

# Meeting Notice and Agenda

## Community Advisory on Public Safety Commission

Monday, April 3, 2023 at 12:30 pm – 2:00 pm

Hooker Conference Room (#245), Showers Building, 401 N. Morton Street

The public may also access the meeting at the following link:

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82618346916?pwd=MU9UUUnVGR1dFcWo1bUxSNy9QUk5mZz09>

- I. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTIONS (name & pronouns)
  - a. Election of co-chairs
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MEMORANDA/MINUTES  
Regular Session Minutes – March 6, 2023
- IV. REPORTS (if any)
  - a. Co-Chairs
  - b. Individual Members
  - c. Committees
  - d. Staff
- V. REPORTS FROM THE PUBLIC / PUBLIC COMMENT  
  
- *BRIEF RECESS* -
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
  - a. Guest Speakers – Mary Morgan and Tatiana Wheeler from Heading Home
- VII. OTHER BUSINESS
  - a. Research Committee Membership
  - b. Reparations & Atonement Special Committee for Juneteenth Event
  - c. Tabled Items from 6 March 2023
    - i. START Program
    - ii. BPD Communications and Questions
    - iii. Anti-Oppressive Framework Working Agreement
    - iv. Amending Conflict Resolution Procedures, Adopted 3/6/2023
- VIII. TOPIC SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS
  - a. CAPS Report to Council this year
  - b. Scheduling
  - c. Budget Proposals for 2024
  - d. Deaf Club
  - e. Brainstorming events and actions for housing & residents experiencing homelessness
  - f. Implicit bias training
  - g. Parking for board/commission members
  - h. Updates on HB 1041 and the advancements of anti-trans bills in Indiana General Assembly
  - i. Updating Procedures & Bylaws

## IX. ADJOURNMENT

### CAPS Commission Goals and Purpose:

Perform research and gather data on the perceptions and preferences about public safety from community members, with specific focus on perceptions and preference data gathered from minority community members, individuals who are disabled, and other often marginalized community members

Research evidence-based alternatives to traditional policing

Identify best practices in public safety globally and evaluate the efficacy of such practices for implementation in Bloomington.

Make recommendations to the Common Council, the Board of Public Safety, and/or the Mayor or the Mayor's designee on policies and programs that enhance public safety for all community members.



## City of Bloomington

# NOTICE

**Monday, 3 April 2023 at 12:30 – 2:00 p.m.**

## **Community Advisory on Public Safety Commission**

**This meeting will be held in the Hooker Conference Room (Suite 245, City Hall, 401 N. Morton St) and may also be accessed electronically via Zoom (see information below).**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82618346916?pwd=MU9UUUnVGR1dFcWo1bUxSNy9QUk5mZz09>

Meeting ID: 826 1834 6916

Passcode: 667953

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,82618346916# US (Washington DC)

+13052241968,,82618346916# US

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 305 224 1968 US

+1 309 205 3325 US

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 931 3860 US

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 507 473 4847 US

+1 564 217 2000 US

+1 669 444 9171 US

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 689 278 1000 US

+1 719 359 4580 US

+1 253 205 0468 US

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 360 209 5623 US

+1 386 347 5053 US

Meeting ID: 826 1834 6916

Find your local number: <https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82618346916>

As a quorum of this Commission or its committees may be present, this gathering constitutes a meeting under the Indiana Open Door Law (I.C. § 5-14-1.5). For that reason, this statement provides notice that this meeting will occur and is open for the public to attend, observe, and record what transpires.

**MEMORANDUM**

**Community Advisory on Public Safety (CAPS) Commission  
Monday, March 6, 2023, 12:30 p.m. – Hooker Conference Room (#245),  
401 N. Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana**

The Regular Session meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m.

