From:	GISELA F WILSON
To:	Alder Work Group Creating MPD Independent Civilian Oversight; Moreland, Donna; Kemble, Rebecca; Bidar, Shiva
Subject:	For the Alder Work Group on Civilian Oversight
Date:	Sunday, July 26, 2020 3:08:31 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

I have been mulling overal several points of discussion that came up during the last Oversight Work Group meeting and am offering input on three specific points (a) how to accomplish the desired diversity of the Civilian Oversight Board (COB), (b) methods for the selection of COB appointees, and (c) selection of organizations.

(a) how to accomplish the desired diversity of the Civilian Oversight Board (COB):
Here is a suggested revision for the section of the Draft Ordinance titled (2) Diverse Composition (under Board Composition) based on comments offered by one of the Alders during the last meeting (Alder Bidar, if I remember correctly). My basic idea is to build the assumption of multiple intersecting identities into the Board composition. I also noted an oversight by the Ad Hoc committee in writing the Report (domestic violence and sexual assault) — an oversight which I believe was not intentional based on other sections of the Report and so have built it into the revision. (Feel free to share this on screen during the meeting if so inclined.)

Diverse Composition. The Board's composition shall be diverse and include individuals:

a. From Madison's various communities, including, but not limited to, representatives of the African American, Asian, Latino, Native American; and LGBTQ communities;

b. Emphasis on lived experience. 20-40% of the Members shall have identities that often intersect with race to compound oppression including lived experience with homelessness, mental health, disability, substance abuse, domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or arrest or conviction records; (I actually would love to see this % increased)

c. Advocates: Alternatively or in addition to (b), who are from organizations in the fields of mental health, disability, youth advocacy, domestic and sexual violence, and AODA;

d. With a diversity of age, socioeconomic status, gender, geographic residence, and work experience;

Nominated by community-based organizations. All Members shall have been nominated by a designated set of community based organizations that have an interest in civil rights, immigrant rights, disability rights/mental health, racial equity, and social justice, and that also have an interest in public safety administration of the City. The designated set of organizations shall be initially created in conjunction with the adoption of this ordinance and the Monitor, Board, and Common Council shall ensure that it is updated at least every two

(2) years.

[Footnotes: --The original (4.) is now 2b. with some elaboration. I think it's better to include all the hoped-for characteristics of Board members in the same section. This helps keep the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee clear.
--Regarding (c), I am not certain that the intention was to have these members necessarily be of the "advocate" type. It's an important point that needs clarification.]

I also would like to register my concern that, especially at the low end of 20%, the City runs the risk of tokenizing the "lived experience" of over-policed/under-served individuals and thus, adding to rather than relieving their oppression. At 20% (2.6 people of 13), both individuals with lived experience could end up being alternates, which clearly would not accomplish the objectives intended by the Ad Hoc Committee in writing this recommendation. As a result I, personally, would like to see (b) rephrased omitting 20-40% and adding a final sentence reading "The number of active Committee members with lived experience shall not fall below 40%."

On several occasions, the Alders have mentioned the concern that all the characteristics in (a) and (b) be represented on the Board. I don't this would be possible in the case of only 2.6 people out of 13 having lived experience, even considering that each individual is likely to have multiple intersecting identities. Even if half of the Board has lived experience, I think covering all the included identities is unlikely. Therefore, I ask the Alders to include either in separate directions/instructions to Board members and/or as part of this Ordinance instructions that they should feel free to consult with nominating organizations on possible cases when the criteria of "lived experience" isn't met by one of the Board members.

(b) On the matter of organizational selection of Board members:
I assume all organizations involved with the board member selection process will have an interest in the Board being representative of over-policed/under-served communities. Therefore I suggest having each organization initially nominate two candidates and then, preferably if they are willing, either the organizations themselves or the Mayor and Council select the final candidates with an eye predominantly towards representation of the characteristics presented in 2(a) and (b).

(c) On the matter of selection of organizations:
I am somewhat less concerned about the risk for a shift in the intention of rectifying the power imbalance for over-policed/under-served communities that the Civilian Oversight Board attempts to correct for, if the Composition Section if the requirement for intersecting oppressions gets hard-wired into the Ordinance. Nonetheless, I prefer that number of nominating organizations be kept small and as characterized in the Ad Hoc Report to make sure that the intent of Civilian Oversight from typically unheard committees is maintained.

Quoting Amelia's suggestions for two options from an email discussion on this topic, two possibilities for initial organization and COB selection:

"Fast Track:
1. Create committee w/former Ad Hoc that makes the initial group selections.

2. Have groups give 2 or 3 names

3. Ad Hoc selects from those names using criteria set forth by their rec.

Or

Slower Track:
1. Alder Work Group creates group selection committee

1.5 Alder Work Group develops criteria for representation of groups to ensure all identities are accounted for (disability, LGBTQI, women's, Black, Indigenous, POC...)

2. Alder Work Group determines process by which groups make their selection (transparent and inclusive input from their members/clients) and groups must be able to demonstrate that they did this

3. groups submit applications to group selection committee that include reasons for why they should participate in civilian oversight selection and those reasons should align with why the recommendation exists in the first place.

4. Groups submit their selection COB is born"

Thanks for your efforts,

Gisela

*Writing as a Community Response Team member who sat through the discussion of all the recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee Report.
****
Gisela F Wilson, PhD
1244 Morrison Ct
Madison, WI 53703