

**PROPOSAL FOR
MINNEAPOLIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR**



RELMAN COLFAX PLLC

1225 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20036

202.728.1888

www.relmanlaw.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
METHODOLOGY	4
COLLABORATION	13
EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY	24
REFERENCES	27
PERSONNEL LISTING	27
BUDGET	29
CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CODE OF ETHICS	30



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Minneapolis is poised to be a national leader on policing. With an engaged and organized community, progressive leadership, and renowned universities and corporations, Minneapolis has the resources to chart a path to community safety that honors the dignity of the city’s diverse communities and the potential of the police department; repairs past harms; and creates mutual familiarity, accountability, and trust. As the Minnesota Department of Human Resources (“MDHR”) and United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) findings demonstrate, substantial work is required to achieve these goals, but the Agreement¹ is an essential step on that path. We are pleased to propose an Evaluation Team that can assess progress under the Agreement and help realize this vision. Relative to past law enforcement monitorships, the hallmarks of our proposal are collaboration with all parties, community participation nested in a pathway of progression over time,² and a team with familiarity with the Minneapolis Police Department (“MPD”) and expertise in measuring and remedying race discrimination.

Our Team

Our team includes former police chiefs, including a former MPD officer, with expertise in transforming departments; leaders with relationships across Minneapolis’s diverse communities; academics and practitioners with extensive policing consent decree experience; and civil rights attorneys who have secured structural changes at local, regional, and national scales.

Relman Colfax is a national civil rights firm with a track record of successfully representing cities and law enforcement officers facing race discrimination; conducting monitorships, audits, and internal investigations; and combatting community-wide race and disability discrimination. **Reed Colfax** will serve as the lead evaluator and will be the primary

¹ “Agreement” in this proposal refers to the Settlement Agreement and Order between the State of Minnesota and the City of Minneapolis, including the Minneapolis Police Department (collectively, “the Parties”), signed by Judge Janisch on July 13, 2023. References by paragraph number throughout this proposal are to paragraphs within that Agreement.

² We understand that Minneapolis’s many communities have a range of experiences with policing and differing views on the best way forward for the MPD. We use “community” here not to suggest a monolithic view by Minneapolis residents, but as a shorthand for the many individuals and communities in Minneapolis whose experiences with the police over time will be an essential measure of the ultimate success of the Agreement.



point of contact for the Parties. Mr. Colfax is an expert on discrimination laws, and he has led ground-breaking litigation, civil rights audits, and enforced settlement agreements remedying the harms of racial discrimination around the country, from denials of clean water for Black neighborhoods in Ohio and Michigan to refusals to provide municipal services to a Gullah Geechee community in Georgia. Relman Colfax will serve as the coordinator of the Evaluation Team, managing the project and directly engaging in all aspects of the Evaluation Team's work.

Chief Mike Davis is a former MPD officer and former chief of police in the City of Brooklyn Park. Chief Davis brings first-hand familiarity with MPD. He also has a track record of effective police leadership, having led the City of Brooklyn Park to its lowest levels of crime in 22 years. Chief Davis founded and operates MBD Innovation, which consults with public safety executives and municipal governments. Chief Davis will serve as deputy evaluator and be the officer liaison and primary contact for MPD.

Chief Scott Thomson served as the chief of police in Camden, New Jersey and is an expert on transforming police departments through community policing. Chief Thomson will serve as a senior advisor on law enforcement, including by providing technical assistance to MPD leadership on cultural change within police departments and leveraging technology as a force multiplier for efficiencies, effectiveness, and accountability. Chief Thomson is the President of Holtec Security International serving clients in the private and public sectors.

The Center for Innovations in Community Safety (CICS) at Georgetown Law School brings a wealth of experience working to transform community safety infrastructure. CICS will help with facilitating community participation; conducting assessments of MPD policies, practices, and data; and coordinating technical assistance. CICS implements innovative programming in partnership with law enforcement and community members. CICS also works closely with law enforcement in implementing a successful, innovative law enforcement training initiative, ABLE (Active Bystandership for Law Enforcement). Over 350 departments across the continent—including the Minneapolis Police Department—have joined CICS' ABLE Project, a training and culture change program designed to build cultures of active bystandership in law enforcement agencies. CICS has convened and is currently facilitating a community-driven problem-solving process with DC's Metropolitan Police Department, area hospital-based violence intervention programs, medical staff, and community members to develop policies governing law enforcement interactions with patients in hospital emergency rooms. CICS also



provides research, policy, and technical assistance to municipalities and organizations to support the creation and success of alternative first response programs. CICS's Faculty Director, Georgetown Law Professor **Christy Lopez**, is one of the most knowledgeable experts on police reform and law enforcement consent decrees in the country. Professor Lopez will serve as a senior advisor on law enforcement and community engagement, helping the Team execute a vision for the evaluation process that will ensure tangible community involvement at every step.

The community team will be led by **dr. raj sethuraju** and **Iris Roley**. Dr. sethuraju has more than 20 years of experience as a community leader and activist, has led trainings for MPD, and has been an integral part of conversations around policing in Minneapolis. Ms. Roley has spent decades successfully building avenues for police/community partnerships during and after the Cincinnati consent decree. Ms. Roley and Dr. sethuraju will lead the substantial, deliberate community engagement necessary for ensuring community participation in each aspect of the evaluation process while building structures for community/police dialogue.

Evident Change, a data analytics non-profit that uses data and research to improve social systems will run the data analysis components of the evaluation, including by assessing MPD's data collection procedures and practices, providing technical assistance on data collection, and collecting and analyzing data for assessing compliance with the Agreement. Evident Change's Chief Program Officer **Dr. Angie Wolf** will direct this work. Dr. Wolf has substantial experience monitoring consent decrees and has worked with communities to use data to increase transparency and advance the public interest.

Our Approach

The Agreement requires changes to policing across several areas, and it requires that every change be made in consultation with the communities policed and with officers at all levels, disseminated through appropriate training, supervised and enforced through discipline, and reviewed for compliance by the Evaluation Team. Our focus as an Evaluation Team is: (1) establishing clear and understandable benchmarks to determine whether the City and MPD have reached full and effective compliance with a focus on incorporating perspectives of Minneapolis residents and assessing outcomes in the community; (2) incorporating input from officers at all levels, supporting MPD with technical assistance, as set out in the RFP, and promoting cultural change within MPD; (3) incorporating community members and groups into every stage of the evaluation process and building capacity among community groups to continue to participate in



reforms after the evaluation period; and (4) conducting rigorous quantitative and qualitative assessments to review progress and describing and analyzing changes over time in publicly accessible and digestible reports.

To ensure a focus on implementing structures that will outlast the evaluation period, and to prevent the evaluation process from becoming stale, we will conduct the Termination Evaluation at the 4-year mark, and if we are still serving as the Evaluation Team after 5 years because full and effective compliance has not yet been achieved, we will submit a report on MPD's compliance with each benchmark and areas for growth at that time. When drafting that 5-year report, we will take a hard look at and discuss with the Parties how and what further evaluation will be productive and who would be the best parties to carry that evaluation forward.

The degree to which MPD engages in meaningful and lasting change is largely within the control of MPD leadership and officers, but we will provide clear guidance on how that change will be measured, support in getting there, and a platform for Minneapolis's communities to meaningfully and consistently participate in the process.