**Commission members present via Zoom:** Kamala Brown-Sparks

**Commission members present in person:** Matthew Needler, Jason Michálek, Renée Miller, Nejla Routsong

**Commission members absent:** Shelby Ford

**City staff present:** Ash Kulak

**Public present:** None

12:35 pm – INTRODUCTION AND ROLL CALL

12:44 pm – APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to approve the agenda. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

12:45 pm – APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes from February 6, 2023. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

12:52 pm – REPORTS:

Co-chairs:

- Cm. Brown-Sparks requested to step down as co-chair. Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to add to New Business to elect a new co-chair. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent. Cm. Miller as co-chair proposed discussing the issue at this time during Reports. Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to make Cm. Needler co-chair. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent. Cm. Needler and Cm. Miller are co-chairs until the end of May, 2023.
- Cm. Miller discussed jail programming survey results from New Leaf New Life.

Individuals:

- Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to create a special committee for alternative public safety outreach to conduct community outreach related to alternative public safety, organize and hold a public event, and prepare a report to deliver to the full Commission. Debate and discussion was held. The motion passed 5-0-0.

- Cm. Michalek reported working with a group that is having civil conversations about candidates for mayor, and the main sentiment raised was to focus on issues affecting the community and to not expect perfection from individual candidates.

Research Committee: members of the Research Committee present agreed to postpone its report until the next Regular Session.

Staff: Staff liaison Kulak welcomed the new member, Cm. Needler, and suggested revisiting scheduling to accommodate the new member's availability for regularly scheduled meetings.

Public: None.

1:37 pm – *BRIEF RECESS*

1:46 pm – UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

There was a discussion on amending the Agenda due to time constraints. Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to table Roman Numeral VI to April's Regular Session. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

1:48 pm – NEW BUSINESS:

Guest speakers: Cm. Miller moved and it was seconded to have Mary Morgan & Tatiana Wheeler as guest speakers for April's Regular Session. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

Working agreements: Conflict Resolution

Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion passed 4-1-0 (Miller).

Cm. Routsong proposed adding Conflict Resolution Procedures to the bylaws.

Cm. Miller moved and it was seconded to table this item and postpone the vote to the next meeting. The motion failed 2-3-0 (Routsong, Brown-Sparks, Michalek).

Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to extend the meeting by 15 additional minutes. The motion passed 4-1-0 (Miller).

Cm. Miller moved and it was seconded to amend the document to remove the words "or at low cost" from paragraph three. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to remove the comma and add the word "or" in paragraph one. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

Cm. Routsong moved and it was seconded to adopt the Conflict Resolution Procedures, as amended. The motion passed 4-0-1 (Miller).

Cm. Miller proposed substantively amending the conflict resolution procedures, as adopted. Due to time constraints, commissioners agreed to discuss substantive amendments at a future meeting.

Cm. Miller proposed tabling the remainder of items under "Other Business" due to time constraints. There were no objections.

2:24 pm – TOPIC SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS:

Cm. Miller requested the Agenda for April be light due to guest speakers' attendance.

Cm. Miller proposed revisiting the tabled items from this Agenda in April's meeting.

2:28 pm – Cm. Michalek moved and it was seconded to adjourn. No objections. Meeting adjourned.

Memorandum prepared by:  
Ash Kulak, Staff

# Anti-Oppressive Decision-Making Framework

## ALTERNATIVE TOOLS: Starting Where We Are

A Proposal promoting an Anti-Oppressive Decision- Making Framework for the Community Advisory on Public Safety (CAPS) Commission

Ordinance 20-20 of the Bloomington City Code

“The Community Advisory on Public Safety (CAPS) Commission’s goal is to increase the safety of all Bloomington community members, especially those often marginalized due to race, disability, gender, sexual identity, or sexual orientation.”

CAPS will “make recommendations to the Common Council, the Board of Public Safety, and/or the Mayor or the Mayor’s designee on policies and programs that enhance public safety for all community members.”

Purpose of CAPS Commission

This means that the entire purpose of the commission is to reduce the amount of systemic oppression in our community.

