1. Call to order and introductions
A quorum was established and Chairperson Richman called the meeting to order at 6:08pm. Commissioners introduced themselves. The Chairperson welcomed the Commissioners and those present, and introduced members of the Worcester Police Department: Captain Ken Davenport Bureau of Professional Standards, Sergeant Lee Boykin, Police Chief Steve Sargent, Deputy Chief Paul Saucier, Lieutenant David Doherty, Tiana Antul Principle Crime Analyst.

2. Approval of April 2nd, 2018 meeting minutes
Commissioner Kennedy motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Commissioner Robinson seconded.

3. New Business:
A. Update on community police relations with Worcester Police Department
Note: All handouts are attached at the end of the minutes

2017 Hate Crimes Statistics
Tiana Antul discussed hate crime statistics for 2017
- 8 incidents in 2017
- 6 out of 8 crimes involved police officer

Bias types included
- 80% race
- 10% religion
• 10% sexuality or gender identity
(*There are 10 reported below instead of 8 because 2 incidents involved 2 types of bias)

• **Captain Davenport presented the 2017 Bureau of Professional Standards Report**
  ● Bureau of Professional Standards (BOPS) Makeup
  ○ Dedicated internal affairs within police department
  ○ Captain, Lieutenant and 4 other sargents
  ○ Higher ranking officers investigate lower ranking officers
  ● 2017 Complaint/Comment Totals:
  ○ 71 complaints
  ○ 4 comments (calls commending police department)
  ● Breakdown: Routes 4, 7, 2 had the highest number of complaints
  ○ Route 4: 9 total complaints
  ○ Route 7: 7 total complaints
  ○ Route 2: 6 total complaints
  ● Analysis:
  ○ Different ethnicities, gender, incident types, different origin (initiated by officer or citizen); Allegations were different, various types of incidents, different make-up of complainants, various officers involved
  ● Use of Force Totals
  ○ 529 in 2017
  ○ Average of 75.5 complaints per year average over 6 years
  ○ Average of 36.8 allegations of unnecessary force over 6 years
  ■ 25 complaints of unnecessary force in 2017
  ■ 4.73% of total uses of force in 2017
  ○ Follow up question: What are national Averages?
  ● Complaint origins:
  ○ 54 generated from citizens
  ○ 17 generated internally
  ● Outcomes:
  ○ 17% sustained from internal complaints (officer found at fault)
  ○ 5.56% sustained from citizens
  ○ 1 recommendation for termination last year
  ● Complaint Process:
  ○ Complaints generated online, on the city web page, etc., comes directly to Captain Davenport’s email. He then assigns it to a Sargent within his office, or will assign to the unit commander of that officer if it’s serious enough
  ○ Sargent gives the complainant a call, then opens an investigation
  ○ Once it’s been investigated, Captain Davenport reviews
  ○ The outcome is forwarded to the Deputy Chief
  ○ Both sit down with Chief Sargent and decide what labels should be on that report
  ○ The complainant is notified via letter to let them know the finding of the complaint
  ○ Interpreters are available to interpret complaints in languages other than English

• **Lieutenant Doherty of the Neighborhood Watch Team presented the 2017 Neighborhood Watch Meetings Activity Report**
  ● 500 meetings per year, coordinated through community partners
  ● Focus on quality of life issues and problem properties
  ● Worcester Police Department attends every meeting
● Same officer attends same meeting each month
● New in 2017 - Worcester Senior Center meeting for seniors all over the city

**2017 Summary of community partnership and outreach**

● Neighborhood Response team works closely with housing alliance, city manager’s quality of life task force, senior center, etc.
● Asked to attend outreach events (e.g. Worcester housing authority cookout, National night out, Working for Worcester build day, Safety talks to refugee and African youth, Union Hill Trick or Treat event, etc.)
● Unit Lieutenant Oversees Crisis intervention team
● Worcester PAR program: follows up with each overdose for referral to treatment program
● Officer Lovely- currently working with on approaching deaf & hard of hearing community
● Gang unit activities - rugby team for youth - 2 police officers
● 300+ young kids in summer camp program 3 weeks with boys & girls club
● Mounted Unit - 4 horses, 7 officers