In keeping with the RFP requirements, this proposal includes a methodology section describing how we will approach the evaluation; a collaboration section describing our vision for how we will facilitate open, complete, and accurate communication among the Parties, the Evaluation Team, and community members; a scope of services describing how we will measure and evaluate success under the Agreement, facilitate technical assistance, and report out those evaluations; an Experience and Capability section discussing the Evaluation Team's most relevant experience; a References section; a Personnel Listing; a Budget; and a section addressing Conflict of Interest/Code of Ethics. Resumes, references, links to relevant publications, and a budget spreadsheet are also included as attachments.

METHODOLOGY

Below, we describe our methodology for engaging the Parties and the community; benchmarking, technical assistance, and evaluating; and an estimate of time we anticipate spending on various activities.

I. Engaging with Parties and the Community

As described more fully in the "Collaboration" section below, we will engage with the



Parties and the community using the following methodologies:

A. Initial Meetings and Advisory Boards

When the Evaluation Team assumes its duties, team leadership will first identify and meet in-person with key stakeholders from a range of perspectives, including the Parties, MPD leadership and rank and file, community leadership and interested community members, the MPD Federation, and DOJ. At these meetings, which will include informal gatherings and structured focus groups, the Evaluation Team will discuss the evaluation process and seek input on the process, goals for the Agreement, and potential stumbling blocks.

To establish structures that will ensure that these interactions have a lasting impact, from these meetings the Evaluation Team will also convene (1) a Community Advisory Board of interested residents from a variety of Minneapolis communities, and (2) an MPD Advisory Board made up of officers from all levels. The Evaluation Team will meet with both boards on a regular basis to ensure that their voices are incorporated into the evaluation process, beginning with discussions about developing the evaluation plan.

B. Communication with the Parties

Effective communication among all Parties is critical to the success of the evaluation process and necessary to the collaboration that is the centerpiece of this proposal. As such, communication will be a high priority for the Evaluation Team. The Team will maintain regular contact with the Parties and other stakeholders, setting up both regular and as-needed meetings with the City, MPD, and MDHR, and we anticipate meeting with the Parties more frequently for the first six months to ensure that everyone has a clear sightline into the Evaluation Team’s work, progress, and immediate next steps, and that any impediments to success under the Agreement are being raised and addressed in a timely way. After the first six months, we anticipate establishing standing meetings at least monthly with each Party separately and/or collectively as appropriate. We anticipate that at some point it will be appropriate for DOJ to participate in these meetings, and we will work with DOJ to incorporate its representatives then.

As discussed more fully below, the Evaluation Team will work with the MPD Advisory Board, MPD leadership, and officers at all levels to ensure that officers’ experiences and perspectives are considered and incorporated into the evaluation process.

As set forth in the Agreement, the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax, will draft an Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan (“Evaluation Plan”), semi-annual Progress Reviews,



and a Termination Evaluation, but it is our expectation that the Parties will not hear about any challenges for the first time when they are reading the required Reviews; instead, we aim through regular communication to raise issues as they arise so that we can address them collaboratively.

C. Ongoing Community Participation

The community participation team within the Evaluation Team will be led by Dr. Raj Sethuraju and Iris Roley. Dr. Sethuraju is a community leader within Minneapolis, with expertise on policing, community building, and restorative practices, and Ms. Roley, who participated in the consent decree process in Cincinnati as a community member, has worked for decades to establish structures for community/police partnership that are respectful, accountable, and productive in bringing about community safety. Dr. Sethuraju and Ms. Roley will be supported by CICS, which has extensive experience engaging communities around policing and public safety, and by the rest of the Evaluation Team.

The community participation team will develop a plan for regular communication with interested community members, justice-impacted communities, and community members who have had previous experiences with the police for the purposes of gathering input as the evaluation process proceeds and ensuring that the community is kept informed on developments and that the evaluation process is transparent. This work will include formal and informal meetings, work with the Community Advisory Board described above, the annual community survey described in ¶ 415, and support and technical assistance for the Community Oversight Commission, described in ¶¶ 337-39.

Through the Community Advisory Board and other channels, we will engage the community in establishing benchmarks for compliance under the Agreement that focus on how the experience of being policed changes during the evaluation period. In addition to feedback received from the public posting of policies under ¶ 28, members of the Community Advisory Board will participate in providing feedback, where appropriate, on new policies and training materials, and they will review and participate in analyzing data regarding outcomes.

While Dr. Sethuraju and Chief Davis have deep connections to Minneapolis, we recognize the critical importance of building trust between Minneapolis communities and the entire Evaluation Team. To help create such trust, the Evaluation Team places a high priority on regular and meaningful presence in Minneapolis and allowing for open communication with the team and all interested residents. Thus, while the Agreement calls for one community meeting



every four months, the Evaluation Team anticipates more frequent meetings with individuals and community groups, including meetings with church groups, parent groups, and community centers. The schedule and format for these meetings, and the specific channels for additional, regular contact, will be established in the Evaluation Plan. For at least the first six months, the Evaluation Team will also hold regular office hours where community members can bring any comments or concerns to the Evaluation Team's attention.

To ensure that reforms outlive the evaluation period, the team will also provide Minneapolis residents and organizations with assistance building capacity to have an ongoing role in reviewing and commenting on MPD policies, procedures, and outcomes, including by exploring funding streams to support that work.

D. Website

The Evaluation Team will maintain a public website that will serve as a hub for communication between the Evaluation Team and the public. The Evaluation Plan, semi-annual reports, schedules for community meetings, briefings for the public, and budget materials will all be maintained there. The site will also provide multiple avenues for public input, from feedback on policies to questions about implementation of the Agreement. The transparency and accessibility the website provides are essential to fostering trust among MPD, the Evaluation Team, and the community.

II. Benchmarking, Technical Assistance, and Evaluations

A. Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan

As discussed more fully in the Scope of Services section below, the Evaluation Team will draft the Evaluation Plan within 90 days of beginning the evaluation. During initial meetings, the Evaluation Team will help stakeholders understand the basic framework of the Agreement's requirements while seeking to understand law enforcement and community priorities for the appropriate time and sequence for addressing each provision, including those that need to be addressed immediately and those that do not. The timing and schedule for the evaluation process will be established in the Evaluation Plan.

The Evaluation Plan will also include a schedule to ensure that the process for establishing and implementing specific policies and procedures remain on track. For example, MPD is required to procure and configure an Early Intervention System and begin phased implementation within 18 months of the Effective Date and have full implementation within 24



months of the Effective Date. The Evaluation Team will set forth benchmarks between being awarded the contract and 18 and 24 months from the Effective Date to ensure MPD is on schedule to meet the Agreement deadlines.

B. Benchmarks

The Agreement's requirements for MPD and City conduct are framed at varying levels of specificity. In establishing how we measure progress, the Evaluation Team will prioritize (1) ensuring that each of the Agreement's requirements is explained with sufficient specificity and objectivity to allow the City and MPD to know what is expected of them; and (2) ensuring that in each category, there are measures that capture whether the desired outcomes have been met.