OPPRESSION DOES NOT EXIST IN A VACUUM

INTERSECTIONALITY MATTERS!

INDIVIDUAL

- **Ableism**
- **Capitalism/Classism**
- **Gender Binary/Transphobia**
- **Patriarchy/Sexism**
- **White Supremacy and Racism**

INSTITUTIONAL

- **Ableism**
- **Capitalism/Classism**
- **Gender Binary/Transphobia**
- **Patriarchy/Sexism**
- **White Supremacy and Racism**

CULTURAL

- **Ableism**
- **Capitalism/Classism**
- **Gender Binary/Transphobia**
- **Patriarchy/Sexism**
- **White Supremacy and Racism**

## AN ANTI-OPPRESSIVE DECISION MAKING FRAMEWORK

An anti-oppressive decision-making framework is designed to be a model of group organization that is horizontal, leaderless, and consensus-based. The decision-making framework is based on the gathering of people present and committed to making a decision at a particular moment based upon a collective agreement or consensus. There is no single leader or governing body of the commission—everyone's voice is equal.

### PROCESS

An individual shares what is being proposed, why it is being proposed, and, if there is enough agreement, how it can be carried out.

The Commissioners would then express their opinions for the proposal by requesting to speak.

### PROCESS

If there is positive consensus for a proposal—*meaning no outright opposition*—then it is accepted and approved.

If there is not consensus, after discussing what prevents the consensus, the responsible group or individual would be asked to revise the proposal and submit again at the following meeting until a majority consensus is achieved.

### WORKING GROUPS

Smaller working groups, such as ones for subsets of public safety, would make it possible for things to get done a little bit smoother. The working groups figure out specifics, such as what needs to be done or how something could be done, and formulates proposals to bring back to the Commission for general consensus. The working groups can also relay important information about things that everyone needs to take into consideration.

### NOT EVERYONE MAKES EVERY DECISION

Only decisions that need to be voted on need to be brought to the Commission. Not every person needs to be involved in every action for them to be successful; people should participate in things that they feel strongly about. Working groups can be formed and a call for people to participate in smaller meetings that do not meet quorum outside of the regular meetings without the entire group agreeing to it.

### WHAT IS CONSENSUS?

- Consensus is an inclusive and non-hierarchical process for group decision making.
- Consensus is coming up with a new solution where everyone involved feels their needs are addressed.

### OUTLINE FOR MAKING DECISIONS

1. Someone brings up a topic of discussion or an idea that requires a decision by the commission. This might take some discussion in order for the commission to identify what exactly needs to be solved.
2. Discussion takes place about the problem, so the commission can start working towards a proposal. The biggest mistake people make in consensus is to call for proposals too soon, before all individuals have had time to fully discuss the issue.
3. When it is apparent that the group is beginning to go over the same ground, a proposal is made which attempts to synthesize the feelings and insights expressed by the commission. The proposal should be clearly stated in very specific language.

**Proposals can be formed in smaller working groups and then brought to the Commission as a whole.**



4. Discussion is held on the proposal, in which it is amended or modified. During this discussion period, it is important to articulate differences clearly.

**It is the responsibility of those who are having trouble with a proposal to put forth alternative suggestions.**

5. When the proposal is understood by everyone, and there are no new changes asked for, someone (**usually the facilitator**) calls for a show of consensus. The proposal is reread with the included changes. The facilitator asks who agrees with the proposal.

If commissioners feel that the proposal reflects the will of the group as a whole, they signal their agreement.

The facilitator asks if there are any **stand-asides**. If someone feels that they have reservations, don't feel strongly about the decision, or don't fully agree with the proposal but doesn't have a serious objection to it passing, they indicate that they stand aside.

The facilitator asks if there are any **blocks**. If someone feels that the proposal seriously and irreconcilably violates the core values of the group.

**If someone has very strong objections to a specific proposal, that person should meet with the relevant working group for further discussion with the aim of coming to a common understanding.**

6. After consensus is reached, the decision should be clearly restated so as to check that everyone is clear on what has been decided.

