

RESPONSE TO RFP2023-22 / EVENT # 0000002510

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Proposal for Independent Evaluator



PREPARED FOR

City of Minneapolis
Office of City Attorney

Date: October 25, 2023

PREPARED BY

Debra Kirby, JD, MA
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60606

debra.kirby@jensenhughes.com



JENSEN HUGHES

October 25, 2023

Jennifer Saunders
Contract Manager
City of Minneapolis

Dear Ms. Saunders,

I am pleased to present how Jensen Hughes can continue to support the City of Minneapolis in its transformation efforts. We are uniquely qualified with the experience, expertise and project management approach to serve as the Independent Evaluator under the Agreement between the Minnesota Department of Human Rights (MDHR) and the City of Minneapolis.

Jensen Hughes and our subject matter experts who would serve on this engagement:

- + Currently serve as Monitor in Bakersfield, California in a California Department of Justice (CALDOJ) Stipulated Agreement and the U.S. Virgin Islands – United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) Consent Decree.
- + Work and provide technical support as an Independent Evaluator for the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), under both the USDOJ initial assessment and ongoing under CALDOJ as the SFPD implements transformational reforms, both as initial fact finding and in overseeing the recommended reforms.
- + Support CALDOJ on a range of police reform projects, including collaborative reform, pattern and practice investigation and monitoring for law enforcement agencies in California, including San Francisco, Torrance, Vallejo, San Bernadino, Bay Area Rapid Transit and Antioch.
- + Conducted an after-action assessment of the City of Minneapolis' response to civil unrest following the murder of George Floyd.
- + Serve the City of Minneapolis by conducting a comprehensive training assessment of the Minneapolis Police Department.

- + Support the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI). This work is centered on the key areas of use of force, bias, community policing, personnel and hiring practices and officer and department accountability.
- + Engage in assessments for numerous municipalities, institutions and their police departments throughout the country, both proactively and in response to specific, recent officer-involved shooting or use of force incidents. For example, our work includes a top-to-bottom review of the Louisville Metro Police Department in the wake of the death of Breonna Taylor.
- + Served as the authors and subject matter experts in creating the COPS Office guide entitled, "Law Enforcement Best Practices – Lessons Learned from the Field," serving as a guide for modern police reforms throughout the U.S.

We appreciate the opportunity to continue to assist the City of Minneapolis and the communities it serves and represents. If you have any questions, please contact me at +1 312 229 9809 or debra.kirby@jensenhughes.com.

Sincerely,

Jensen Hughes



Debra Kirby, JD, MA
Global Service Line Leader
Law Enforcement Consulting + Investigations

Table Of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5

METHODOLOGY 7

COLLABORATION 12

SCOPE OF SERVICES 14

EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY 22

REFERENCES 23

PERSONNEL LISTING 23

BUDGET 24

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CODE OF ETHICS 26

SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 27

ATTACHMENTS 28

Executive Summary

Statement of Understanding

We understand the City of Minneapolis seeks an Independent Monitor to fairly and efficiently evaluate compliance and move the City and MPD into full and effective compliance with the State Court Agreement dated July 13, 2023. Our project management approach and team of experts bring a focus on professional policing that is community-centric and grounded in best practices. Our project management approach assures our clients of an on-time and on-budget delivery.

Proposal Organization

In accordance with the RFP, our proposal is organized into the following sections:

- + Methodology
- + Collaboration
- + Scope Of Services
- + Experience And Capacity
- + References
- + Personnel Listing
- + Budget
- + Conflict of Interest/Code of Ethics
- + Attachments

Proposed Project Team Members

Our proposed project team brings diversity of perspective and experience, as well as a range of critical skills including law enforcement executive leadership, community engagement, reform at the national and internal levels, civilian oversight, and science-led data analytics. Our team has instituted and supported law enforcement reform at the local and state levels for a range of public safety agencies. Two of our team members serve as Monitors, and this team has engaged in measuring and engaging in technical assistance on reform projects.