The Evaluation Team will work with the City, MPD, and community members to assess whether each requirement is sufficiently specific and clear to serve as the standard for implementation on its own, or whether further benchmark-setting is needed in order to measure whether the City and MPD have implemented the requirement. Where additional benchmarks are needed, the subject area experts within the Evaluation Team will draft proposed benchmarks based on input from the groups described above, best practices, data regarding current MPD performance, and their own experience. Moreover, for each substantive category within the Agreement, the Evaluation Team will work with the City, MPD, and community members to determine the desired outcomes under the Agreement's requirements and establish measures for assessing whether those outcomes have been achieved.

In establishing the benchmarks and outcome measures, the Evaluation Team will maintain a focus on optimal yet reasonable expectations for policing performance, the impact and outcomes on Minneapolis communities (in terms of safety and the experience of being policed), and whether the changes promote trust between MPD and the communities it serves. The Evaluation Team will describe how it will measure performance against the standards, benchmarks, and outcome measures so that expectations are clear.

C. Evaluating Policies and Procedures

The Evaluation Team's law enforcement and legal experts, led by Chief Davis, Relman Colfax, and CICS, will gather all existing and proposed policies and procedures relevant to the Agreement currently employed by MPD and the City and review them to assess their compliance with the requirements of the Agreement. The Evaluation Team will also examine how these policies and procedures will be animated within MPD to produce the intended outcomes.



Because insights from MPD leadership and officers are essential to ensuring that new policies are responsive to the needs of the community, compliant with the law, and practical for officers, as recognized in ¶ 27, Chief Davis and other members of the Evaluation Team will facilitate MPD officer review and comment on new policies. Likewise, the team will facilitate community review and comment on relevant policies, also in keeping with ¶ 27.

If, based on the Evaluation Team's review, any existing or proposed policy does not comport with the Agreement's requirements, the Evaluation Team will make recommendations with sufficient time for MPD to consider and implement changes prior to the deadlines for promulgation set forth in the Agreement. The Evaluation Team's review of policies will continue to be informed by community experiences and input, data and information on effectiveness, and developing norms.

D. Evaluating Trainings

Existing and new trainings will be assessed in the context of the requirements of the Agreement, ¶¶ 179-240. The Evaluation Team's law enforcement and legal experts, led by Chief Davis, Relman Colfax, and CICS, will engage in individualized review of the trainings and training plan and connect MPD with technical assistance on trainings where appropriate. When possible, the community participation team will discuss the trainings and training plan with the Community Advisory Board and other community members to obtain their perspectives on how the trainings and plan reflect their understanding of the Agreement's requirements. Where practical, the Evaluation Team will include community members in both conducting and auditing trainings to ensure that evaluation of the trainings takes into account community members' experiences and to build capacity among the community.

As with policies, insights from MPD officers of all ranks are critical to assessing the effectiveness of trainings. Chief Davis and other members of the Evaluation Team will work with MPD officers at all levels to review and comment on new and existing trainings.

E. Technical Assistance

Throughout the evaluation period, the Evaluation Team, led by Chief Davis, Chief Thomson, and Professor Lopez, will make recommendations regarding needed technical assistance, and the Evaluation Team will connect MPD with appropriate resources for technical assistance and help facilitate that assistance as needed. The roadmap for technical assistance is discussed in more detail in the Scope of Services section below.



F. Data/Information Collection and Analysis

The goals of data/information collection and analysis are to provide a shared understanding of departmental activities through data transparency and reporting and to utilize data to inform practice, facilitate monitoring, and implement the Agreement. Much of the data-related work will have the two-fold purpose of 1) helping MPD in its efforts to fulfill Agreement requirements, and 2) helping the Evaluation Team's assessment of progress toward implementation and of the need for feedback and assistance to MPD.

1. Assessment of Current Data Collection and Technical Assistance to Bridge Gaps

This process will begin with an assessment of current MPD data systems and the data currently collected, including whether the data being gathered are sufficient and are being maintained in a manner that enables an accurate assessment of progress toward compliance. Chris Scharenbroch, the Director of Analytics at Evident Change, will lead a comprehensive assessment of current data systems. He and his team have extensive experience, including intaking and inventorying hundreds of data systems in policing, juvenile justice, child welfare, and other social service administrative data. Evident Change will use its intake and data management protocol to create an inventory of:

- All available MPD information relevant to the Agreement;
- Data entry policies, access, and data usage across the various departmental units;
- Security requirements; and
- Relevant pre-existing reports, dashboards, and other public or internal benchmarks of current practices.

Mr. Scharenbroch will facilitate conversations with MPD leadership, database administrators, and IT professionals to gather information for the inventory process. This often entails front-end access to the user interfaces and back-end extracts of system data. Where needed, Evident Change will develop data requests and a secure protocol for the safe exchange of information.

The Evaluation Team will use this assessment to determine whether the current systems can meet the data-related requirements of the Agreement. The team will collaborate with MPD to provide technical assistance in bridging any gaps in data collection, bringing the systems to the required levels, and implementing the Data Systems Plan outlined in ¶¶ 362-63. Dr. Wolf will oversee this reconciliation, drawing from years of experience in law enforcement data collection,



analysis, and reporting related to settlement agreements, and in implementation and evaluation projects in policing and probation departments nationwide. All data work will be done in the context of national best practices for collecting and analyzing data. This process will include ensuring compliance with the data collection provisions of the Agreement, covering ¶¶ 52 (performance evaluations), 78-80 (use of force), 109-115 (critical incidents), 140, 164-70 (searches), 195 (training), 214-15 (non-discriminatory policing), 267-88 (employee support services and early intervention system), 361-64 (data systems plan), as well as 358 and 377-81 (transparency).

2. Data Reviews and Analyses

The data systems assessment will dovetail with the core of the data-related work, that is, conducting data reviews and analyses, using the results to inform MPD practices, , and facilitating evaluation of compliance with Agreement requirements. Often, patterns can be illustrated with simple descriptive statistics or bivariate relationships. These analyses, conducted on a regular basis and expressed through customizable dashboards, can be invaluable for MPD managers to monitor officer, unit, and department-wide activities; identify occurrences and patterns that need attention; and assess implementation of departmental priorities. Advanced statistical techniques, such as regressions, clustering, or predictive modeling, can illustrate significance and multivariate associations. Both simple and advanced statistics can be used to better understand, for instance, how patterns in stops or searches relate to policing strategies, crime statistics, geography, time, demographics, and other factors, and how those patterns are impacted by changes in practices implemented by the department. The results of these reviews will likely inspire new inquiries, encouraging deeper exploration. This use of data reflects current national best practices in law enforcement. Evident Change has capacity and experience in each of these types of analysis and will be available to conduct analyses and assist in building MPD's capacity.

In addition to “the numbers,” fully understanding data analysis findings and applying them to practice includes consideration of other quantitative and qualitative data and information. For instance, to inform compliance assessments, the Evaluation Team, led by Chief Davis and Relman Colfax, will review policies and procedures, review and audit trainings, conduct ride-alongs, make station visits, work with the Community and MPD Advisory Boards, review officer supervision and discipline records, review body worn and in-car camera footage,



and review critical incident reports. Throughout, the Evaluation Team, with input from the Parties and the community, will review, scrutinize, and develop new analytics reporting. All routine on-site visits and evaluations will be done with appropriate notice and coordination, and any visits without notice will be infrequent. Further, Chief Davis will hold open office hours where MPD officers can share their concerns regarding the Agreement and proposed policy and procedure changes.