**Update on body camera pilot timeline and policy**

● Chief Sargent reported that the Police Department is working on best practices and will be putting out camera program at some point in the future
● Boston just finished pilot program; WPD trying to get a copy of their program to identify best practices for Worcester
● Plan: Pilot program - 19 officers spread throughout all divisions
  ○ Pilot program would dictate finances and long term
● Current initiatives:
  ○ 91 video cameras installed “from wagon to cell”

**Sargent Lee Boykin presented WPD Diversity Officer recruitment and training initiatives**

● Working with Chief Diversity Officer for the City of Worcester
● New to position, going through a lot of training
● Job description includes recruitment, retention and inclusion in department
● Working with Lieutenant Mark sawyer to get minorities up for next class
● Cadet program:
  ○ Conduit for providing diversity for department and city
  ○ Boston and Springfield both have similar programs
  ○ Going to high schools and colleges to recruit
● Barriers to recruitment:
  ○ Cost. How can we support young people who want to be police officers?

**B. Preliminary analysis of the Neighborhood Watch meeting surveys**

**Background**

● July 2017: Discussed Police Community Relations Initiative as part of annual Public Safety Work Plan and created following action steps:
  ○ Attend meetings to understand their process and makeup
  ○ Research best practices/case studies
  ○ Design tools to gather additional information
  ○ Develop recommendations to enhance facilitation, attendance, effectiveness and other aspects of meetings
● August 2017: HRC members began attending meetings
  ○ Developed Field Note Template and Questionnaire
● September 2017: Commissioners/Volunteers began distributing surveys to Neighborhood Watch
Meeting attendees
Survey Overview
● Data collected September 2017 - April 2018
● Sample size: 113 individual respondents across 17 out of ~52 total meetings

Methods
● Observers/Survey Administrators: Commissioners, students, interns and city employees
● Survey distribution methods: Differed between survey administrators
● Sample Selection: Meeting selection based on availability of volunteers

Survey Format
● Survey items captured various types of information:
  ○ Checklist of basic meeting information
  ○ How long and how often they’d attended
  ○ Additional offerings they’d like to see
  ○ 12 statements presented in a Likert scale format measured individual attitudes
  ○ Voluntary demographic information (Age, Race, Gender)

Results
● Respondents were most often: White (77%), Female (65%), Over 55 years of age (75%)
● Survey respondents not proportionate to relative shares of city resident demographics
● City of Worcester Demographics
  ○ Gender: Men 49%; Women 51% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011)
  ○ Race: White: 57%; Hispanic: 21%; Black/African American: 12%; Asian: 7.1%; Bi-Racial/Other: 3%
  ○ Median age: 34 (Data USA, 2017)

Breakdown by age compared to the general population (Data USA, 2017):
● Over 55 age group overrepresented in the data by two thirds
  ○ (Respondents over 55=75%; Share of adult population=31%)
● 45-54 age group is underrepresented in the data by one third
  ○ (Respondents 45-54=10%; Share of adult population=17%)
● 35-44 age group underrepresented in the data by half
  ○ (Respondents 45-54=7%; Share of adult population=15%)
● ≤ 35 age group underrepresented by a margin of nearly 20 to 1
  ○ (Respondents under 35 =1.5%; Share of adult population=20%)

Breakdown by race compared to the general population:
● White respondents were overrepresented in responses by 20%
  ○ (Share of Respondents=77%; Share of population=57%)
● Hispanic and Asian respondents were underrepresented by half
  ○ (Share of Respondents =11%; Share of population=21%)
  ○ (Share of Respondents =3%; Share of population=7%)
● Black/African American respondents were underrepresented in survey responses by ¾
  ○ (Share of Respondents =3%; Share of population=12%)

Results: Length of Attendance
● Nearly half (44%) of all respondents had been attending 5 years or more
● Two-Thirds (66%) had been attending more than 2 years
• Only 20% of respondents were new to neighborhood watch meetings

Results: Likert Responses: Gauged respondents’ views on 12 statements:
• These questions scored an average rating of 4.5 / 5 across all individual responses:
  o “I have the opportunity to share concerns”
  o “I feel safe attending neighborhood watch meetings”
  o “I plan to attend future neighborhood watch meetings”
• These questions scored 2 or more standard deviations below the total average rating:
  o “It’s easy to find information”
  o “Meetings are well-attended”