* *Denotes subcontractor*

- + Debra Kirby, MA, JD: Monitor, Executive Oversight
- + Sydney Roberts, JD: Deputy Monitor
- + * Michael Dirden, JD: Subject Matter Expert, Organizational Accountability
- + Edward Denmark, DA: Subject Matter Expert, Use of Force
- + William Green: Subject Matter Expert, Operations
- + Wesley Stought: Subject Matter Expert, Academy Training
- + Chad McGinty: Subject Matter Expert, Leadership
- + * Rania Adwan: Subject Matter Expert, Community Engagement
- + Regina Scott: Subject Matter Expert, Training
- + * Jon Maskaly, PhD: Subject Matter Expert, Data Structure and Analysis
- + * Christopher Donner: Subject Matter Expert, Data Support
- + Michelle Cook: Subject Matter Expert, Project Support
- + * Joan Biebel: Subject Matter Expert, Project Support

Summary of Proposed Services

After our acceptance as the Independent Evaluator, we will work with the formal stakeholders to confirm the Evaluation Plan (plan) for monitoring practices and technical assistance and the reporting process, including report delivery. This application outlines our intended approach, our team and the anticipated level of effort to deliver on the reform goals in Minneapolis. Our goal is to engage independently and objectively, and to measure and report whether the Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) and the City of Minneapolis (City) have obtained Full and Effective Compliance with the Agreement. Specifically, we will fulfill the role of the Independent Evaluator in developing an Evaluation Plan (Plan) that will offer a strategic project approach that will measure Full and Effective Compliance (FEC) with the Agreement's requirements. We have had success in providing agency-specific guidance on the

requirements for compliance with each Agreement paragraph. These requirements and compliance measures provide clarity to the organization in the actions needed to achieve compliance and provide transparency and a consistent goal for delivery. Our plan will be to ensure our team works closely with the City, the communities of Minneapolis, and the MPD and its staff in a cost-effective and collaborative manner to facilitate compliance with the terms of the Agreement.

Our work is focused on defining the expected outcomes, coming to an agreement on the tasks required and observation, analysis and engagement throughout the monitoring period to ensure clarity, focus and progression. These actions will then be validated through data analysis and ongoing engagement with community and other stakeholders regarding their perceptions, concerns and observed outcomes.

Methodology

Jensen Hughes will follow a tested process designed to gather the information needed to measure progress, identify risks and engage in corrective action to ensure fidelity to the completion of the Agreement requirements. Our work is predicated upon a project management approach; we define the work plan, the timeline and the anticipated budget and deliver on the plan. There is transparency to the client at all times, including any risks identified with the project progression. We use established protocols, tools and methodologies for collecting and analyzing data, including interviews, observations, sampling methodology and file reviews as needed, such as internal affairs investigations and use of force reviews.



We hold active BSI certification for ISO/IEC 27001:2013 Information Security Management Systems, reflecting the high standard of information security to which Jensen Hughes will adhere for this project.

We will leverage qualitative and quantitative research methodologies to understand the operational approach the MPD is using to implement the Agreement. Our evaluation tools ensure consistent review and provide objective evidence of interviews, reviews, observations and training assessments. Given the importance of data extraction and use, we have developed the resources and knowledge to extract data from the myriad law enforcement databases. Over the past decade, we have developed strategies that align disparate database information, including evaluating what types of digital systems an agency uses for computer-aided dispatch, records management, criminal case management, internal affairs case management and early intervention systems. The status of MPD data is also a risk issue for this program, and we would have to determine the state of the data and what analytics we can conduct based on how data is collected and stored. However, we leverage a team of skilled and experienced data scientists and researchers to assist not only in extraction, but also in identifying trends and informing our analysis, confirmation of compliance and reporting based on the raw, background data. With this process, we ensure that MPD reporting is accurate.

Frequency of Proposed Activities and Personnel Responsible for Various Activities

Monitoring is a high-touch process, particularly in the first two years. We will use digital meeting systems to facilitate communication and collaboration throughout the project. However, effective evaluation requires on-site observations and direct community engagement. Based on the RFP requirements, we anticipate four site visits in Year 1, which will include a kickoff visit for all stakeholders and each site visit will include a community outreach event as well as individual meetings and contact based upon specific goals for the site visit.

Monthly check-ins will occur with MPD for each of the strategic reform areas, with more frequent contact anticipated during the early work phases. For example, during policy review, we would anticipate bi-monthly meetings during the building phase of the policy as the discussion and editing are active. Further, we provide additional meeting hours for issues as they arise to address additional discussion, review or technical assistance.