The results of early analysis will establish baselines to measure future progress in each of the Agreement's focus areas. These benchmarks will then be routinely reviewed, and we will establish mechanisms for continuously monitoring analytics. For instance, as the Evaluation Team, MPD, and other key stakeholders set goals and define objectives, we will hold meetings to monitor analytics for success. Evident Change will work with community members, with support from CICS, to develop these methodologies, and the Evaluation Team will publicize its data collection processes, and methodologies to community members in an effort to ensure community capacity. Information will be obtained from community members and directly from MPD officers through a variety of methods, including the Advisory Boards; engagement events and meetings; and informal in-person discussions, phone calls, and emails.

3. Community and MPD Surveys

Dr. Sethuraju and Ms. Roley, guided by their discussions with communities in Minneapolis, will lead the Team in developing an annual community survey concerning community members' experiences with MPD, ¶ 415. Before distributing surveys, the Evaluation Team will meet with the Parties to discuss the evaluation and the methodology used in developing, administering, and analyzing them. Evident Change will conduct all appropriate quantitative analysis of the survey results. The Parties will agree to a process for distributing the survey and survey results, which may include a survey report, online access to the data, and discussions with interested Minneapolis residents and with MPD personnel.

The law enforcement team, led by Chief Davis, with input from CICS and Evident Change, and guided by discussions with MPD officers, will also develop an annual survey to assess officer views on MPD and their work. Evident Change will conduct all appropriate quantitative analysis of the survey results. The survey will include the aspects required by the Agreement (e.g., officer experience, organizational culture, and officer support and wellness) as well as additional topics, approved by the Parties, that may prompt responses that will assist in



achieving the Agreement's objectives. The Parties will agree to a method for disseminating the survey and survey results, including discussions with interested MPD managers and officers.

III. Time for Various Activities

The time we anticipate we will devote to each category of activities is set forth in detail below. Subject to amendment as the Evaluation Team prepares the Evaluation Plan, the Evaluation Team anticipates that in the first year it will spend approximately 10-15% of time on policy and procedure review and comment, 10-15% on training and training plan review and comment, 20% on community engagement, 30-40% on data, document, incident, and outcome review and analysis, 10% on report drafting, and 10% on project management and coordination.³ In subsequent years, the Evaluation Team anticipates that time spent on policy and training review may decline, while time spent on outcome review and report drafting will increase, with the remaining categories generally remaining constant.

COLLABORATION

Collaboration among the Parties, the Court, non-party stakeholders, and the Evaluator is a guiding principle of this application. The team will have a leader and a project assistant for each of the Evaluator sub-teams: (1) the overall Evaluation Team; (2) the community participation team; (3) the law enforcement team, and (4) the data collection/analysis team. Further, much like the MPD Implementation Unit discussed in ¶ 24, we will have a team member serve as a liaison among the Parties, non-party stakeholders, and the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team will facilitate open, complete, and accurate communication, establishing regular meetings as the evaluation proceeds and ensuring that everyone has timely information about any shifts in the relevant landscape. Where unexpected issues arise, the Evaluation Team will be available and will provide clear and prompt replies. At every stage, the Evaluation Team will describe in unambiguous terms what it is analyzing related to implementation of the Agreement.

Establishing clear communication and a trusting relationship with MPD is critical for the success of the Agreement and is a priority for the Evaluation Team. Chief Mike Davis, a former MPD officer, will serve as the officer liaison to MPD. The Evaluation Team will engage

³ Much of the work will cut across categories: for example, setting benchmarks will require reviewing current policies and training, engaging the community, conducting data review, report drafting, and project management.



with MPD on every aspect of the Agreement, and we anticipate that Chief Davis, Chief Thomson, and others from the Evaluation Team will meet with Chief O'Hara and MPD regularly and on an as-needed basis to discuss information necessary for the Evaluation Team to complete its work; MPD's progress toward Agreement implementation; and ways in which the Evaluation Team can provide support and technical assistance to help MPD achieve compliance.

Collaborating with Minneapolis's community groups in a meaningful and empowering way is at the heart of our approach. The community participation team, led by Iris Roley and Raj Sethuraju and with support from CICS, will establish regular channels for communication, both formal and informal, with community groups, and will work with the entire Evaluation Team to identify avenues for community participation in setting benchmarks and assessing implementation of the Agreement, including through the Community Advisory Board described above.

Facilitating information-sharing among the Evaluation Team, the Parties, and the many non-party stake holders is critical to ensuring that the various elements of the process do not become siloed, where individuals working with one group of stakeholders do not have full information regarding the progress and status of other elements of the team. Rebecca Livengood, a partner at Relman Colfax, will have the primary responsibility for facilitating communication and collaboration among the various aspects of the evaluation process to ensure that everyone is communicating regularly, receiving appropriate information and updates, and incorporating each other's work and perspectives.

In order to reduce disputes, collaborative elements are woven through this evaluation proposal. We anticipate that collaboration from the start of the evaluation process will make the process more efficient and save overall costs. To the extent disputes arise, we anticipate employing a flexible process to reach resolution. The Evaluation Team will create spaces and forums for the Parties and community members to communicate with each other in a way that gives them the comfort and security to openly share their positions. Depending on the particular circumstances, the conversations may occur directly among the Parties or be facilitated by, or pass through, the appropriate member of the Evaluation Team leadership. Emphasis will be placed on precision and accuracy in communications to assure that disputes do not linger because of inaccurate or garbled information. To the extent disputes remain after the passage of complete and accurate information, the Lead Evaluator may serve in a facilitator role akin to a mediation



where the Parties would explore alternative options and the possibilities for compromise. Where appropriate, the Lead Evaluator will provide a recommendation for resolution as to how he would resolve the dispute in light of the articulation of both Parties' positions.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

This section describes how the Evaluation Team will gather data, establish benchmarks, identify areas for technical assistance, measure progress, and report on that progress. Collaboration is critical to achieving these goals, and so the plan described above will guide the Evaluation Team as it carries out this scope of services.

I. Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan

Within the first 90 days, as required by the Agreement, the Evaluation Team will develop and draft an Implementation Progress Evaluation Plan ("Evaluation Plan") in coordination with the City, MPD, and Minneapolis community members. The Evaluation Plan will set a schedule for when each provision will be evaluated; include measurable benchmarks for compliance with each provision and identify what data and information will be reviewed to assess compliance with those benchmarks; outline a plan for technical assistance to help bring about compliance; include a timeline for Progress Review production, both to the Parties and to the public; explain the role of each member of the Evaluation Team; outline multiple channels for community participation, from the Community Advisory Board to formal and informal meetings to conducting assessments with the Evaluation Team to designing and responding to the community survey; establish a protocol for communication and engagement with the Parties; and explain all Parties' document preservation and retention obligations.

A. Assessments – as a first step, the Evaluation Team will conduct a thorough review of current MPD policies and practices in the categories identified in the Agreement, including:

- **Data collection** – as described in the Methodology section above, the Evaluation Team, led by Dr. Wolf and Evident Change, will assess MPD's current data collection to:

1. Assess the City and MPD's progress in the MPD information collection assessment process described in ¶¶ 360-63;

2. Determine areas where additional data collection is needed to assess implementation of the Agreement's requirements, including by identifying what information the Evaluation Team will rely on to establish baseline measures for the following categories: Non-discriminatory and



impartial policing; use of force policies and procedures; stops, searches, and arrests; body and dash camera usage; training; officer support and wellness; mental health and behavioral health crisis support; accountability and supervision; data systems, analysis, and transparency; and detection and management of acute officer stress; and

3. Work with community members to assess whether MPD data is currently accessible and understandable and to consider how community members use the data in an effort to inform the effort to make data publicly available and useful.

