



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Meeting Minutes

COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE COMMISSION - COMMUNITY SURVEY & RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Paul Mozina, Chair.

Deborah Blanks and Steve Jansen

Monday, June 21, 2021

6:00 PM

Virtual

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81187965359?pwd=dzl6aDRJaE42Sk83ZmNTbllxMlpndz09>

Meeting ID: 811 8796 5359

Passcode: p4wxej

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,81187965359#,,,,*578716# US (Chicago)

Dial by your location

312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 811 8796 5359

Passcode: 578716

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81187965359?pwd=dzl6aDRJaE42Sk83ZmNTbllxMlpndz09>

1. Minutes Discussion and Approval

*Call to order at 1:00 p.m. Present Steve Jansen, Deborah Blanks and Paul Mozina.
Also Present: Asia Carter (Safe and Sound)*

Minutes from June 9, 2021 meeting unanimously approved.

2. Discussion of options for getting professional assistance with the Community Survey and what we would need to do to release a BID

Paul reviewed emails with City Clerk, Jim Owczarski, and City of Milwaukee Procurement Manager, Delisha D. Moore, regarding how we should proceed to hire professional services to help us with the survey. During an information seeking phone conversation, Delisha explained that we need to work through the City Clerks Office. She explained that a Request for Proposal could take a long time and that we should consider issuing a BID instead.

Jim asked if we were attempting to do a "scientific" survey. Paul confessed to the Committee that he did not know much about Surveys and what made them "scientific". We concluded that we want the survey results to be taken seriously and that means a "scientific" survey.

Stephen emphasized the importance of finding a consultant or polling firm that is completely independent of the City. Stephen suggested the Wisconsin Policy Forum and Asia agreed and added "Data You Can Use" as a possibility.

Paul mentioned email from Jim that said the last time the City asked WPF to do a survey, they gave a 6 month lead time and it cost \$30,000.

Deborah used to be on the Board of "Data You Can Use" <https://www.datayoucanuse.org/> and she highly recommended Katie Pritchard. She said it was important that the organization we bring to help us with the study have a diverse group of staff and researchers including people of color. She said she would not be involved with "Data You Can Use" helping them do the research. Deborah mentioned that Dr. David Pate, chair of the UWM Social Work Department, may have students that might be interested in helping us including a doctoral candidate, Nicole Robinson, who is involved with The American Evaluation Association (<https://www.eval.org/>). Deborah mentioned that when we get the RFP together we should make sure that the WPF, Data You Can Use, Dr. Pate and Nicole Robinson are made aware. Nicole may be able to circulate the RFP with The American Evaluation Association. We want a cross section of organizations to bid on our proposal.

Stephen suggested we bring the idea of using the bidding process to the CCC and Amy Orta in the Community Outreach Committee as a way of generating interest in the Community in the survey itself. He wants a very public bidding process to generate competition and awareness and "a media buzz". He suggested that this would help with issues of scrutiny of the survey results.

Deborah reminded us to work with Rhonda Kelsey in the City of Milwaukee's Purchasing Director, to make sure we follow their procedures. Paul agreed and mentioned the contacts made with Delisha and Jim.

Paul reviewed his discussion with Delisha and the idea that we would proceed with a BID rather than an RFP, and he described the different kinds of surveys and suggested that the one we were going to do was a "Successive independent samples study" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Survey_methodology).

Deborah mentioned that she used to work in the City of Milwaukee's Procurement Office and that she thought that a Request for Proposal (RFP) was the preferred way to go. She cautioned against relying too much on Wikipedia as a source of information. The value of doing an RFP is that you get to see a variety of solutions to your problem. Then you look for who will give you the most for a given price – who has a strategy. Stephen agreed with Deborah that we should go with an RFP.

Deborah pointed out the importance of customer service in our search criteria. Will the survey consultant write a report? Will they present the results to the Common Council? How often will they meet with us?

