



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

City of Chicago NOTICE OF CCPSA NOMINATING COMMITTEE SCHEDULED MEETING

The Nominating Committee for the Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability will hold its public meeting on the following date, time, and location:

Saturday, July 19, 2025, 10:00 AM– 12:00 PM
Chicago Public Library Manning Branch
6 S Hoyne Ave, Chicago, IL, 60612

MINUTES

I. Roll call & quorum determination

Total Quorum		17 Attendees	
Name (DC #)	Attendance	Name (DC #)	Attendance
Adrienne Johnson (01)	Yes	Michelle D. Page (12)	Yes
Marquinn McDonald (02)	No	Ashley Vargas (14)	Yes
Kenya Franklin (03)	Yes	Karen Arewa Winters (15)	No
Gloria Jenkins (04)	Yes	Colleen Dillon (16)	No
Tom McMahon (05)	Yes	Beth Rochford (17)	Yes
Aisha Humphries (06), Acting Chair	Yes	Robert Johnson (18)	Yes
Dion McGill (07)	Yes	Sam Schoenburg (19)	Yes
Al Cacciottolo (08)	Yes	Darrell Dacres (20)	Yes
Denise McBroom (09)	Yes	Lee Bielecki (22)	Yes
Elianne Bahena (10)	Yes	Marilyn Pagán-Banks (24)	Yes
Jocelyn Woodards (11)	No	Angelica Green (25)	No

II. Public comment

1. No Public Comment

III. For discussion and votes

1. Approval December 6, 2024, and June 7, 2025, minutes.

- Tabled to next meeting pending corrections.



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

2. Calendaring of upcoming special meetings.

- DC6: How do we feel about meeting during the week?
 - o Most in agreement
 - o Motion:
 - **If quorum is available, meet on Sept 6, 2025, the day of quarterly**
 - **DC's who won't be there: 7, 9, 19, 24, 25**
 - **DC22 seconds**
 - **All in favor**
- **DC19: Motion for special meeting on Wed, Oct 1, 6:30PM.**
 - o DC5 seconds
 - o All agree
- **Reminder Saturday Nov 15 is a regular meeting at 12pm.**
- **DC22: Motion to reset time to 10am**
 - **All in favor**
 - **Potentially a longer meeting because of proximity to Dec.**

3. Discussion on 2026 CCPSA vacancies process:

- a. Considerations for youth candidates
 - a. DC6: Do we need separate qualifications?
 - i. DC19: The willingness to ask questions and to hear difficult comments is important. We should look for someone who has the ability to do the job. Someone who is able to do the work, and who is not about to go through a life transition.
 - ii. DC17: On the comment of “a sophomore in college is more reliable than a senior in college,” because of the 4-year of the position, they will still go through a transition
 - iii. DC18: I think it comes down to who is in front of us.
 - iv. DC14: Some of my community members wanted some say into what qualifications we wanted.
 - v. DC12: More education needs to be put out about what the role will be and what the CCPSA is.
 - vi. DC22: For Sept 6 meeting, let's see if we can come up with something like 6 questions to add to the interview and application process.
 - vii. DC19: Suggests we do it at a working group
 - viii. DC01: Thinks we should assess the candidates to make sure they are not doing it just to look impressive.
 - ix. DC17: Questions can be a bit generic. We need to look at questions overall.
 - x. DC06: Liaisons have been meeting but understands that working groups could work.
 - xi. DC19: For perspective, I found it helpful that the working groups met separately with staff. It was good to then have the liaisons compiling everything.
 - xii. **DC06 Motion: to meet as regional working groups to assess the questions for the application process. Focus on the needs of evaluation youth and returning applicants.**



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

b. Evaluating CCPSA's work and record

- a. What special considerations do we want to have for youth applicants?
 - i. DC07: Wants to consider the “slope”. Over the period of time you been on as a Commissioner, how did this person use their time? How did they grow
 - ii. DC17: Wants to know about how they have engaged with the community. How did they use the role specifically to connect with community.
 - iii. DC22: Wants to know hoe this person contributed to the commissioner.
 - iv. DC12: Their attendance and participation at meetings matter. Would like to know that.
 - v. DC08: Interested in seeing how the Commissioners, especially returning, would interact with DCs.
 - vi. DC19: Has little view of the work CCPSA does. Time is an issue and would like to know how more about how the CCPSA works. For things like attendance, I'd like to ask staff to compile a report of things they have done. What meetings they attended, what their votes were like, etc.
 - vii. DC14: Curious about how the candidates see information being streamlined.
 - viii. DC22: Would like to know how successful the reapplying candidates were. What role did the Commissioners played in the meetings. We need them to answer the question “what is this body for?”
 - ix. DC17: Would like to consider attendance at more than just the monthly meetings.
 - x. DC18: Agrees, the CCPSA meetings are usually pre-planned. So there is a need to know how Commissioners are acting prior to meetings.

c. How does the Nominating Committee check-in on the CCPSA's ongoing work?