• **Policies and procedures** – to determine what new and modified policies and procedures are needed to fulfill the obligations of the Agreement, the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax and Chief Davis will, as noted in the Methodology section above:

1. Review MPD’s current policies and procedures;
2. Conduct interviews with MPD leadership regarding MPD policies and procedures;
3. Meet with MPD officers at all levels regarding current MPD policies and procedures; and
4. Meet with community members to understand priorities and concerns regarding MPD policies and procedures.

• **Current training** – to assess what changes to training are necessary to fulfill MPD’s obligations under the Agreement, as outlined in ¶¶ 179-240, the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax and Chief Davis, will assess the current state of training. This assessment will include:

1. Review of training obligations and courses offered;
2. Interviews with MPD officers at all levels regarding training;
3. Review of training records to assess which trainings officers receive and how; and
4. Review of training materials.

• **Supervision and discipline** – to understand the current state of supervision and discipline, the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax and Chief Davis, will review current procedures for discipline and supervision within MPD. This review will include:

1. Review of the investigative, disciplinary, and supervisory structure within MPD;
2. Review of systems by which investigation and discipline are conducted;
3. Interviews with individuals responsible for investigation and discipline within MPD;
4. Review of a sample of investigative summary reports; and
5. Review of a sample of summaries of disciplinary action taken.



- **Community priorities** – as described above, it is a priority for our Evaluation Team to involve Minneapolis’s communities from the beginning, and we will engage communities early to identify individuals and avenues for participation that will best enable community members to participate in establishing benchmarks and measuring success under the Agreement.

The Evaluation Team, building on the feedback gathered by the Minnesota Justice Research Network during the MDHR listening sessions, and led by Dr. Sethuraju, Ms. Roley, and CICS, will conduct community outreach, including through a Community Advisory Board; open community meetings; outreach to organizations like churches, cultural centers and parent groups; and informal meetings with community members, to identify what success under the Agreement would look like for the communities in Minneapolis. Informed by this outreach, the Evaluation Team will aim to identify:

1. Areas of consensus for goals for policing among Minneapolis’s communities;
2. Priority areas for changes to the current state of policing in Minneapolis; and
3. A plan for engaging community members around the evaluation process, including:
 - Creating a Community Advisory Board consisting of representatives from a variety of communities and representing diverse views to facilitate community input into the evaluation process; community review of efforts taken by MPD to comply with Agreement provisions; and community input as new policies, procedures, and trainings are being considered and drafted; and
 - Establishing channels to work with the community to discuss the experience of being policed and the degree to which changing practices under the Agreement are felt in the community, including through feedback directly to the Evaluation Team, community meetings, smaller informal meetings, and the annual community survey.

B. Establish Criteria for Full and Effective Compliance – after conducting the above assessments, and based on the Agreement and the findings in the MDHR report, the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax, Chief Davis, and Dr. Wolf, will establish a set of objective benchmarks, standards, and measures for assessing whether MPD and the City have implemented the Agreement’s requirements. The Evaluation Team will be guided by the recognition that a major city police department such as MPD is a complex adaptive system, meaning that changing a policing outcome often requires addressing multiple policies, processes,



and systems. It is through this lens that clear standards and proofs for compliance will be created.

- **Set objectively measurable benchmarks in each of the focus areas** – the Evaluation Team will work with MPD, the City, and community members to establish a set of objectively measurable criteria that will be benchmarks for whether MPD has fully and effectively implemented the provisions of the Agreement. While the benchmarks will necessarily capture activity, such as stops and searches, they will also reflect an emphasis on achieving the outcomes prioritized in the Agreement, including non-discriminatory policing, de-escalation, and responsiveness to community requests for assistance. To accomplish this, the Evaluation Team will engage in at least the following:

1. **Assess Agreement requirements** to determine which requirements are sufficiently specific to serve as the standard for implementation on their own and which require additional benchmarks in order to measure whether they have been implemented.
2. **Draft benchmarks and evaluation criteria** for every provision of the Agreement to be evaluated. For each benchmark/standard, the team will identify what data and information will be reviewed and how compliance with that benchmark will be measured.
3. **Discuss benchmarks and evaluation criteria with stakeholders** by meeting with the Parties, leadership and line officers from MPD, and community members to review the initial assessment and to discuss draft benchmarks.

The Evaluation Team will include benchmarks for priority areas in the Evaluation Plan, and for any categories where benchmarks will be established later. The Evaluation Team will include a timeline for those benchmarks in the Evaluation Plan.

- **Conduct review to determine the baseline for each benchmark based on the current state of conduct:** We will conduct quantitative reviews of available data and MPD materials to determine how MPD is currently performing on each of the benchmarks listed in the Agreement, which we will use as a baseline for measuring progress.

C. Establish Plan for Technical Assistance – while much of the need for technical assistance will arise during implementation, to lose no time, the Evaluation Team will meet with MPD during the 90-day period to identify potential barriers to progress and determine areas in which technical assistance is most immediately needed. For those areas where technical



assistance is needed, the evaluation team will help MPD identify and engage appropriate expertise. Where Evaluation Team members themselves have the needed expertise, the Evaluation Team may provide technical assistance as appropriate and feasible. We anticipate that technical assistance will be needed in the following areas:

- **Use of Force and Stops, Searches, and Arrests:** two early priority areas to assess for the need for technical assistance are (1) use of force and (2) stops, searches, and arrests. There is no doubt that appropriate policies and procedures in these areas are critical to ensuring safe and fair treatment of residents and MPD's legitimacy and effectiveness within the community. To this end, the Agreement requires reorganizing and revising MPD's policies regarding use of force, ¶¶ 59-60, and it calls for revising policies regarding stops, searches, and arrests, ¶¶ 123-24. For use of force, the Agreement also mandates an approach to de-escalation and limiting use of force that will require revised policies, training, and supervision, ¶¶ 61-116. For stops, searches, and arrests, the Agreement likewise calls for an approach grounded in respect and limited by necessity, ¶¶ 117-71. Sustaining these changes will require a culture change within MPD. The Evaluation Team, led by Chief Davis, Chief Thomson, and Relman Colfax, will identify specialized experts to provide specific assistance on policies, training, and supervision, and Chief Davis will lead the Evaluation Team in supporting cultural change within MPD around use of force, stops, searches, and arrests.

- **Community Engagement:** Chief Davis will work with Dr. sethuraju, Ms. Roley, and CICS on developing paths for community engagement by MPD. Community engagement in this context is not simply seeking input but instead an actual collaboration, which is critical to the efficacy and permanency of these efforts.

- **Officer Supervision, Including Evaluation and Promotion:** performance management within MPD must reflect the principles and desired outcomes of the Agreement for there to be lasting change within the organization. Chief Davis, Chief Thomson, and Relman Colfax will examine the construction and current execution of these processes within MPD for any opportunity for enhancement and alignment to desired outcomes.