**Before moving away from the subject, the group should be clear who is taking on the responsibility for implementing the decision.**

#### TYPES OF DISAGREEMENTS

**Non-support Stand Aside:** "I don't see the need for this, but I'll go along with the group."

**Reservations Stand Aside:** "I think this may be a mistake, but I can live with it."

**Personal Conflict Stand Aside:** "I personally can't do this, but I won't stop others from doing it."

**Blocking:** "I cannot support this or if the group to support this."

Blocking consensus is something that should only be done in extreme situations. It is not just a difference of opinion or a strategic disagreement—it is a complete and absolute rejection of the group moving forward.

**Blocking should be used cautiously and sparingly.**

*Consensus does not override each individual's ability to make their own decisions. Just as we hope that everyone will respect the decisions made by the Commission, the Commission should also strive to respect decisions made by individuals outside of the consensus process. Alongside consensus, we can celebrate our diversity and individual strengths. The problems we are confronting are wide and multi-faceted; thus, so our resistance should be too.*

#### ROLES IN THE CONSENSUS PROCESS: FACILITATOR

The facilitator's job is to help the group efficiently move through the agreed-upon agenda and to make room for people to have their opinions heard on the topics being discussed. *Facilitators should see that speaking opportunities are evenly distributed, that quiet people get a chance to speak and people who talk too much are given a chance to listen.* The facilitator should observe when the discussion seems to be nearing the point when a proposal could be made.

The facilitator can then call for a proposal or over one to the group, after more discussion if necessary, and then guide the group through the check for consensus as outlined above. *Facilitators should not use their position as a platform from which to offer solutions; solutions should arise from the group, and no one should facilitate if they find they have strong opinions on a given issue.* A facilitator can always hand over her or his responsibilities temporarily if s/he feels it necessary to step down.

***The group should not rely upon the facilitator to solve process problems, but should be ready to help with suggestions on how to proceed.***

#### ROLES IN THE CONSENSUS PROCESS: STACK-TAKER

The role of the stack-taker is to keep stack—a list of people who would like to speak on the topic. The stack-taker can prioritize people who have not spoken yet in order to get more voices in the discussion and can cut off the stack in order to create room for proposals or if the discussion is going too long or going around in circles. ***THIS CAN BE A JOB OF THE FACILITATOR IN SMALLER GROUPS.***

#### ROLES IN THE CONSENSUS PROCESS: TIME-KEEPER

The timekeeper assists the facilitator by keeping track of how long each part of the discussion has gone on. Often, each topic on the agenda will be assigned a time limit. The timekeeper lets people know when the time allotted is running out on that topic, and when the time is up. The group can always decide to add more time if it seems necessary for reaching consensus. ***IN SMALLER GROUPS THIS CAN BE THE NOTE-TAKER BUT SHOULD NOT BE THE STACK-TAKER or FACILITATOR TO INSURE IMPARTIALITY.***

#### NOTES ON MAKING DECISIONS IN A LIMITED TIME

It is the facilitator's responsibility to quickly and succinctly articulate the problem to be discussed and to eliminate those points on which agreement has already been reached. It is the responsibility of everyone in the group to keep the discussion to a minimum if quick action is called for. If your point has already been made by someone else, don't restate it.

**A calm approach and a clear desire to come to an agreement quickly can help the process. Don't let anxiety overwhelm your trust in each other or your purpose in the action. Strong objections should be limited to matters of principle.**

If a block is raised prior to the scheduled consensus, it is suggested that the proposal be discussed with the dissenter and consideration given to postponing the consensus date. If the dissenter is unavailable for an extended period of time, then the proposal will go back to CAPS Commission as originally presented. When the party dissenting returns, this party is invited to bring a proposal to reverse or amend the consensus in question.

