**Brooklyn Park Police Scorecard Community Task Force Final Report 2022**

**Task Force Purpose**
The Police Scorecard Community Task Force was created by the Brooklyn Park City Council to evaluate the Brooklyn Park Police Department against Wilder Research's best practices in law enforcement. The goal of the Task Force was to help Brooklyn Park promote transparency, accountability, and positive relationships with Brooklyn Park residents and stakeholders. The Scorecard was developed as part of a study by Wilder Research for the city of Brooklyn Park.

**Background**
On November 30, 2020, the City Council hired a nationally respected research and evaluation group, Wilder Research, to perform an evaluation of the Police Department including the development of an assessment scorecard. Wilder Research worked with the City and the Council-appointed Police Reform & Racial Justice Advisory Committee from December 2020 to July 2021 to perform their evaluation and develop the scorecard. On July 12, 2021, Wilder Research presented their final report and recommendations to the City Council.
The City Council received Wilder Research's recommendation to assess the Brooklyn Park Police Department for improvements using the developed scorecard. At the September 27, 2021 Council meeting, the City Council interviewed community members for the Police Scorecard Community Task Force. The Task Force members were recommended for approval at the October 11, 2021 regular meeting and were appointed.
The Task Force met five times in October and November on Wednesday evenings at the Brooklyn Park Police Department.

**Task Force Membership**
The Task Force consisted of:
- One Human Rights Commission Member (Voting)
- One Multicultural Advisory Committee Member (Voting)
- Two West District Brooklyn Park Residents (Voting)
- Two Central District Brooklyn Park Residents (Voting)
- Two East District Brooklyn Park Residents (Voting)
- One At-large Business Owner/Operator Member (Voting)
- One At-large Community Organization Member (Voting)
- One At-large School or Faith Community Member (Voting)*
- One Brooklyn Park Police Department Representative (Voting)
- One Youth Representative (Voting)
- One City Council Liaison (Non-voting)
- Alternate Members (Non-voting) – Alternates were invited to sit in on the discussion so they would be prepared to vote if needed. Alternates were voting members when attending in place of the appointed voting member.

    *Both the appointed member and the alternate had conflicts with the meeting schedule and were unable to participate.

The Task Force project was sponsored by Brooklyn Park staff members Wokie Freeman-Gbogba, Assistant City Manager, and Brooklyn Park Police Department Deputy Chief, Mark Bruley. Sergeant Matthew Rabe presented background and supplemental information at each of the Task Force meetings. The staff facilitators for group discussions were Josie Shardlow,

Community Engagement Manager; Brenda C. Morales, Community Engagement Specialist; and McKaia Ryberg, Strategic Management Coordinator.

**Task Force Process**
The Task Force used a similar process throughout each meeting to score the 66 indicators in the Brooklyn Park Police Department Scorecard. The indicators were sorted into ten separate goals in the scorecard. Each goal had instructions and a separate scoring scale from 1-5, which outlined criteria for each of the numbers. The criteria for the scoring scales varied between the goals but had the same structure throughout the scorecard. A copy of the blank scorecard can be found here.

Before the Task Force scored each indicator, Sergeant Matthew Rabe presented information from the Brooklyn Park Police Department on each of the indicators and compared the information to the Wilder Research best practices. After Sergeant Rabe presented, members of the Task Force asked clarifying questions to obtain the information they needed to vote on each indicator. After questions and initial discussion, the members used [1]voting cards to score each indicator. If there were varying scores from the initial vote, as often occurred throughout the voting process, the group held a facilitated discussion to address discrepancies in the score. After further discussion, the Task Force voted on the same indicator again and documented the vote. If a consensus could not be reached, the facilitators recorded the most common score and also included an asterisk (*) with an explanation for the varying scores. After a score was recorded, the Task Force then moved to the next indicator and repeated the process.

**Results and Scoring**
Below are the Scorecard results and notes from the Police Scorecard Task Force meetings. Each of the 10 goals has its own scorecard chart with information below.

| Goal 1. Law enforcement policies | |
|---|---|
| **Policy indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. Use of force | 5* |
| B. Body worn camera | 5 |
| C. Union contract | 5 |
| D. Stops | 5 |
| E. Protest response | 4* |
| F. Consent to search | 2* |
| G. Social media use by department and officers in unofficial capacities | 3* |

Notes:
1A  Eight members scored this indicator as 5 and two members scored with a 4. The members who scored with a 4 indicated that there was no documentation of process and procedures regarding community engagement on policy review for the Use of Force Policy.