Results: Respondent Feedback
• Most requested item: access to more information about Neighborhood Watch meetings:
  o 60% of respondents requested some type of information (N=68)
  o 39% of respondents requested social media updates (N=44)
  o 26% of respondents requested email updates (N=29)
  o Others: requests for a website, pamphlets, flyers or general written information
• Likely that potential attendees would also benefit from increased access to information

Other feedback
• 26% requested more convenient meeting times
• 8% requested transport
• 2 individuals requested ASL Interpreters

Inferred Requests/Unmet Needs: Bilingual materials
• Several surveys were completed in languages other than English
• 24% of the population speaks English as a second language
• Spanish speakers comprise 15% of the population (Data USA, 2017)
• Written materials in one’s native language increases understanding, promotes inclusivity

Analysis
• White, older respondents significantly over-represented in survey response data
• Other demographics absent or significantly under-represented in survey responses
• Language and cultural barriers, lack of knowledge, availability and access include potential factors
• Respondents report feeling generally safe and encouraged to participate in meetings
  o “I feel safe attending meetings” (Average = 4.5 / 5)
  o “I feel comfortable sharing concerns” (Average = 4.2 / 5)
• Respondents were less likely to agree that meetings were well-attended
  o “Meetings are well-attended” (Average= 3.5 / 5)
• Increased access to information about meetings requested in a majority of responses

Limitations
• Limited sample size: Both overall and for specific meetings
• Not all meetings were attended: 17 of ~52 (approximately 33% of total meetings)
• Sample bias: Meetings not randomly sampled; May miss trends; potential confounds
  o Potential confound example: Meeting times happen to be convenient for college students and one overrepresented group
• Self-Selection bias: Number of survey responses different from total observed attendees
• Language/cultural barriers: Some surveys completed in other languages or not returned
• Reliability in survey administration: Differences in survey distribution yield varied results
• Results may overestimate positive attitudes
Those less likely to complete the survey also may feel less comfortable at meetings, and/or are less likely to attend in the first place

How much is self-selection bias, and how much is due to lack of attendance/underrepresentation of these groups?

- Multiple underlying factors inform a comprehensive approach

Follow-up

- HRC will continue to distribute surveys for additional data with the following goals:
  - Reach every Neighborhood Watch Meeting
  - Address limitations of preliminary survey
  - Identify gaps in information

Changes to address limitations

- Standardized survey distribution: Create consistency between meetings
- Decrease self-selection bias
- Increase overall sample size
- Updated field note forms: Increase secondary reliability measures (IOA)
- Gap analysis to identify meetings not yet attended
- Decrease potential sample selection bias
- Increase Access: Remove language barriers by offering survey in spoken language

Preliminary Conclusions

- Attendees have an overall positive outlook toward neighborhood watch meetings
- Current attendees are likely to continue attending in the future
- Lack of information, access and comfort may be barriers to new membership
- Increasing attendance, access and inclusiveness are likely to amplify current positive effects attributed to Neighborhood Watch Meetings

Recommendations

- Increase Access: Ensure individuals can access location and written materials
- Increase Inclusivity: Ensure that all members of the community feel welcome
- Increase Information: Ensure information is shared widely and easily located

Increasing Access

- Eliminate Barriers: Written Materials (Announcements, Minutes, Agendas)
- Bilingual meeting materials: Provide in individuals’ primary spoken language
- High Contrast / Large Text Materials: for those with visual impairments
- Signage / Location: Ensure entrances are clearly marked and accessible to public
  - Ensure location is accessible to individuals with disabilities
- Verbal Communication: ASL / Interpreter services

Increasing Inclusivity

- Educate organizers on City of Worcester standard language for inclusivity/participation:
  - “The City of Worcester does not discriminate on the basis of disability. The Human Rights Commission will provide auxiliary aids and services, written materials in alternative formats, and reasonable modifications in policies and procedures to persons with disabilities upon advance request.”
- This notice should be included at the bottom of on every announcement, agenda, of every public meeting in the City of Worcester
Increase Information

● Increasing/Centralizing information regarding meetings can promote new membership
● Outreach can increase attendance: Especially among younger demographics
● Social media, local businesses, college campuses, social hubs

Potential Outreach Strategies:
  ○ Could the city include flyers with tax/utility bills?
  ○ Could the WPD share on its social media page?
  ○ Could local representatives share with constituents?