- **Nondiscriminatory policing:** Relman Colfax has extensive experience litigating race and disability discrimination claims, and alongside Chief Davis, may provide technical assistance and can identify other technical assistance providers as necessary to help MPD



establish guidance for eliminating discrimination in policing, as required by ¶¶ 36-52, including, for example, how supervisors can identify racial bias in officers' conduct, ¶¶ 42-52.

- **Training/preparedness:** in the MPD focus groups that 21CP Solutions conducted during the MDHR investigation, MPD officers expressed concern that training was often lacking, with new policies simply rolled out by email. The Agreement requires a robust training approach guided by a Training Needs Assessment, ¶ 183, and subsequent Annual Training Plans, ¶¶ 184-85. Implementing the Agreement's training requirements, ¶¶ 179-240, may require technical assistance on, for example, adult learning techniques (¶ 190), data tracking (¶ 195), non-discriminatory policing (¶¶ 213-15), and mental health crisis intervention (¶¶ 236-40).

- **Officer Support and Wellness:** as MPD focus groups and the recent BJA recommendations make clear,⁴ officer mental health is critical to the healthy functioning of the police in the community, and the Agreement enshrines this principle, ¶¶ 253-67. Chief Davis and CICS will provide support as appropriate for officer mental and behavioral health systems, including needs identified in the employee support plan, ¶¶ 254-56, to ensure that mental health resources are available and credible with MPD officers at all levels and with the Federation.

- **Mental and Behavioral Health Crisis Support in the Field:** Behavior Health Crisis Response Teams, such as the one the Agreement requires the City to fund, ¶ 289, have been critical to meeting the needs of people in crisis and to helping police focus their efforts where they are most needed and appropriate. Working with experts who have implemented such programs successfully, the Evaluation Team will connect the City with technical assistance as necessary to set up such a team and will work with MPD as appropriate to facilitate technical assistance on working with the BHCRT, such that MPD is not responding in situations where a non-police, mental health response is more appropriate, and that when MPD does respond, it is deescalating as appropriate.

- **Accountability/Oversight Processes:** where technical assistance is useful for implementing the accountability processes required in ¶¶ 291-354, the Evaluation Team, led by Chief Davis and Relman Colfax, will either provide such assistance or identify appropriate technical assistance providers.

⁴ See Recruitment and Retention for the Modern Law Enforcement Agency, available at <https://bja.ojp.gov/doc/recruitment-retention-modern-le-agency.pdf>.



- **Acute Officer Stress Identification and Mitigation:** the Agreement requires the development of an Early Intervention System, ¶¶ 268-88. This vital tool has been used effectively in other cities, and we will connect MPD with these departments to provide technical assistance on the development of an Early Intervention System in Minneapolis.

The Evaluation Team will then carry out the technical assistance plan as needed and appropriate throughout the evaluation period.

* * *

In sum, and in keeping with the Agreement’s requirements, the Evaluation Plan produced after the first 90 days will include: (1) a detailed schedule for evaluation of each provision of the Agreement; (2) measurable benchmarks for compliance with those provisions that will be evaluated early on and a schedule for setting benchmarks for the remaining provisions; (3) identification of data and information to be reviewed in assessing compliance; (4) a plan for technical assistance; (5) a timeline for drafting Progress Reviews; (6) role definitions for Evaluation Team members; (7) mechanisms for ensuring community participation; (8) protocols for communication and engagement with the Parties; and (9) document preservation procedures.

II. Ongoing Evaluation and Reporting

In accordance with the schedule set forth in the Evaluation Plan, the Evaluation Team will assess ongoing progress under the Agreement and report on those assessments. For each change the Agreement requires, MPD must: (1) promulgate policies and procedures, (2) train on them, (3) conduct supervisory review to determine whether they are being followed, and (4) use corrective actions for officers who violate those policies and procedures.

To assess compliance in each Agreement area, the Evaluation Team will conduct quantitative and qualitative reviews to determine the degree to which policies are being trained on, implemented, and enforced through promotions and discipline; and assess the impact of those changes. While the manner in which each requirement will be evaluated will be developed fully in the Evaluation Plan and subsequent documents, the Evaluation Team will engage in at least the following:

A. Quantitative Review of Implementation and Impact

The Agreement requires MPD to use existing or new data systems to collect and analyze information for training, accountability, and continuous quality improvement. The Evaluation



Team will assess the degree to which all Agreement requirements have been implemented by conducting quantitative assessments of MPD data and survey data.

- **Verifying the Data Systems Plan:** The Evaluation Team will verify all data before analyzing it, and in order to verify data, Evident Change will:
 - Verifying data entry: gain front-end user access in order to experience and analyze data entry protocols.
 - Verifying data integrity: conduct a descriptive analysis of all data points from every focus area to systematically explore data completion and data integrity.
 - Verifying existing reporting: seek to independently recreate reporting metrics, including those that are publicly available dashboards from source data.
 - New reporting: as feasible, consult in developing new data-related methodologies with MPD. The team will explore the most effective mechanisms for making data routinely available to the Parties, the Evaluation Team, and other stakeholders as appropriate.

We will share findings from the data systems assessment and recommendations for any needed data-related procedure or system changes with the Parties, and we will continue to verify the efficacy of the systems until there is shared confidence in MPD data systems.

- **Ongoing Data Analysis:** the Evaluation Plan will establish benchmarks for progress in the Agreement's requirements, and we will assess progress in part through quantitative review of these benchmarks. Progress toward benchmarks will be monitored with analytics developed by MPD and the Evident Change team. Whenever possible, analytics will be shared with the Parties continuously, with up-to-date data, and reach as many stakeholders and community members as possible and appropriate. Evident Change will continually assess and scrutinize the quantitative analysis measures of implementation and impact to ensure efficacy.

B. Qualitative Review of Implementation and Impact

The Evaluation Team will conduct a qualitative review of all substantive areas for reform in the Agreement. Because each change must be captured in policies, trained on, reviewed by supervisors, and subject to discipline where appropriate, we describe the process by which we will qualitatively review each of those areas here.

1. **Review of New Policies and Training Materials** – for new policy proposals and training materials, the Evaluation Team will:



- **Create a review and reporting protocol** – to ensure consistency, the Evaluation Team will develop a protocol for reviewing policies and training documents that will include assessments of compliance with the Agreement’s requirements in light of best practices and usability for officers and supervisors. The Evaluation Team will develop a standard reporting form so that comments on materials are delivered in a consistent and accessible manner.
- **Review policies and training materials according to the protocol** – the Evaluation Team, led by Relman Colfax, Chief Davis, and CICS, in consultation with Professor Lopez, will review all new policies and training materials as required by the Agreement.
- **Elicit and incorporate MPD officer input** – the Evaluation Team will work with MPD to establish a process for feedback that minimizes delay and creates ample opportunity for MPD officer participation in developing and reviewing policies and training materials, ¶ 27.
- **Elicit and incorporate community input** – the Evaluation Team will establish a process for receiving community input on policy proposals and, where appropriate, training materials, that includes community member review, comments submitted through the MPD portal, ¶ 28, and an opportunity for real-time input directly to the Evaluation Team.

2. **Review of Camera Footage, Written Reports, and Investigations:** The Evaluation Team will establish a process for reviewing a significant sample of body-worn and in-car camera footage, written reports, and investigations connected to uses of force, stops, searches, seizures, and arrests, to determine the degree to which policies are being implemented on the ground, monitored through supervision, and reinforced through discipline and promotion. The Evaluation Team will also evaluate all available camera footage and reporting related to every reportable use of force incident. The process will include a review and reporting protocol.