Personnel Responsible for Various Activities

<i>Name and Role</i>	<i>Hours</i>
Debra Kirby, MA, JD: Monitor, Executive Oversight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight, Progress Review Development, Stakeholder Engagement 	310
Sydney Roberts, JD: Deputy Monitor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy, Non-Discriminatory Policing, Stakeholder Engagement 	610
Michael Dirden, JD: Subject Matter Expert, Organizational Accountability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Force, Accountability 	618
Edward Denmark, DA: Subject Matter Expert, Use of Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Force; BWC, Training 	450
William Green: Subject Matter Expert, Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stops, Searches and Arrests, Supervisory Roles, Officer Wellness 	450
Wesley Stought: Subject Matter Expert, Academy Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academy Operations 	200
Rania Adwan: Subject Matter Expert, Community Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder Engagement 	490
Regina Scott: Subject Matter Expert, Organizational Change and Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training, EIS 	250
Jon Maskaly, PhD: Subject Matter Expert, Data Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Identification, Survey 	310
Christopher Donner, PhD: Subject Matter Expert, Data Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis 	115

Joan Biebel, MS, PMP: Subject Matter Expert, Project Support	350
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management 	
Michelle Cook: Subject Matter Expert, Project Support	147
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Support 	

Manner of Coordination with MPD and City

We would work with the Implementation Unit to assist in:

- + Securing any needed documents or electronic data for review. A tracking system would be developed to ensure no duplicative requests and to ensure transparency around requests and delivery. This sheet would be reviewed as part of the monthly meetings.
- + Arranging for physical facilities, such as interview rooms that would accommodate confidential discussions and a conference room where our team members would have access to tables and electrical outlets.
- + Assisting our team with the scheduling and arranging of the interviews of key personnel, recognizing that many interviews might be conducted remotely using an online platform such as Microsoft Teams.

Communication with Parties, Community Members and MPD Officers

We will conduct extensive outreach to identify stakeholders for interviews to understand their perceptions of the police department and its critical response operations. Internal strategies will include scheduled meetings, focus groups, ride-alongs and direct interviews. We also conduct outreach to collective bargaining representatives, elected officials and other government stakeholders to gather a broad range of perspectives from the systems stakeholders. We conduct extensive outreach to identify community stakeholders to engage with to understand their perceptions of the police department and its critical response operations. We rely on a technique known as snowballing, in which we engage key community stakeholders for initial interviews and enlist their support in identifying other key parties to engage. We work from a perspective of non-attribution with a goal of broadly

identifying and defining the community sentiment towards its police department. Our approach includes individual interviews, group interviews based on identified association and the larger community town halls to discuss issues of concern to the community and their engagement with and perceptions of the MPD. We have hosted these types of meetings in other cities and will rely upon tested processes to conduct outreach, engage and support the meetings required under the RFP. Finally, we will provide remote and anonymous opportunities for outreach through the website which will encourage and record the outcomes of other engagements.

We have found that on-site activities during an evaluation should focus on collaboration, whether it is observations, interviews or community meetings. We are able to maximize these visits using remote platforms. For example, leading into and from a site visit, we schedule meetings using online meeting platforms to prioritize issues and to have follow-up conversations. We have had success with this methodology as it allows for ongoing engagement with a reduced cost. The snowballing technique is helpful with remote meetings, as once physical contact is made, many community stakeholders are comfortable within the digital environment. However, each visit will focus on engagement and inclusion, recognizing that not all persons can or want to engage remotely.

Collaboration

Jensen Hughes sees the role of the Independent Evaluator as not only measuring the progress of MPD, but one that is invested in a successful outcome. This comes through a collaborative focus on achieving the goals of the Agreement. Internal and external stakeholders play a key role in successful compliance with the reform requirements. Our job is to help support that outcome.

Internal Collaboration

Our team brings the experience of both having worked under similar demands and in having held agencies to account in implementing reform. We use a range of support, engagement and technical assistance in helping police departments and their communities achieve transparency, share perspectives and reconcile supportive outcomes. We reduce internal resistance and increase success through face-to-face conversations with law enforcement agency personnel of all ranks. Our ability to listen to representatives from the agency's rank-and-file members and our policies regarding non-attributional interviews help ensure open, frank conversations. We use focus groups, peer interviews and ride-alongs to inform our understanding of concerns and performance consistent with the Agreement requirements. We then place these concerns within the reform framework, seeking to provide technical assistance or defined measurements that help address and clarify concerns.