Current strategies to replicate: Apartment building bulletin boards, social media pages

Get Involved: The Human Rights Commission is seeking volunteers to attend Neighborhood Watch Meetings. If interested, please contact by phone or email.

References

Community Feedback Questions

● How can we increase attendance among groups underrepresented in the surveys?
● How can we make meetings a welcoming space for everyone in the community?
● How can these meetings help foster strong community relationships?

Written feedback submitted by members of the public during the meeting:
  ● Provide food!
  ● Childcare too? Maybe?
  ● Let’s have a focus group with targeted coordinators to discuss more! How can HRC help???
  ● Send bilingual officers out to neighborhoods with high concentrations of people that speak that language to do outreach and then have those officers attend those meetings.
  ● Ensure all attending officers have training on intentional language and trigger words. Example: “citizen”, “community,” “hooker”
  ● Change the name of the meetings. Stop calling them watch as watch is problematic.
  ● Require officers to do outreach in neighborhoods with organizer one week prior. And follow up after no shows.
  ● Provide community partners with financial support to staff/administer/coordinate efforts
  ● Increasing attendance: identify why underrepresented groups don’t attend in the first place. Is the meeting not addressing topics they are familiar with?
  ● Offer childcare, offer food. Accessible central location and person to person outreach
  ● Welcoming space: central/easily identifiable location, facilitated by a person familiar to the neighborhood, provide copies of the agenda in multiple languages, take large/public notes
  ● Makes notes accessible to all participants
  ● Create sign in sheet and follow up with people
  ● Offer childcare and food when possible
  ● Fostering relationships: establish trust among neighbors, identify available community spaces, connect neighbors to resources, create sense of community by encouraging people to take action on their own terms, connect residents to organizations, representatives and other resources.
C. Request from Cedric Arno regarding hosting of mock trial on June 28th, 2018

“Did constitution support legal slavery?”

Reading of Frederick Douglass Speech - July 3rd at noon, City Hall Common
Clerk O’Callahan motioned to support the work in assisting Cedric Arno’s mock trial on June 26th or 28th, 2018. Commissioner Robinson seconded. Motion passed with all in favor

Public Comment:
Gordon T. Davis asked:
● Where can hate crime statistics be found?
  ○ Hate crime data is available as public record submitted to state and FBI
● When is the next date for body cameras? No set date, but 6 month program to evaluate
● Does affirmative action for military personnel trump work through schools?
  ○ No, it’s just another tool to increase diversity of City of Worcester
● Is there quantitative data on use of horses vs use of cruiser in effectiveness of patrol?
  ○ Qualitative data: “some things you just can’t evaluate with a number”
  ○ Younger kids won’t walk up to motorcycle or vehicle
  ○ Useful as community engagement tool

Alexizendria Link, resident of Worcester asked:
● Is there data as it relates to arrests or hospitalizations where mental health may be a component; disparities in sentencing, particularly because of young people, and difficulty in recruiting young people, especially people of color
  ○ There is a school resource officer program
  ○ Training from SRO programs to work with kids in schools
● What would it look like for police officers to have listening sessions with students in schools to dismantle some of their fear?
  ○ Informal sessions held in schools

Hannah Winestaff asked about the type and frequency of diversity training
● Setting up diversity yearly training through Sgt Boykin

Laura Watkins, family partner at Community Healthlink asked the police department to look into creating a program for children in therapeutic mentoring programs to engage with police and horses as a short term service following exposure to potentially-traumatic law-enforcement related incidents, with the goal of helping those kids repair relationship with police

Amy Ebbeson, member of Worcester Acts, Professor of Social Work, commented that there was a missed opportunity for feedback when the young people in the room believed that they would not be able to make a public comment

Rev. Jesse Gibson commented that the African community is often overlooked in conversations on race, drawing the distinction between African and African American communities. He asked how we include people from this group. He also commented that people are often discouraged after not hearing back, and asked how the follow-up process can be improved.

● Cadet program will help address limitations from the civil service test
● WPD doesn’t have receive a list of people to contact and can’t get list until hiring
● Will look into potential fixes for this issue

4. Reminder: World Refugee Day Friday, June 15th, from 4:00 – 6:00pm at Trinity Lutheran Church, 73 Lancaster Street, Worcester MA
5. Location of next meeting (July 2nd, 2018): City Hall, Esther Howland Chamber

6. Adjournment at 8:21