP must develop new ways to deal with contentious events and situations. Defensive public comments about poor police behavior, and criminalizing victims, must end. Simple, neutral, factual statements serve everyone better. Silence is not transparent and not community-focused.

Some officers are open about criticizing residents. Their contempt is clear to the people they encounter. Stonewalling residents who want to make a complaint is unacceptable. The Division should have zero tolerance for bigotry of any kind.

Mission statement – keep it simple.

Communication from the Division, at all levels, needs to be included. The mission needs to include a requirement for integrity from all employees of the Division – officers and civilians. Creating a partnership with the community is key. Maintaining an attitude of respect for human life, regardless of the condition of that life in the present, is well-included. The Division also needs to address the demoralization of the officers.

“Lord Stevens” – London

This narrative is filler; no cares. Looking for the causes of problems is good. This needs to be done *with* the community. Also, the Officer Jones example was unnecessary fill. The concept of Lord Stevens is over forty years old and outdated. Why is the CDP still using this information, today why? Because they still want the same outcome in addressing issues in the community. If the CDP want to make this model successful, in the community they have to lose their tunnel vision approach and think outside the box. Society is not a perfect world this is reality, and prepare themselves for events that, may take them out of the comfort zone. An example of that, many of the officers, have been in the military. The current CPOP plan uses terminology words and terms such as deploy, which is a military action word to find, fight, and destroy. These are communities, not battle grounds, where hand grenades, are not posted at every stop sign or traffic stops. Another example of a military word is used at the district before and after their work day is Platoon. They are *shifts*.

What is CPOP

CPOP is a whole new way of thinking about policing. The old style was totally after-the-fact, reactive, enforcement based. Community relationships matter most in community policing.

All officers are responsible for CPOP

The CPOP plan says all officers are responsible for it. The Division needs to be more specific about what this means for different parts of the CDP. What does this mean for detectives? Vice? Personnel? Civilian employees? The Division needs to change all of their position descriptions to include CPOP values and activities. If they do not implement CPOP accurately for the officer to understand, their duties the plan will fail.

SARA

Officers presently behave differently depending on the economics of the community. They charge citizens differently, too, depending on the economic environment. East and West side citizens see the police differently, according to their economic status and race.

SARA model is OK, probably useful. It is a serious change from the regular police work day now.

Scanning – Who does this? Sergeants? Commanders? Patrol Officers? This isn't really clear. Citizens should be part of the scanning process ALWAYS. Scanning is an important application of critical thinking by both partners – community and police.

What ranks of officers participate in CPOP? In SARA?

Staffing for the dedicated Crisis Intervention staff are mentioned, but there is no schedule for selecting them.

Data in this whole process, and analyzing it well, is crucial. The data person on the Monitoring team is Christine Cole. It isn't clear what kind of support the new data person in the Division will have.

Partners have equal weight in the relationship. Both partners' concerns are equal. This is a new situation for both police and community members. They collaborate equally on SARA. Commander Johnson and 3 sergeants wrote the CPOP policy, with no input from the community. This is the *old* way. Writing CPOP should start with a conversation in the community.

How will officers and supervisors qualify and quantify 20% of officer time? Entering tasks into CAD might identify activities. Time of entry will offer some measure of time. But not all activities are equally important or productive. Bike patrols don't guarantee any real community contact.

CDP needs to talk about shootings and killings from the past. This is an important piece of the reconciliation process that has to come before trusting relationships and partnerships can develop.

There are many sections of the CDP's CPOP that are filler that list what they already do. This needs to be deleted; e.g., business cards, narrative about 'organizational transformation', description of reductions in officers' demands for time.

Any plan needs to include specific actions that identified people will take with clear due dates. For example:

“Within 60 days of the Court’s approval of a final Community- and Problem-Oriented Policing policy, the Mayor and Chief shall each issue a public statement acknowledging that significant segments of the City’s population experience a great deal of pain, anger and fear concerning the police. Further, that the City and Division will use the Consent Decree process, and this adoption of community policing, to take the initiative in resolving some of these feelings.”

Not everyone will want to engage with individual officers. Their position must be respected.

Citizens in the community want contact with their patrol officers; from all shifts.

Staffing

Using civilian employees isn't included in any of the Division's documents. There is much they can do to support the data needs of SARA, and otherwise reduce the time officers spend on calls for service.

Engagement officers seem to be in the Bureau of Community Engagement – don't have a clear role in SARA. Also the NICE units – Neighborhood Impact and Community Engagement – don't have a clear role in SARA. Maybe these should be disbanded.

Recruits should have at least an associate degree in social work, psychology, sociology or other related fields. Existing officers should be encouraged strongly to take college course that will improve their ability to develop and maintain partnerships in the community.

The Public Safety Recruiting Team leader, Sgt. Charmin Leon, has done a good job of targeting colleges in her recruiting efforts and plan. Any high school students should be encouraged to pursue an associate degree before applying to the Division.

The CPOP needs to include more information about what police leadership will do to implement Community Policing. They have to set the example for patrol officers to follow. They need training about developing and maintaining trusting relationships with community members.

Recruiting and training both need to include a requirement for education in social work, psychology, sociology, and related fields. An associate degree should be required in a recruit. Community policing requires a different approach, and this requires different backgrounds than the old style of policing. Current officers also need this education, to bring different skills to bear in providing service to the community. In addition to appropriate in-service training about bias-free policing, current officers need to be strongly encouraged to take appropriate college courses. Pursuing an associate degree might be part of preparation for promotion.