We have found in other agencies that leadership concerns, while sometimes aligned with the rank and file, also focus on resources, budget, external factors and for the executive staff, obtaining the support of mid-managers. Our discussions with the executives may shift to providing technical assistance on managing organizational change, identifying best practices in leadership development and training and helping to implement long-term strategies aimed at the key reform components. As with the rank and file, our work and evaluation are supported by data culled from interviews, internal and external, and observations.

Community Stakeholder Collaboration

Providing an active voice in policing strategies is one of the key reasons we always meet with community members, thereby ensuring their voices are heard in our work. This information is critical for police reform because whether policing practices have improved is closely aligned with the community perspective. Our team members seek to engage across all communities and have expertise in community activism and outreach. Additionally, we will meet at least once a quarter with the community more broadly in a publicized meeting. We will ensure culturally appropriate engagement and ensure language and ability needs are addressed. Using a town hall perspective, we will seek to host these meetings across the city with a focus on those neighborhoods facing policing challenges, be it service delivery, direct actions or to learn more about specific aspects of the Agreement.

We will also establish a website for the posting of information relevant to the reform progress and our independent evaluation. The website will provide another direct contact link for the community and other stakeholders to engage and address concerns confidentially.

Finally, we provide non-attribution for the community voices in our reports, which we have found to be helpful in addressing concerns among the community when discussing police services.

Scope of Services

We have learned that organizational focus must be directed to be successful in implementation. The Agreement covers a wide range of reform requirements and there are three components of compliance: policy, training and implementation. Key to our approach will be the fundamental objective of the Agreement, namely, *“...to facilitate an improved relationship between MPD and community members through increased transparency and public input; to improve oversight and accountability systems so that MPD will collect and analyze data on officer activities and fairly and efficiently impose corrective action for misconduct; and to enhance support for officers through robust employee wellness programs, training, and supervision.”*

Our methodology and work plan have been refined over the years during our engagements with diverse municipalities and law enforcement agencies of all sizes. The stakeholders would have visibility at every step of the work plan, as transparency in the process drives the best outcomes. Our work is based on a defined project management approach that ensures on-time, on-budget delivery. The client will have visibility at every step of the work plan, as transparency in the process drives the best outcomes. As such, the following information is designed to serve as an overview of how we would conduct our evaluation.

Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan: We would initially focus on those issues that contribute most to community mistrust and to developing a change culture, specifically policies, practices and training regarding use of force and personnel complaints. These two issues intersect across many of the Agreement requirements and are generally central to communities that lack trust in their police departments.

Year 1 would also set forth the baseline requirements across all strategic areas of the Agreement. For example, while the initial focus on the policies for use of force and personnel complaints would lead Year 1, other essential policies would be added to the discussions as relevant. In this manner, the iterative process of drafting policies to inform officers and the public would begin to take root and facilitate the understanding and development for policies that follow. The Year 2 plan would prioritize focus on the key strategic areas of non-

discriminatory policing and stops, searches and arrests, as these are generally linked in data and by the public. Year 3 would focus on the overall training strategy of the department in addition to officer support and wellness. Year 4 would focus primarily on the implementation of the prior work but also address the larger issue of oversight and accountability within MPD, including transparency, community and internal programs and processes that hold officers to account. Our experience has shown that policy and training consume most of the early focus in a reform program, and the operational rollout is most felt in the following years. Therefore, we do not anticipate Year 1 and Year 2 would have significant achievement for Full and Effective Compliance (FEC), but rather, measured progress toward reform goals.

Our Approach

Within 90 calendar days of assuming duties as the Independent Evaluator and in conjunction with the Parties, Jensen Hughes will develop an Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan (Plan). We would establish the prioritized Agreement Paragraphs for Year 1 and Year 2, including all paragraphs related to use of force and to personnel complaints and accountability in Year 1. In Year 2, stops, seizures and arrests would then shift to the prioritized focus and include non-discriminatory policing. Each yearly Plan will include all Agreement paragraphs in addition to the prioritized strategic areas, with the actions taken overall reported as part of the annual report.