3. **Supervision and Promotion/Discipline Processes and Decisions:** The Team will engage in a qualitative review of the supervision structure laid out in the Agreement, which includes supervisory review, performance evaluations, discipline, and promotion, by:

- Developing a process for assessing supervisors’ reviews of reports of uses of force, stops, searches, seizures, and arrests;
- Developing a process for assessing supervisors’ reviews of whether each of the activities described in the paragraph above was carried out in a non-discriminatory and impartial manner;
- Reviewing a meaningful sample of performance evaluations and promotion decisions



- across job categories and comparing those evaluations to other performance-related information, including use of force reports, de-escalation information, civilian complaints, and civil law suits;
- Developing a process for reviewing internal investigations and disciplinary actions;
- Working with the MPD Review Panel, including, at minimum, to confirm that quarterly meetings are occurring, ¶¶ 368-74, understand the scope of what is being reviewed, and review any written action items coming out of these meetings.

C. Reporting

The Evaluation Team will discuss the results of these quantitative and qualitative reviews contemporaneously with the Parties to identify and troubleshoot issues before they are memorialized in reports. The Evaluation Team will also produce and publish semi-annual progress reviews, ¶ 413. As described below, the Evaluation Team has extensive expertise producing reports for public audiences. Finally, the Evaluation Team will produce and publish a Termination Evaluation in compliance with the requirements of ¶¶ 422-25. The Termination Evaluation will report on MPD’s compliance with each benchmark and areas for future growth.

EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY

The Evaluation Team is made up of a lead evaluation group from Relman Colfax and others with extensive experience implementing law enforcement consent decrees throughout the country.

Relman Colfax has extensive experience relevant to the Evaluation Team role:

Representing cities and law enforcement officers facing racial discrimination. Relman Colfax would enter an agreement with Minneapolis having worked extensively in partnership with municipalities, including successfully representing both the City of Baltimore and the City of Memphis in separate suits against Wells Fargo after the bank intentionally targeted Black and brown communities for predatory mortgage loans. The firm has also built close relationships with law enforcement officers over time, having successfully represented a class of Black Secret Service agents who were denied promotions under a discriminatory system, and currently representing an individual Black Secret Service agent who was discriminatorily stopped while he was on duty by the United States Park Police, approached at gunpoint, and detained for hours.

Monitorships, audits, and internal investigations. The firm is well-equipped to handle the large-scale project-management and evaluation aspects of the process, as the firm has significant



experience with years-long audits and monitorships: for example, the firm conducted a Civil Rights Audit of State Street, assessing how the financial giant’s conduct impacts racial equity, and the firm currently serves as an independent fair lending monitor of Upstart Network, arising from Upstart’s agreement with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Student Borrower Protection Center. Like the evaluation work here, our audit work includes creating and maintaining a rigorous work plan, working with internal and external stakeholders, analyzing data and conducting and directing significant quantitative analyses, providing actionable and scalable recommendations, and preparing public-facing reports. We have also been retained by major organizations to conduct internal investigations of allegations of discrimination and harassment, analyze obstacles to equitable employment settings, and provide recommendations.

Combating community-wide race and disability discrimination. Relman Colfax has also successfully engaged and represented entire communities in remedying race discrimination in provision of municipal services: for example, the firm represented members of the Gullah Geechee community on Sapelo Island, Georgia, who were denied municipal services that white residents received, and it represented a subclass of Flint, Michigan residents who were subjected to contaminated drinking water. These cases all resulted in settlement agreements with injunctive relief, which the firm has monitored for compliance for years. The firm also brought a nationwide suit against Fannie Mae for its racially discriminatory practices after the foreclosure crisis, requiring coordination of nationwide testing data across dozens of organizations and resulting in one of the largest Fair Housing Act settlements in history. Finally, the firm successfully brought the largest affordable housing accessibility case in U.S. history against the City of Los Angeles, resulting in an agreement with extensive equitable relief, and it continues to be actively involved in enforcing that settlement agreement.

Professor Christy Lopez has extensive relevant experience. As a Deputy Chief in the Special Litigation Section of the U.S. Department of Justice, and head of the Police Practices Group, Professor Lopez led pattern-or-practice investigations of law enforcement agencies of all sizes and across the nation (e.g. Chicago Police Department; Ferguson Police Department; Los Angeles Sheriff’s Office; New Orleans Police Department; Newark Police Department; Missoula Police Department). These investigations involved many tasks required of a court appointed monitor/evaluator, including learning community and line officer experiences and perspectives; conducting policy, incident, and training review and evaluation; drafting reports, and explaining



findings to the public. This work also involved working closely with law enforcement, data science, and statistical experts, and with federal judges. Professor Lopez also was co-monitor of the Oakland Police Department for seven years. This project involved many of the same tasks listed above and included the need to develop a deeper understanding of and relationship with a variety of stakeholders and issues in a single jurisdiction. Both in leading police department investigations and as a monitor, Professor Lopez has experience with keeping complex projects moving forward without sacrificing quality or accuracy, even in high-pressure circumstances.

Dr. Angie Wolf and Evident Change have worked in counties and states nationwide to provide data and analytics to drive system improvement. Evident Change conducts and oversees the data analytics associated with settlements against two large sheriff departments in California. Evident Change also has extensive experience working with large data sets to generate actionable information. For example, Evident Change worked with New York City to develop a cross-systems data sharing and transparency project. This project brought together systems data to explore interactions between education, child welfare, and juvenile justice. It created a shared data repository specifically for child-serving systems in New York City and explored these systems as a first step to discovering how cross-systems data might be leveraged to promote better outcomes for children and youth and identify system and community levels of intervention that go beyond individual-level risk factors. The data show how children experience the juvenile justice system differently by race/ethnicity; gender; community; education characteristics such as attendance, test scores, and suspensions; and child welfare involvement.

Scott Thomson has served as a subject matter expert on numerous consent decrees around the country, and **Iris Roley** was instrumental in the success of the consent decree in Cincinnati. Ms. Roley was a plaintiff in the civil suit that resulted in a settlement agreement that ran in parallel to the DOJ consent decree, and as part of that process she established a new standard for ways in which community members can participate in shaping successful consent decree outcomes.



REFERENCES

Team Member	Project	Reference
Relman Colfax	<i>Hicks v. Ferreya</i>	Agent Nathaniel Hicks , Plaintiff Nathanielhicks89@yahoo.com
	<i>Baltimore v. Wells Fargo</i>	Suzanne Sangree ssangree@gelaw.com
	State Street Audit	Constanza Cabello , Vice President of Equity, State Street ccabello@statestreet.com
	Sierra Club Internal Investigations/Counseling	Aida Davis , Chief People Officer, Sierra Club Aida.davis@sierraclub.org
	<i>NFHA v. Fannie Mae</i>	Lisa Rice , President, NFHA Lisa.rice@nationalfairhousing.org
Evident Change	NYC Education Data Transparency	Christopher Tan , Assistant Comm’r for Education Inits. NYC Administration for Children’s Services christopher.tan@acs.nyc.gov
	Monitoring of the Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement	Eric Lasko , Acting Captain, Audits and Accountability Bureau Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department 661-993-3430
Christy Lopez	Oakland Monitoring Team	Justice Kelli M. Evans (co-monitor) Chief Paul Figueroa , ret. paulfigueroa@ggu.edu
	Ferguson Police Department Investigation, Litigation & Consent Decree Negotiation	Andre Anderson , Exec. Asst. Police Chief, Tempe, AZ (then-Chief, Ferguson Police Department) andre_anderson@tempe.gov Derecka Purnell derecka.purnell.law@gmail.com Wesley Bell , St. Louis Prosecuting Attorney wbell@stlouisco.com

PERSONNEL LISTING

The Evaluation Team offers familiarity with Minneapolis and MPD; national leadership around policing, consent decrees, and data; experts in police/community relationships who sustained such partnerships for decades; and a national civil rights firm with expertise in race and disability discrimination law. Resumes and references are included as Exhibit A.