- a. DC6: Is there a role we need to play in evaluation?
 - i. DC18: yes, but we need more information
 - ii. DC19: It is essential that the Nominating Committee play a role in knowing what the CCPSA has done. Our power and the legitimacy of the CCPSA comes from this body because we are democratically elected. Those seeking to be renominated, need to know this.
 - iii. DC12: Yes, this body should play a role in evaluating progress. These folks in their interviews told us what they wanted to do. It is now the time to assess whether or not they succeeded.
 - iv. DC22: Staff member sent me a list of things of what Commissioners are working on. Commissioners do not always speak on the work that they are doing outside of the Commission.
 - v. DC01: I am split. “Evaluating” is a strong word. Is in favor of a “check-in” or to do “progress reporting”.
 - vi. DC14: Does think evaluation should be the framework due to the importance of the position.
 - vii. DC5: Who will do this evaluation? What will be the criteria? When these individuals seek the 4 year term, that is the right time to assess. Selecting them or not will be one of the ways to hold them accountable.



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- viii. DC10: It is not asking for a lot. The whole City has Commissioners for everything. Alders always reach out to Commissioners to report, and I think this isn't unusual. We really need to ask ourselves, what is being achieved? If you are a Commissioner in this city, that transparency is not too much to ask for.
- ix. DC24: In favor of the evaluation language. Also, we need to think about mutual accountability.
- x. DC22: Thinking about these positions, the new nominators need to have some established powers to have accountability. The new nominators cannot come in saying "I don't know what the CCPSA is doing". There is a need to set precedent for this group.
- xi. DC17: If a person does not reapply, then their performance will not be evaluated. So, there is need to evaluate their work.
- xii. DC6: It is not too much to release a statement that sets standards for CCPSA members. A statement of standards can be something public that allows us to cement the work for the CCPSA. Now, once that statement is set, we can set a review to see if the CCPSA is meeting the standards we set. If they do not meet the standards, then we could issue recommendations. This is all of course adding more work and we need to consider our capacity. But would like to ask "do we need this sort of statement?"
- xiii. DC1: This body needs a PR person.
- xiv. DC8: Please note that we do not have the expressed power to be their boss". I would suggest we soften the language to be less strong.
- xv. DC24: There should be a process for mutual accountability for everyone.
- xvi. DC6: Is there something that we can say that constitutes the expectations that should be set for CCPSA members? It is a starting point.
- xvii. DC12: Agrees with setting a mission statement. Is not worried about using the work evaluation. Would be in favor of something that calls for a "vote of no-confidence."
- xviii. DC19: Not in favor of a mission statement, but does like the idea of bringing the Commissioners to answer written questions, asking staff to report on the work they have done. We can also consider other accountability measures that have a "no confidence" vote. It wouldn't have legal ramifications, but worth noting.
- xix. DC24: Agrees. Evaluation does not have to antagonistic.
- xx. DC6: Review and evaluation differ. Review is about their work. Evaluations, however, have ramifications. I am in favor of reviewing their collective work, and not in
- xxi. DC08: Curious to know what previous Commissioners, like OG, think.
- xxii. DC14: Our evaluation should set standards brought on by the community.
- xxiii. DC01: Would like to have an exit interview for people who are not reapplying. What are the lessons you learned?
- xxiv. **DC6: Motions: Move this conversation to working groups.**
 - 1. All agree

4. Discussion on internal protocols and expectations.



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- a. What steps can be taken to make sure that all nominators are ready for the busy season ahead.
 - a. DC6: This body has moved forward with setting its timeline of meetings and special meetings. Assessing the questions that are being asked to candidates now will help save us time later. The Committee really needs staff support to do the outreach. Note that based on timeline, we might see a February where we will be reviewing applications and conducting interviews. The liaisons are encouraged by the progress. Are there suggestions to make this nomination process?
 - b. DC19: If you cannot be the nominator for the entire process, reassess with your DC.

IV. Additional announcements/announcement of the next meeting

1. DC 22: Motion to adjourn

- DC 6 seconds
- All in favor

2. Next meeting: Special meeting on October 1, 2025, at a location to be determined later, and dependent on quorum.

Please Note: Items on this agenda are subject to change. If you have any questions regarding this agenda, please contact the Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability by emailing CommissionNomination@cityofchicago.org.

The Nominating Committee will provide an opportunity for public comment. Each person participating in public comment will have up to 2 minutes to speak. A total of 20 minutes will be dedicated to public comment. Anyone interested in speaking during the public comment period must write their name on a card provided at the meeting and give it to the members of the Nominating Committee or staff in the meeting room any time within 30 minutes of the start of the meeting. If the number of interested speakers exceeds the time dedicated to public comment, speakers will be selected by a random drawing. Anyone may submit written public comment by delivering it at the public meeting or by emailing it to CommissionNomination@cityofchicago.org.