The Jensen Hughes Evaluation Plan would:

- + Establish a kickoff call with key stakeholders to the Agreement and set baseline expectations across the reform program.
- + Engage with the Implementation Unit to set the meeting schedule and to share the data requirements. Our data requirements generally focus on both the data reporting of the department and the raw data as downloaded from the various systems used by the agency. Tracking the ask and receipt of records will be part of the Plan.
- + Set forth a schedule of Agreement paragraphs to be evaluated during the first two years. The Plan will provide for coordination across all Agreement paragraphs, even those not

evaluated in Year 1 or Year 2. For all provisions of the Agreement for which a deadline is not otherwise specified, the Plan will engage in the initial work for and discussion prior to the evaluation beginning.

- + Establish the measurements for the strategic areas under review; for example, use of force, community engagement or personnel will have different measurements in evaluating FEC.
- + Identify opportunities for ongoing technical assistance and problem-solving. The monthly meetings will serve to help address early concerns and to help identify gaps, challenges or good practices to share across the department.

Determining Compliance: We will evaluate FEC through a transparent process that identifies the tasking/actions required to achieve FEC, the data that will inform and the implementation requirements. We would ensure:

- + Each paragraph requiring action by MPD will have established compliance measures that will outline the tasking required of MPD to achieve compliance. We find that this allows for transparency in the evaluation process and allows the law enforcement agency to move forward on its reform goals. These measures would be developed as part of the initial work plan and will be linked to the requirements of FEC. For example, if the paragraph requires the policy to state something specifically, a compliance measurement would have that requirement.
- + Our use of data will either support or identify the gaps in compliance, based on the paragraph requirements.
- + Review of training and implementation, and its influence on FEC. While policies are key, how they are trained and implemented will determine FEC. We use a standardized review tool tied to the training objectives that will allow for consistent review and determination of whether the training is consistent with the paragraph requirements.
- + Implementation is assessed both as a matter of data and observation, but also as a component of community input and determination. Whether the community sees and recognizes the changes in the MPD will be a key question in our work.

As a matter of compliance, what data will be used will determine on the data available and applicable. For example, for use of force, compliance reviews would increase whether use of force as a whole has decreased (data); how reports of use of force are completed and whether in policy (review); and whether the internal review practices are robust and consistent with the policy and Agreement goals (data, observation and review).

Data Collection and Analysis Plan: Data, and its status within MPD, is a risk issue and one that we prioritize. Our team has vast experience in extracting and analyzing data from a variety of data sources that house the data necessary to oversee and improve the operation of police organizations. Additionally, our team of researchers is skilled in training agency personnel in how to extract, define and analyze the data—as well as presenting the findings to various audiences. Supported by a team of other researchers, our team’s goal is to develop accurate and actionable information that agencies can use to inform stakeholders about the progress, issues and challenges that are faced by the organization.

Our Senior Researcher has a Ph.D. in criminology; a graduate certificate in Measurement, Evaluation, Statistics and Assessment; and a demonstrated track record of excellence in policing research. He is a nationally recognized expert in various facets of policing research and quantitative methodology within the academic realm and has a demonstrated track record of supporting our work with police agencies to understand, manage and capitalize on their data for organizational management and improvement. Our work focuses on following the logic of the department, validating the reporting against policy and observations and analyzing the accuracy of the reported data. The evaluation will use this data to determine whether MPD is compliant with the Agreement as a matter of both quantitative and qualitative review, the latter being the observations of the team and the input from stakeholders.

Assessment of Implementation Progress: Jensen Hughes will conduct Implementation Progress Reviews, periodically as required under the RPF, and as described in the Plan. Jensen Hughes will provide the City, MPD and MDHR with the underlying analysis, data, methods and source of the information relied upon in the Progress Reviews upon request.

- + The Plan will develop timelines in accordance with the work completed and in progress as referenced in the Agreement. As identified, the work will be measured against the paragraph requirements and as defined in the compliance measures. Generally, the progression is policy, curriculum development, training and implementation.
- + Audits and data review for reporting will be transparent to the stakeholders and will run parallel to the work as it develops and the data are refined. We will work within the Plan and Agreement to develop a timeline and sequence for sharing the results of all Progress Reviews with the Parties.
- + Each Jensen Hughes team member has a defined role and responsibility, aligned with the RFP strategic areas and will drive the work of the subcomponent. These team members will work with the MPD Implementation Unit to align and ensure progress on the key reform requirements throughout the monitoring process through meetings, policy review and technical assistance as requested.

Communication

Our experience has demonstrated that consistent scheduled communication is key to reform success. We will work with local community stakeholders to establish public meetings in locations throughout the city as part of the Plan. These meetings will be held during each site visit. The team will also meet individually with stakeholders and community groups to address specific issues and concerns relative to their community.

