



**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL**

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

City Hall, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Hearing Room #1
Oakland, CA 94612

Selection Panel Members: Chairperson Sarah Chavez-Yoell (District 3), Second Chairperson John Jones III (At Large), Tal Klement (District 1), James Chanin (District 2), Shikira Porter (District 4), Mary Vail (District 5), Candice Jessie (District 6), Jean Blacksher (District 7), Arnold X. C. Perkins (Mayor)

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

The meeting started at 5:33 pm.

Selection Panel members present: Jean Blacksher, Jim Chanin (5:36 pm arrival), Sarah Chavez-Yoell, Candice Jessie, John Jones III, Arnold Perkins, Shikira Porter, and Mary Vail.

Absent: Tal Klement

Staff present: Stephanie Hom

City Attorney Staff: Allison Dibley, Harveen Gill

2. Open Forum

There were no comments from the public.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of Selection Panel Meeting Draft Minutes

- August 8, 2017 Meeting
- August 9, 2017 Meeting
- August 10, 2017 Meeting
- August 14, 2017 Meeting

Motion to approve the meeting minutes for August 8, 9, 10, and 14, 2017 was moved (C. Jessie) and seconded (M. Vail).

Motion passed with 7 ayes. J. Chanin and T. Klement were absent at time of vote.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

City Hall, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Hearing Room #1
Oakland, CA 94612

4. Determining Staggered Terms for Initial Police Commissioners

The Selection Panel determined staggering of terms for the first group of Commissioners in accordance with Measure LL, City Charter Section 604(c)6.

Motion to appoint José Dorado and Regina Jackson to an initial term of 4 years was moved (J. Jones) and seconded (M. Vail).

Motion passed with 8 ayes. Absent: T. Klement.

Motion to appoint Ginale Harris, Mike Nisperos, and Thomas Smith to an initial term of 3 years was moved (J. Jones) and seconded (A. Perkins).

Motion passed with 8 ayes. Absent: T. Klement.

Motion to appoint Mubarak Ahmad and Edwin Prather to an initial term of 2 years was moved (J. Jones) and seconded (A. Perkins).

Motion passed with 8 ayes. Absent: T. Klement

5. Determining Regular Annual Meeting Date

The Selection Panel determined a date for its annual regular meeting.

Motion to establish the second Thursday of each May as the regular annual meeting date for the Selection Panel was moved (J. Jones) and seconded (M. Vail). The next annual meeting date will be Thursday, May 10, 2018 at 5:30 pm.

Motion passed with 8 ayes. Absent: T. Klement.

6. Debrief on Selection Panel Process

The Selection Panel discussed revisiting the process used this year, including the Application, at the regular annual meeting in May 2018. Ms. Vail distributed a written handout titled, “Additional agenda items related to Post 11/1/17 follow up work plan” (attached to these minutes).

Motion to change “Voluntary Self-Identification Questionnaire” section of the application to remove the description of each race and/or ethnicity and list options as “White,” “Black or African American,” “Latino,” “Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander,” “Asian,” “American Indian or Alaskan Native,” “Other,” and “I do not wish to Self-Identify” was moved (J. Jones) and seconded (A. Perkins).

Motion passed with 8 ayes. Absent: T. Klement.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
POLICE COMMISSION SELECTION PANEL**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

City Hall, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Hearing Room #1
Oakland, CA 94612

Open Forum

There were no comments from the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:06 pm

DRAFT

XFINITY Connect

4406vailcat@comcast.net

+ Font Size -

Additional agenda items related to Post 11/1/17 follow up work plan**From :** 4406vailcat@comcast.net

Thu, Oct 26, 2017 08:59 PM

Subject : Additional agenda items related to Post 11/1/17 follow up work plan**To :** SHom@oaklandnet.com**Cc :** Sarah@schavezconsulting.com, John Jones III <jjones@curyj.org>

Unfortunately I am having more internet/tech issues this week, so the proposals I am suggesting are in this email rather than an attached document.

The proposals are:

I. Should we do an assessment of this year's recruitment/evaluation and assessment process:

The Selection Committee will probably never again have to work on the scale we have this year, but I believe that future selection processes, the City's efforts in announcing and recruiting for vacancies on other Commissions and Oaklanders could benefit from an assessment of our 2017 efforts.

The subjects/issues that should be assessed would include:

- (1) Recruitment/outreach to applicants:
 - a) Which methods of outreach appeared to have been the most or least successful in generating applicants?
 - b) Were there any sub-groups (e.g., by diversity/work-life experience/occupation, age) that were under-represented in the applicant pool?
 - c) Were there outreach methods/target groups used by individual members of the Selection Committee that should be incorporated into future recruitments to fill vacancies on the Police Commission?
 - d) Which recruitment/outreach methods used this year are ones that the Selection Committee should recommend that the City add to its standard process for announcing/recruiting for applicants to serve on City Commissions?
- (2) The application form and questions used in AdHoc and full Selection Committee interviews:
 - a) Any questions or Sections of the application form that should be changed?
 - b) In the Ad Hoc panel interviews, which of the standard questions gave us the most (or last) useful information about the applicants?
 - c) As to the finalist interview supplemental questions, same as b)?
 - d) Are any changes warranted going forward in either the Panel of Finalist interview process that we would recommend ?
- (3) Other issues for study/scrutiny/comment?

As to overall assessment process, I envision first that the above questions be discussed separately by each of the Ad Hoc panels, then that we have a public meeting to present each Ad Hoc Committee's observations and to take public comment/input. After that, on issues where there is, strong public and/or Selection Committee consensus, we may want to produce a report to the Mayor, City Council and City Administrator addressing those observations and recommendations.

The ultimate question I am presenting for your consideration on November 1, is whether we should proceed with such an assessment.

II. Should we identify a list of reserves/top runner-up applicants:

I was one of our members who opposed this idea because I learned that it would lead to campaigns to reject the slate in order to cause the Selection Committee to replace original slate members with applicants on the reserve/runner-up list. Now that we are past the confirmation process, it could be useful (e.g., expediting filling vacancies with previously considered, highly-qualified applicants) to identify those applicants who we would have nominated to serve on the Commission had e.g., we either had more nominations to make or had the runner-up applicant not had the like skill/experience/diversity characteristics possessed either by the Mayor's nominees or whose qualifications were exceeded by one of the SC's nominees.

Identifying these exceptional runner-up applicants (likely no more than three to six of them) is not intended to bind future Selection Committee's, as who is the best applicant to fill a future vacancy will and should be dictated by the race/sex/age of and the life

work and community experience of the departing Police Commissioner.

The ultimate question I am putting before you on November 1 is whether we should put the matter of identifying a reserve/runner-up applicant group on a future public Selection Committee meeting agenda.

III. Establish/clarify process for filling future vacancies created by resignation of a Selection Committee-nominated Commission member:

The potential need for us to do this (next year) was posed to me by another Selection Committee member (in 1-to-1 conversation). Hopefully, all of the current members will serve out their full terms, so that we will not face this question for several years. There also may be other potential tasks, either mandated by Measure LL or the to-be-determined language of the Measure LL Ordinance, that will need to be done in the next year.

The question I am putting before you on November 1 is whether we should handle this issue at a future Selection Committee meeting.

Mary Vail