---

[1] Each voting Task Force member received paper cards labeled 1-5 to match the scoring scale referenced in the Scorecard. The members also received a card with a question mark (?) to utilize if they did not know how to vote on a particular indicator of if they had further questions or needed more clarification at the time of voting.

1E      Two members scored 3, seven members scored 4 and 1 member scored a 5. The discussion and discrepancy largely concluded that the community is currently not involved in determining the appropriate action for military-grade equipment. Although the Multi-Cultural Advisory Commission has had input on military-type equipment that the Police Department purchases, there is no greater community wide engagement on this topic.

1F      Eight members scored 2 and two members utilized their question mark (?) score card during voting. There was general disagreement with the Wilder Research recommendation for best practices around this policy. The Task Force indicated the desire to seek community input on this policy.

1G      Ten members scored 3 and one member scored a four. No explanation was provided for the discrepancy in score selection.

| Goal 2. Training and education | |
|---|---|
| **Training and education indicators** | **Consensus Score** |
| A. Implicit bias | 5 |
| B. Procedural justice | 5 |
| C. De-escalation | 5 |
| D. Use of force | 5 |
| E. Stops | ?* |
| F. Cultural sensitivity | 5 |
| G. Adolescent brain development | ?* |
| H. Consent to search | 1 |

Notes:

2E      The Task Force reached consensus to score this indicator with a question mark (?) as they felt the indicator was described in the Wilder report and scorecard as too ambiguous to provide an accurate score.

2G      The Task Force reached consensus to score this indicator with a question mark (?) as they felt the indicator was described in the Wilder report and scorecard as too ambiguous to provide an accurate score.

| Goal 3. Transparency | |
|---|---|
| **Transparency indicators** | **Consensus Score** |
| A. Arrests (including custodial, citations, etc.), by type of crime (person, society, property initially; possibly defined in partnership with community later) | 1 |
| B. Use of force incidents, aggregated if necessary | 2 |
| C. Civilian complaints, aggregated if necessary, including results (where reportable) | 1 |
| D. Calls for service by type of crime | 5 |
| E. Stops, by type of stop (vehicle or pedestrian/subject), race of person stopped, reason for the stop, de-escalation or use of force tactics used | 1* |
| F. Demographics of officers compared to Brooklyn Park residents | 1 |
| G. Response time to calls, by type of call, and/or geographic area | 1 |
| H. Clearance rate by type of crime (person, society, or property, initially; possibly defined in partnership with community later), where denominator is the number of reported crimes and numerator is, of those reports, the number cleared with arrest., citation, referral to charges, or referral to diversion, by race | 1 |
| I. Diversion outcomes, by type of crime | 1 |
| J. Vehicle pursuits, including why pursuit was initiated, outcome (collision, etc.), and driver demographics | 1* |
| Annual department cost | 5 |
| Report of SWAT actions | 5 |
| Scorecard results | 2 |

Notes:

3E    Nine members scored 1 and one member scored 3. The discrepancy and discussion centered on the lack of pedestrian data. The member who scored a 3 noted that the data is not accessible enough to make it fully transparent but scored differently than the rest of the Task Force.

3J    Two members scored 5 and nine members scored 11. The members scoring 5 said there was "too much data" reported.