The Plan would establish meetings at varying levels of the overall program development: working group meetings that are centered on technical assistance and discussions on how to advance the specific work within the strategic area, Implementation Unit meetings with key members of the Evaluation Team to address data and coordination issues, and executive meetings to discuss overall progress and larger organizational matters.

We will establish work rules regarding communication, engagement and problem-solving with the City, MPD and MDHR. This will include problem-solving and escalation practices if warranted based on the level of engagement.

Jensen Hughes will establish processes to facilitate consistent, transparent review and comment across the reform actions of MPD. We will use a tracking system that will identify when a review is submitted and the Evaluator's response, within 30 days wherever the Agreement requires the City or MPD to share a policy or plan with the Independent Evaluator. This will include policy and plan review and training review. Our Project Manager will ensure timely engagement and activity.

- + *Communication with Community Members:* We will regularly meet with community stakeholders who have expressed an interest to meet on a regular basis to discuss the City's and MPD's progress under the Agreement, to explain our reports and the Agreement implementation process, and to understand community perspectives of police interactions, including the outcomes from the annual community evaluation survey. In addition to other meetings, we will hold at least one community meeting every four months at varied locations throughout the city, as required by the Plan. We will publicize community meetings on its website and designate a member of the team as a community liaison, who will serve as a point of contact for community members.
- + *Communication with MPD Officers:* We will meet with MPD officers on a routine basis to inform them about the Agreement implementation process and to capture their questions, concerns and suggestions regarding implementation. We will designate a member of the team as an officer liaison, who will serve as a point of contact for officers.
- + *Publicly Posted Information:* We will maintain a public website and will post, at a minimum, our Evaluation Plan, reports, the Parties' Court filings, if any, schedules of community meetings and briefings, and proposed budget and accounting.

We will make public statements only to the extent permitted by the Agreement and will testify to its observations, findings and recommendations only before the Court with jurisdiction over the Agreement, unless required to do otherwise so by a court order.

Progress Reviews: The Plan will provide for the publication dates of the Progress Reviews, on a semi-annual basis. These reports will also include progress achieved in the key areas of policy, training and implementation. Jensen Hughes will provide a copy of the semi-annual

reports to the Parties in draft form at least 30 calendar days prior to public release as scheduled on the calendar. Prior to posting, we will support a process of review, known as a collaborative conference, for a line-by-line review as necessary and reconciliation of the comments regarding any errors. After this process, we will then post the final report to the website. As part of the publication, we will also establish an electronic mechanism for receiving public feedback on the reports. This feedback will inform our future work as well as provide context for the data and observations in the Progress Review.

Annual Community Evaluation: To obtain additional insight into the perceptions of MPD policing practices, we will deliver two surveys on an annual basis: one external to the community and one internal to the department. Jensen Hughes will present the survey methodology to the Parties and will evaluate and implement as appropriate any feedback from the Parties in the development of the initial surveys and in making improvements to subsequent surveys. The specific collection practices will be refined upon award and consistent with the RFP and Agreement. Our team has conducted such survey activity in other cities with good results.

We will separately conduct an anonymous annual survey of MPD officers regarding officers' experiences in MPD, the organizational culture, officer support and wellness, and other areas deemed appropriate. Our team has engaged in this type of survey across multiple law enforcement agencies and finds it to be informative in identifying any challenges with reform. This data will also be available on the public website with appropriate breakdowns regarding gender, rank, type of assignment and precinct.

Termination Evaluation: Evaluation is required no later than four years after the Effective Date, or at the time the City and/or MPD reach a consent decree with the Department of Justice, whichever is sooner. We will complete the Termination Evaluation to determine whether the City and MPD have demonstrated Full and Effective Compliance with the Agreement.

The Termination Evaluation will (a) determine whether and to what extent the Agreement has been achieved; (b) areas of greatest achievement with analysis of what has contributed to

this success; (c) areas requiring further attention and strategies or technical assistance needed to achieve the requirements of the Agreement; and (d) any suggested modifications to the Agreement that may be necessary for continued achievement in light of changed circumstances.