Stephen asked Paul to reach out to the CCC Chair, Nate Hamilton, to get an agenda item in front of the full CCC to discuss the RFP for the survey. He also mentioned reaching out to Amy Orta to develop a media "buzz" about how we are creating an RFP for the survey to get community involvement and public discussion about it.

Paul asks how many people we would like to contact in the survey and Stephen suggested 2000-3000.

Deborah suggested we contact Delisha and get some boilerplate language to use for the RFP. Paul agreed to follow up on this and Deborah offered to help if needed. She wondered if the City already has a list of consultants that can do this work and she offered to develop a short list (some have already been mentioned). Deborah asked if we were looking for a for-profit or non-profit organization and that we should keep our options open to both.

Paul listed some of the scope of work ideas that had been presented and Deborah said we do need to provide some general parameters for how many times we expect to meet with them. We will want them to present their proposals to us so we can ask them questions and talk to them. We should have a two-pronged decision making process: first, read written proposal, then meet and discuss with final candidates.

Stephen reiterated his idea that we have public meeting to hear the presentations of

the finalists. We should discuss this with the CCC and ask for help from Amy Orta in the Community Outreach Committee to make this happen. He talked about different options to publicize the event: social media, flyers, news organizations, press release etc... to generate attention to what the CCC is working on.

Paul offered to write the RFP and Stephen offered to help. Then we will send it to Jim Owczarski and hopefully onto Delisha Moore.

Deborah said we need to make sure that Jim is OK with doing a public RFP process. She may be able to get a copy of an RFP that we can use for a template.

Asia supported our decision go with an RFP.

Paul asked if we want to include the method or mode of contacting people to be surveyed in the RFP and Deborah suggested it would be better to leave that open to the survey consultant to generate the best response rate.

Deborah mentioned that we need to be prepared for people to ask us 'why are you doing another survey'? She mentioned a recent Journal Sentinel article discussing a survey (Suffolk University, USA Today, Journal Sentinel

<https://www.suffolk.edu/academics/research-at-suffolk/political-research-center/polls/issues-polls>).

Paul asked about types of questions we should limit ourselves to. Open ended questions require more "coding" on the part of the surveyors and made be harder to interpret the results of. Deborah thought we should leave our options open and wait for feedback from the consultant regarding the format and style of our questions. We can learn How and Why questions should be asked.

We revisited the idea of providing some general acknowledgment of the types of meetings we would be asking the consultant to participate in and how many that might be.

Stephen stressed the importance of fixing a time to get this survey done because we are experiencing an unacceptable level of statistical anomalies in the numbers of black and brown people who are getting stopped and frisked. He wants this done by the end of the year. This needs to be in the RFP.

Deborah suggested we follow up with Delisha to verify what is acceptable as far as how much of the process is public and how much is confidential.

Stephen asked that we make sure the questions are not public until later on in the process. He wants the survey questions to be confidential until we release it to avoid distractions with people critiquing the questions.

Paul asked Stephen to clarify what he wanted to get accomplish with the full CCC regarding the survey by August. He hoped to be able to have a public RFP forum in the first week of August. Deborah thought that might not be a realistic timeline and explained why. Stephen adjusted and suggested the first week of September would be a good goal for the public RFP meeting.

Deborah suggested we have a review panel look at the written proposals and narrow it down to the top three for the public RFP. Stephen said then we should have two short-term dates: one deadline for a screening committee to be picked by the CCC to review the written proposals and narrow them to three, and another date for the public RFP discussion.

3. Review and Refine Survey questions and organize into themes

Tabled until the next meeting

4. Discuss FPC Policies and Standards Committee meeting on July 29, specifically SOP 970 Search Warrants and SOI Sensitive Crimes Division and forwarding research to the CCC Policies Committee

Tabled until a future meeting

5. Brief introduction to Tableau Dashboards displaying the MPD data provided to the FPC and CJI per the Collins/ACLU Settlement Agreement

Tabled until a future meeting

Adjournment at 2:14 p.m.

Minutes provided by Paul Mozina