In general, proposals would be presented to the Commission and brought to consensus in no less than one month and no more than three months from the date originally proposed to the Commission. During the interim period, the proposal materials would be **posted in our packets on the website** and the proposal would remain on the agenda.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS

There are occasions where certain proposals may need immediate attention. In such cases, the Commission can override the above process when deemed necessary (e.g. the reversal or amendment of any previous consensus). ***In order for the Commission to override the waiting process, consensus must be reached and all dissent for immediate action discussed prior to the presentation of the proposal requiring the immediate action should be discussed before the Commission.***

## COMMON PROCESS MISTAKES TO AVOID

- Not having a co-facilitator when you need one.
- Rushing the group, facilitation does not “hurry”.
- Not setting clear boundaries for yourself in your role as facilitator, getting pushed around by the group.
- Not taking a break when the facilitator needs one.
- Spiraling down into group process about group process.
- Not leaving time and space for people’s feelings.
- Becoming inflexible or unwilling to adapt the agenda/ plan to meet the group’s evolving needs.
- Forgetting to get additional support-- a notetaker, logistics coordinator, someone to set up the meeting space, etc.
- Meeting for too long a time period without food, water, and/or breaks.

## COMMON PROBLEMATIC GROUP DYNAMICS TO AVOID

- Unhealthy, unchallenged, or unnamed power dynamics.
- People interrupting each other or the facilitator.
- People repeating or re-stating what others have said.
- Tone and body language: Do people look upset? Checked out? Bored? Angry? If a facilitator sees this, they should check in with the group as a whole, or quietly with individuals.
- Individuals monopolizing conversation.

## Conflict Resolution

1. **Procedures:** It is vital for the functioning of the Commission that members identify and resolve interpersonal conflicts in an effective and meaningful way. A conflict between members is a dispute or disagreement between two or more members that hinders the functioning of the Commission. In the event that a Commission member experiences such a conflict with one or more members of the Commission, that member may notify the staff liaison of their intention to request mediation between the parties experiencing conflict. Commission members shall not retaliate against any member who requests mediation or is a party to a conflict. Retaliation is considered a separate instance of conflict subject to mediation under these rules.
2. **Mediation:** Upon such notification by the member requesting mediation, the staff liaison shall promptly inform all parties with whom the requesting member wishes to mediate. Subject to circumstances noted below, the Community Justice and Mediation Center ("CJAM") shall be the service used to mediate the conflict. The member requesting mediation or staff liaison may contact CJAM (or, should the contingencies below apply, other third party mediation or conflict resolution services as stipulated below) to initiate the process. Subject to extraneous circumstances or scheduling issues among CJAM staff and the parties, mediation shall be scheduled within one month of the notification to the Chair and/or staff liaison.
3. **Contingencies:** If CJAM cannot mediate due to any reason outside the merits of the case to be mediated, or if CJAM no longer exists, then a majority of the Commission will decide what outside third party will provide mediation or conflict resolution services. The outside third party services decided upon should be free. Should these services cost funds, then the Commission shall request a conflict resolution budget from the City in the next Commission report delivered before the Common Council budget session. Under no circumstances should Commission members pay for Commission-related mediation services.
4. **Resolution:** The party who requested mediation services shall promptly notify the staff liaison upon successful or unsuccessful mediation, or upon CJAM's decision to not mediate for any reason. This completes the conflict resolution process.
5. **Recommendation for removal:** If any member refuses to participate in mediation as requested by another member, and that person continues to hinder the functioning of the Commission, then any member of the Commission may make a motion at the next regular session for the Commission to recommend the governing body (the Common Council) remove that member from the Commission for cause. If two or more mediations deemed to have merit by CJAM have been requested of any member, and that person continues to hinder the functioning of the Commission, then any member of the Commission may make the motion described above. A motion to recommend removal is debatable and amendable. During debate, no member shall discuss any of the substantive matters discussed during mediation. The motion must pass by a majority vote. If passed, the Commission shall designate a member to write an explanation recommending removal to be forwarded to the appointing body.