At least 30 calendar days prior to finalizing the Termination Evaluation, Jensen Hughes will submit the Termination Evaluation to the Parties in draft form for review and comment by the Parties and meet with the Parties to discuss the Termination Evaluation. The Parties will have 30 calendar days from receiving the draft Termination Evaluation to provide comments and objections. We will make any revisions deemed appropriate in light of the Parties' comments.

To the extent that Full and Effective Compliance has not been achieved, the Termination Evaluation will identify specific areas requiring further progress to meet Full and Effective Compliance. Jensen Hughes will provide a table outlining the status of any paragraph not deemed compliant and will update annually if requested by the City, until Full and Effective Compliance has been reached.

Experience and Capacity

As requested, below we provide two projects that our team has completed or progressed substantially.

San Francisco, CA: Following the assessment of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) under the CRI-TA program, we served as Independent Monitor of the SFPD in a city-funded collaborative reform project reporting to the California Department of Justice (Cal DOJ) to enact lasting reform through implementation of the 272 recommendations identified in the assessment report. From 2018-2022, we provided implementation guidance, technical assistance, and other support including development and review of plans, policies and procedures to support SFPD's implementation and substantial compliance with 245 of the recommendations (90%). Additionally, we submitted three reports on SFPD's progress in implementing the recommendations covering a range of issues, including internal investigation policies and procedures, early intervention program (EIP), use of force, bias, community engagement, and employee development. Currently, we continue to:

- + Assist Cal DOJ, in consultation with the city of San Francisco and SFPD, as it evaluates and reports on the implementation of the reforms, including the development and review of any necessary plans, policies or procedures
- + Assist Cal DOJ in providing SFPD with technical assistance
- + Prepare and submit independent reports to Cal DOJ assessing the city and SFPD's implementation of the reforms

Bakersfield, CA: We serve as the appointed Monitor to oversee the implementation of the stipulated judgment entered into by Cal DOJ and the city of Bakersfield. Similar to a federal consent decree, the judgment is enforceable by the Court, in effect for five years and ends upon compliance with the requirements of the judgment. This work focuses on protecting individual statutory and constitutional rights, treating individuals with dignity and respect, and promoting public safety consistent with community priorities. The monitor is tasked with evaluating the BPD's progress in implementing the judgment's reform requirements.

References

Nancy Beninati
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
nancy.beninati@doj.ca.gov
510-879-0010

Greg Terry
Chief of Police
Bakersfield Police Department (California)
GTerry@bakersfieldpd.us
661-326-3880

Personnel Listing

Below are the names and roles of our project team. Please see the **Attachments** section for complete resumes of each team member. We reserve the right for team member expansion to provide the Scope of Services identified in this RFP and the Agreement, but we do not anticipate the need, nor will the budget increase as a result.

* *Denotes subcontractor*

- + Debra Kirby, MA, JD: Monitor, Executive Oversight
- + Sydney Roberts, JD: Deputy Monitor
- + * Michael Dirden, JD: Subject Matter Expert, Organizational Accountability
- + Edward Denmark, DA: Subject Matter Expert, Use of Force
- + William Green: Subject Matter Expert, Operations
- + Wesley Stought: Subject Matter Expert, Academy Training
- + Chad McGinty: Subject Matter Expert, Leadership
- + * Rania Adwan: Subject Matter Expert, Community Engagement
- + Regina Scott: Subject Matter Expert, Training
- + * Jon Maskaly, PhD: Subject Matter Expert, Data Support
- + * Christopher Donner: Subject Matter Expert, Data Support
- + * Joan Biebel, Subject Matter Expert, PMP, Project Support
- + Michelle Cook: Subject Matter Expert, Project Support

Budget

Jensen Hughes is offering these services to the City of Minneapolis on our General Services Administration (GSA) Schedule 84 Contract GS-07F-0345W, through the Cooperative Purchasing Program. We hold a GSA Schedule 84 Total Solutions for Law Enforcement contract, and clients can purchase our services through a competitively bid federal contract with specifically defined areas for services such as those outlined in this proposal.

For this engagement, we are willing to discount our GSA rates from the approved hourly rate of \$378.09 for subject matter experts assigned to this project to a **blended rate of \$305 per hour, a discount of approximately 20 percent**. Our pricing breakdown by year is detailed on the following pages.

Assumptions

Annual costs will shift as the work progresses. The focus will shift from policy and training to evaluation; therefore, the level of effort is anticipated to be fairly consistent. Site visits will cover policy, training, community outreach and other key functions but are grouped based on the need for flexibility to address emerging issues.