Performance Evaluations, Promotions and Discipline

There is no hint about how or when CPOP will be incorporated into staff evaluations – either civilian employees or officers. The community needs to be involved in this redesign. The section of CDP's document about promotions is all filler; it says little that is concrete about how this will change with CPOP.

Bringing in officers from places around the country, who are already doing community policing as part of the evaluation of officers trying for promotions might be very helpful; from San Diego, Cambridge, MA, and Seattle – Yes. From Baltimore, Chicago or Los Angeles – NO. The community should make a performance evaluation of the Chief and Public Safety Director annually.

Equipment & Resources

CDP has never completed an inventory or equipment plan that the Monitor would approve. This a horrible commentary on CDP's administrative capacity.

Their 'plan' has no due dates, dollar amounts or any other necessary specifics. It reads like a shallow policy.

Evaluations and CPOP changes

The community must be involved in making the changes to the personnel evaluation process. Do reports go into CAD? How is the data used? Who organizes it? Using social media could add some really good information to the process.

Repeating bad habits (like not including the community in the development of a 'community policing plan') starts at the top. Leaders in the CDP need to commit to community policing and show how it works. Include the community in what you do. Every step.

When will the FTO manual be up-dated to include CPOP?

The community wants and needs to be involved in developing the elements of training that relate to bias-free policing. Sending out a poorly-designed survey about attitudes toward police, and turning the responses over to the training section to develop training about the community, is dismally poor. This department has a deep history of poor communication with significant parts of the community. They need to spend real money on real training by professionals who are qualified. There are dozens of such firms and agencies in Cleveland.

Accountability Not Mentioned in the CPOP

The current CPOP did mention integrity, once again it is vague. There is nothing stating what the consequences are when, an officer is held to a standard of being punished for misconduct, nothing. The CPOP needed to have a section geared towards, the trauma that families have suffered because of their lack of addressing issues with officers in the department for misconduct.

The department of Justice, investigated the CDP and found numerous fourth amendment rights violations. This is not the first time the DOJ ruled against the police department and those other times the police was left to oversee their reforms. As we the people, citizens see they failed because the DOJ came again.

Other than the Cleveland Police Commission there is no community influence or participation, to influence this policy or provide accountability. The Cleveland Police Commission is made up of some community members, is not a permanent body, nor is it binding - because the city has repeatedly ignore their suggestions correcting behaviors or providing accountability. The examples, are as follows, the city picks the police civilian review board even, and who are aligned with the city or those from the city recruited them. And even if the body rules against the officer the Chief and Safety director can disagree with their decision, and not use the recommendations of a now powerless board.

The problem is not just with this bad version of CPOP not addressing accountability issues, the consent decree has not addressed it either. We demand as citizens, want a permanent police commission with approve power that can strike down policies in policing, and the makeup of the Police Commission and the police review board that reflect the community and be selected by the community not residents who are employed by the city who can influence recommendations. The mayor who is considered to be the leader and chief of this city. The one strong hold on the police department is the collective bargaining agreement contract, through their union is operated by the police the mayor along with the law director approves the contract.

Juveniles/ Children Ages 6-17 Not Mentioned in CPOP

Officers in the CDP needs a softer touch dealing with children especially children, who are in the younger years of life. When approaching small children especially children who are 14 and under they need to alert but be gentle. For example, if they get a call that a child is being unruly in a public place and not responding to basic commands. Of course the officer has to assess the situation before he or she arrives, through the call taker or dispatcher. Once they are on the scene they need to use reverse psychology to divert the child's attention and calm the child down for safety issue. Also if an officer has to arrest a child and cuff them, they should take into great consideration their size and the seriousness of the offense. The CDP department needs to do role play training scenarios, *with* children, so they can have a better understanding of how to deal with high-strung situations.

Conclusion

The findings this CPOP is very vague as it was supposed to serve as a tool to guide officers to be better role models and leaders in the community in which they serve. Out of twenty five sub headings, nothing is clear or focused on change. The City Of Cleveland along with the monitors came together as a team put the CPOP in place, and conducted a listening tour around the city. CPC incorporated a CPOP and introduced it at monthly meetings for twenty minutes, once a month for three months. This led to one hour for twenty seven pages of what the City of Cleveland felt was in the best interests of the citizens. Some of the citizens who attended the meetings did not understand or know what the meaning of CPOP and its purpose is. The CPC did not do a good job, publicizing the importance of CPOP and why it was essential for residents to attend. Hundreds of survey or questionnaire responses in a city of 300,000 people is not significant.

There is a major concern about the political standing on the CPC board. Two of the leaders who were engaging with the community are gone and no replacement has occurred. When doing the CPOP recommendations the commission did not guide the community in the process. Because some of stakeholders have turned in their suggestions it may be overwhelming to read due to the volume of information, and if the CPC was involved they could have encouraged the community to come together and submit one submission of recommendations. This would have been easier to under the purpose of CPOP and what power and respect it hold between the residents and the police.

Please note there was nothing addressing persons with disabilities or mental illness, this was addressed in the consent decree why not CPOP? These are citizens that need to be accounted for; they are not a lost society - they too are a part of the human race. Officers needs to have a CPOP experience with them as well.

In ending these recommendations the CPOP policy needed to be shorten and given more direct details and examples of the causes and reforms within the CDP that will be effective plan that will empower the CDP to become better officers and more respected by the citizens in the communities that they serve in.

Date Submitted
September 25th 2018
1:00 pm

Brenda V Bickerstaff/ Sister of Craig L Bickerstaff
Samaria Rice / Mother of Tamir Rice
Alicia Kirkman/ Mother of Angelo Miller