| Goal 4. Community oversight | |
|---|---|
| **Community oversight indicators** | **Consensus Score** |
| A. There is a community oversight board that adheres to best practices for civilian oversight of law enforcement | 1 |
| B. Civilian complaints are public | 1 |
| C. The community oversight board is consulted when BPPD seeks to adopt, implement, or evaluate surveillance, crowd control, and/or "militarized" techniques, technology, weapons, or vehicles | 1 |

| Goal 5. Commitment to standards | |
|---|---|
| **Commitment to standards indicators** | **Consensus Score** |
| A. Staff reflects the diversity of Brooklyn Park | 5 |
| B. Officers are regularly surveyed on their ethics, values, and cultural fluency | 1 |
| C. Crisis intervention teams or community-based specialists are first responders when appropriate | 5 |
| D. Officers, staff, and volunteers are prohibited from affiliating with hate groups and groups that advocate for violent suppression of political opposition, and are prohibited from contributing to these groups' ideologies | 3 |
| E. Officers are regularly surveyed on knowledge of department policies and criminal law | 5 |

| Goal 6. Officer wellness and safety | |
|---|---|
| **Officer wellness and safety indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. Officers are surveyed on satisfaction and morale, including their perceptions of procedural justice within the department | 1 |
| B. Officers are surveyed on department leadership | 5 |
| C. Officer workplace injuries are tracked | 5 |

| Goal 7. Community policing | |
|---|---|
| **Community policing indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. BPPD officer(s) spend time in non-enforcement activities including strengthening relationships with community members, collaborating with community members and groups to solve problems, and attending open meetings in community | 5 |
| B. BPPD convenes forums where community members can interact with police and help influence programs and policy | 5 |
| C. BPPD assigns officers to small geographic areas for the long term, these officers have problem-solving authority, and are assessed on indicators such as community satisfaction and reduced fear of crime | 5 |

| Goal 8. Data-driven management | |
|---|---|
| **Data-driven management indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. Arrest data by race and/or other demographics | 5 |
| B. Civilian complaint data by race and/or other demographics | 5 |
| C. Call data by race and/or other demographics | 5 |
| D. Stop data by race and/or other demographics | 5 |
| E. Early warning system results, including which officers are flagged, why, the results of the disposition, and subsequent flags for that officer's behavior | 5 |
| F. Deadly force incidents by race | 5 |
| G. Less lethal force incidents by race | 5 |
| H. Call response time | 5 |
| I. Clearance rate, by crime type | 5 |
| J. Officer discipline, re-training, mentorship, and subsequent flags for officer behavior | 5 |
| K. Civil suits | 5 |
| L. Officer absenteeism | 5 |

| Goal 9. Quality services | |
|---|---|
| **Quality service indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. Household survey on satisfaction with police | 3/4* |
| B. Business survey on satisfaction with police | 1 |
| C. Community survey/interview on perceptions of BPPD, including procedural justice indicators, BPPD violence and abuse | 1 |
| D. Community survey on reporting crime, problems to BPPD | 1 |
| E. Survey of people stopped by BPPD, including identification of the officer to the person stopped | 1 |
| F. Survey partners and other stakeholders (including community oversight board members, violence prevention program workers, victim/survivor advocacy groups) about experiences with department | 1 |

Notes:

9A    Those who scored this indicator with a 3 discussed that while the management team reviews results, there is no evidence that improvements have been made based on the resident survey. The members who scored with a 4 discussed that results are shared with the public although they would like to see a survey focused on just the Police Department.

| Goal 10. Safety | |
|---|---|
| **Safety indicators** | **Consensus score** |
| A. Violent crime rate | 5 |
| B. Property crime rate | 5 |
| C. Crime rate victimization by demographics | 5 |
| D. Repeat victimization rate by demographics | 1 |
| E. % of officers on force with multiple civilian complaints annually | 5 |
| F. % of officers on force who cause death annually | 5 |

Notes:
The Task Force indicated an issue with using the word "force" to describe the Police Department.

**Challenges**
One persistent challenge throughout the Task Force scoring process was the time limitations for discussion given the large number of indicators to score. The Task Force met four times as originally scheduled and added a fifth meeting to finish the scoring indicators. While the Task Force's charge was to score the indicators, it was particularly challenging to only provide information or host discussions specific to the intention of scoring, as the scorecard covered many complex indicators.

The Task Force at times had to use interpretative understanding to score certain indicators. As demonstrated in the notes above, there was some ambiguity with the language used by Wilder Research on the intent behind certain indicators. In addition, some task force members questioned Wilder's methodology with identifying some factors as "best practices" when there was limited data or research on particular topics.

**Next steps**
This report will be presented to the City Council with recommendations for further next steps at the January 10, 2022 City Council meeting.