Additionally, we anticipate the data used by MPD to be in a relatively clean and accessible format. If the data are not consistent with national standards – which we will determine as part of the plan – work focus could shift in Year 1, but the budget would remain consistent.

Billing Schedule

Jensen Hughes will invoice on a monthly accrual basis, including monthly expenses incurred, with payment received within 30 days of invoicing.

Independent Monitor – Year 1

<i>Phase or Activity</i>	<i>Fee</i>
Site Visits and Community Outreach	\$566,000
Monitor Engagement	
• Policy Review and Technical Assistance	\$244,000
• Training Engagement	\$93,000
• Data Analytics, Survey and Website	\$265,000
Monitor Activities – Evaluation and Reporting	\$186,000
Direct Costs/Expenses	\$141,000
Total	\$1,495,000

Independent Monitor – Proposed Year 2

<i>Phase or Activity</i>	<i>Fee</i>
Site Visits and Community Outreach	\$570,000
Monitoring Activities	\$523,000
Data Analytics, Survey and Website	\$265,000
Direct Costs/Expenses – Includes Website	\$150,000
Total	\$1,499,000

Independent Monitor – Proposed Year 3

<i>Phase or Activity</i>	<i>Fee</i>
Site Visits & Community Outreach	\$570,000
Monitoring Activities	\$523,000
Training Engagement, Data Analytics, Survey and Website	\$265,000
Direct Costs/Expenses – Includes Website	\$150,000
Total	\$1,499,000

Independent Monitor – Proposed Year 4

<i>Phase or Activity</i>	<i>Fee</i>
Site Visits & Community Outreach	\$570,000
Monitoring Activities	\$523,000
Training Engagement, Data Analytics, Survey and Website	\$265,000
Direct Costs/Expenses – Includes Website	\$150,000
Total	\$1,499,000

Conflict of Interest/Code of Ethics

Jensen Hughes does not have any issue in complying with the City's Code of Ethics, namely Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances.

Sample Work Product

The following are publicly available reports of our work product, including work produced as Hillard Heintze, the former name of what is now Jensen Hughes' Law Enforcement Consulting service line. Jensen Hughes acquired Hillard Heintze in 2019.

2023

- + *Operational Assessment of the Wichita Police Department*. March 10, 2023. [link](#)

2022

- + *City of Minneapolis: An After-Action Review of City Agencies' Responses to Activities Directly Following George Floyd's Death on May 25, 2020*. March 7, 2022. [link](#)
- + *San Francisco Police Department Collaborative Reform Initiative: Phase III – Final Assessment Report*. February 11, 2022. [link](#)

2021

- + *La Mesa Police Department: An Independent After-Action Report for the Civil Unrest on May 30, 2020*. January 26, 2021. [link](#)
- + *Louisville Metro Police Department: An Independent and Objective Assessment of the Department's Policies, Practices and Procedures, as Well as Community Engagement*. January 27, 2021. [link](#)
- + *Santa Rosa Police Department: An Independent After-Action Report on the SRPD's Response to High-Profile Events in Late May and Early June 2020*. February 22, 2021. [link](#)
- + *The State of Indiana: An Assessment of Indiana's Law Enforcement Curriculum and Training, the State's Law Enforcement Training Board, and State Law Enforcement Agencies' Policies and Practices*. September 15, 2021. [link](#)

2020

- + *Fontana Police Department: An Independent Assessment of Law Enforcement Operations*. November 6, 2020. [link](#)
- + *Oakland Police Department: Police Discipline Disparity Study*. April 23, 2020. [link](#)

2019

- + *Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board: An Independent Review of Law Enforcement Operations and Management*. December 30, 2019. [link](#)
- + U.S. Department of Justice. *Law Enforcement Best Practices: Lessons Learned from the Field*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. 2019.

2017

- + *Ann Arbor Police Department: Independent Analysis of Community Engagement Practices*. November 3, 2017. [link](#)

2016

- + *Boulder Police Department: Independent Analysis of Police Data and Review of Professional Police Complaint Processes*. February 18, 2016. [link](#)

Attachments

On the following pages, please see the following attachments:

- + Applicant Checklist
- + Team Resumes
- + Certificate of Insurance

In addition, please note that have reviewed the sample terms and conditions that were part of the RFP package and have no modifications to propose.