Reed Colfax, a partner at Relman Colfax, will serve as the lead evaluator and will be the primary point of contact for the Parties. Mr. Colfax is an expert on measuring and combatting race discrimination, having led the ground-breaking race discrimination litigation described in the previous section, has engaged in organizational and company civil rights audits, and enforced



large and complex settlement agreements. Relman Colfax will serve as the coordinator of the Evaluation Team, managing the project and engaging in all aspects of the Team's work.

Rebecca Livengood, a partner at Relman Colfax, will have primary responsibility for facilitating collaboration among the Evaluation Team, the Parties, and community members. Ms. Livengood has managed large, complex projects, having litigated disability rights class actions and complex cases (*P.D. v. Middlesex County*; *Adam X. v. DOCCS*; *Bashin v. Conduent*), along with race discrimination cases (*Sapelo*; *Fannie Mae*), and has extensive experience with Fourth Amendment law, having argued several Fourth Amendment cases in the New Jersey Supreme Court. Ms. Livengood began her career in Mayor Cory Booker's administration and understands the constraints and opportunities facing city governments and how to work within them.

Chief Mike Davis served in MPD for 16 years and was chief of police for the City of Brooklyn Park, where under his tenure, the city had its lowest levels of crime in 22 years. Chief Davis will serve as deputy evaluator and be the officer liaison and primary contact for MPD. Chief Davis founded and operates MBD Innovation, where he has reviewed executive leadership efficacy in the Richmond, California police department; created a diversity training curriculum for the Ohio State Patrol; served as the policing expert for the Washington, D.C. Commission for Police Reform; and advised leadership on revising the use of force processes, conducted technical assistance, and researched police occupational stress for the Tucson Police Department.

Chief Scott Thomson served as the chief of police in Camden, New Jersey for 11 years and is an expert on transforming police departments through community policing. Chief Thomson will serve as a senior advisor on law enforcement, including by providing technical assistance to MPD leadership on cultural change within departments and leveraging technology as a force multiplier for efficiencies, effectiveness and accountability. Chief Thomson is the President of Holtec Security International servicing clients in the private and public sectors. Chief Thomson has ample relevant experience, including as an expert in several U.S. DOJ Civil Rights Division constitutional policing consent decree investigations and enforcement.

Christy Lopez, Faculty Director of CICS, is one of the most knowledgeable experts on police reform and law enforcement Agreements in the country. Professor Lopez will serve as a senior advisor on law enforcement and community engagement, helping the team execute a vision for the evaluation process that will ensure tangible community involvement at every step.



CICS staff will play a significant role in the community participation team; will provide technical assistance, including on officer mental health and behavioral health responses; and will assess progress outcomes through data and document review.

Dr. Angie Wolf, will direct the data analysis components, including by assessing MPD's data collection procedures and practices, providing data collection technical assistance, and collecting and analyzing data for compliance with the Agreement. Dr. Wolf has substantial experience monitoring consent decrees and working with communities around data analysis.

Chris Scharenbroch, the Director of Analytics at Evident Change, will play a pivotal role in conducting a comprehensive assessment of MPD data systems and collaborating on all aspects of reporting and data analytics. With more than two decades of experience, Chris excels at translating complex systems data into meaningful insights. He has worked with dozens of child welfare, juvenile justice, adult correction, education, and adult protection agencies from around the world to use data to improve systems and achieve strategic objectives.

dr. raj sethuraju has more than 20 years of experience as a Minneapolis community leader and activist. He is an associate professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Metro State University, and he has led trainings for MPD. Dr. Setharaju is uniquely positioned within the city to create structures that will repair past harms and build a new path of mutual respect, concern, and familiarity among the police and community members in Minneapolis. Dr. sethuraju and Ms. Roley will lead the community participation team.

Iris Roley is a founding leader of the Cincinnati Black United Front and the City of Cincinnati's consultant for issues related to the Collaborative Agreement, a set of police-community relationship values outlined between the Cincinnati Police Department, Cincinnati Black United Front, the ACLU, and community members in 2002. Ms. Roley is among the most successful leaders of community and police relationship efforts in the country, and along with dr. raj sethuraju, she will lead the Evaluation Team's community participation team.

BUDGET

A budget spreadsheet is set forth at Exhibit B. The Evaluation Team will complete the activities required by the Agreement during the initial 5-year period for an average of \$1.5 million/year, or \$7.5 million for the 5-year period. The first-year budget is larger than following years because the Evaluation Team anticipates that additional time will be needed to complete the work in the



Agreement within the first year relative to subsequent years. The overall 5-year budget, however, is within the aggregate of the capped annual amount and is based on the following estimate:

10-15%	Policy and procedure review and comment
10-15%	Training and training plan review and comment
20%	Community engagement
30-40%	Data, document, incident, and outcome review and analysis
10%	Report drafting
10%	Project management and coordination

While these estimates may of course change over time, the Evaluation Team will keep costs within the overall budget number. However, as the Agreement and RFP contemplate, the Evaluation Team’s scope may increase if DOJ and the City enter a consent decree. In such a case, the Evaluation Team would submit a revised budget that includes any additional work.

Rates for the Team are set forth below and reflect a discount from regular hourly rates.

Relman Colfax Attorneys	\$450	Support Teams	\$100
Chief Michael Davis	\$350	Chief Scott Thomson	\$350
Professor Christy Lopez	\$350	CICS Staff	\$200
dr. raj sethuraju	\$200	Iris Rowley	\$200
Law Enforcement Consultants	\$350	Evident Change	\$350

Costs will be billed at actual costs within the overall 5-year \$7.5 million cap. The costs are estimates because the Team’s activities cannot be finalized until at least the Evaluation Plan is developed. The Evaluation Team anticipates expending \$350,000-\$450,000 a year in costs.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CODE OF ETHICS

The Evaluation Team does not anticipate any conflicts of interest. Three team members—Evident Change, CICS, and Dr. sethuraju—currently provide training for MPD. As a subcontractor for the Bowman Group, Evident Change is helping develop a training on engaging with minors procured by MPD. CICS designed and hosts the ABLE curriculum MPD is using (and is required to use per ¶ 207), and in that role, CICS evaluates the ABLE training delivery. Dr. sethuraju has provided recent trainings to MPD. The Evaluation Team will work with the Parties to ensure that no conflict of interest arises from these engagements, including by taking steps to ensure that no member of the Evaluation Team evaluates the efficacy of a training their organization conducted outside of the Evaluation Team capacity.