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Whereupon, the meeting began at 5:38 p.m.)

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Good evening. Welcome to the Sixteenth Meeting of the Ferguson Commission.

We'll begin by taking roll.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Chairman Rich McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Kevin Ahlbrand.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Scott Negwer.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rasheen Aldridge is on his way.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Right on time. All right Rasheen, perfect.

Pastor Traci Blackmon has an excused absence.

T.R. Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Gabe Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Dan Isom has an excused absence.

Brittany Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pat Sly.

COMMISSIONER SLY: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rose Windmiller?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Here.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Thank you very much.

At this time I'm going to ask Reverend Starsky Wilson to introduce the individual who will be giving invocation followed by the welcome.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Good evening. It is indeed a pleasure to come and to be able to share and to have our friends to come and provide an invocation on tonight. It has been our intention and our practice throughout the Commission's life that we'd have someone to provide some centering whether that be through art, through a call to faith and centering and prayer or some expression. We even had a beautiful little children's choir to begin to center us. We're pleased today as we have continued to journey through this time together to have our friend Leah Gunning Francis to come and share with us. Leah is the author of this work, Ferguson & Faith, Sparking Leadership and Awakening Community which was recently released by Chalice Press, also based here in St. Louis, through a partnership with the Fund for Theological Education. We have been I think blessed and I even heard about one tonight with
various expressions of faith that have been awakened and engaged to help the community through healing to find its way towards reconciliation and Dr. Gunning Francis has captured much of that, many of the voices of young activists and faith leaders as they have been sparked in relationship with one another and calling the community into action in this work. So before she comes I'd thought I'd do a little bit of commercial and encourage you to find your way to Amazon or to your local book store and get a copy of Ferguson & Faith to acquaint yourself with these narratives of people who have been doing this great work for our community. So we're pleased to have and we invite to come now to lead us in our devotion Dr. Leah Gunning Francis, the professor of Christian Education of Eden Theological Seminary and Associate Dean for Contextual Education there as well.

DR. GUNNING FRANCIS: Good evening everyone. Thank you to the Commission for this gracious invitation.

I just come this evening with a very brief prayer, will you pray with me?

For the beauty of this day oh God we give you thanks. We thank you for the investment
of time and energy and spirit this Commission has made. For everyone though they were formed together out of the crucible of death we remain hopeful that their work can yield life more abundant for all of our region's inhabitants. As their work quickly draws to a close we pray for the wisdom and courage needed to enliven their report and their efforts so that the fruit of its labor can be feasted upon by all. For it is in your name we pray. Amen.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Good evening. My name is Rich McClure, I'm one of the co-chairs of the Commission and we are fortunate to be here in the Creve Coeur Government Center and we have had the hospitality of a number of organizations and municipalities around the region. Here at our 16th meeting we're pleased to be here in Creve Coeur and the mayor of Creve Coeur, Mayor Barry Glantz, is here to offer a word of greeting.

Mayor Glantz.

MAYOR GLANTZ: It's always tough to be after an invocation that nice. Good evening ladies and gentlemen.

It's my pleasure to to welcome the Ferguson Commission to the City of Creve Coeur this evening.
As the mayor of Creve Coeur I have witnessed firsthand the profound impact that a group of educated and engaged citizens can have on a community. I am grateful to the Ferguson Commission and so many citizens throughout the greater St. Louis area who have dedicated themselves to improving our region.

I've lived in St. Louis almost my entire life and recognize that we have inherited a great community. As inheritors though we owe it to the generations that will follow us a St. Louis that is even greater than the one that we were given. We must always look for opportunities to strengthen our community and make our region a better place for everyone to live, work and play.

As history has shown the St. Louis region is not nor ever will be a finished product. We have been given a work in progress that we can change for the better or for the worse. We are writing future history today and I am optimistic that through meaningful dialogue and respectful and purposeful action that we can build an even stronger community that is receptive of our values of fairness and equality.

Thank you all again for your service
and once again welcome to the City of Creve Coeur.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you Mayor Glantz and thank you for your hospitality.

I understand, you have a city council meeting I believe, we're very grateful.

Well just very briefly Starsky and I would just like to set the context for this evening, we appreciate you all being here, thank you for your attendance. We see a number of folks who have been with us through many of our 16 meetings and others perhaps for this is your first meeting and everyone in between.

Tonight we're going to begin to shift our focus to the question of what happens after we issue our report. We've listened carefully, we've been very thoughtful, we've had extensive engagement, we think before we are through we will have over 20,000 volunteer hours, engaged activity of folks contributing and talking and being thoughtful to yield our results and our calls to action. We've worked hard to listen carefully to make this a very responsive report and as we now sprint toward the finish line of completing the report for issuance in mid September it's important
that we realize that this is a commission report
that just can not sit on a shelf, in fact it will
be a digital first report as many of you have heard
so literally it can't sit on the shelf because
there won't be an easy printed document to sit on
the shelf although we will certainly make sure it's
available and accessible by print and we're
committed to make sure that report and the
principles and the calls to action that it has
lives and it has collective impact and so you're
going to hear that phrase tonight, you're going to
hear a lot about collective impact and as a
commission we're going to wrestle with and think
about what that really means for our region so that
our report has impact going forward. To use Dr.
Gunning Francis' phrase, how do we have a report
that leads to more abundant life for those in our
region? How can we enliven what we have learned
over these past months? We know that we can't have
1,000 great projects that are out there on their
own doing wonderful things individually but not
collectively. I heard a speaker this morning who
said we have a tendency in this region to have
great flowers that bloom and we water those and
those that bloom and keep blooming we tend to say
let's have more flowers like that but maybe they're doing just their own thing and not working together and not creating a collectively beautiful picture. So we have to have a common vision, mutually reenforcing actions, continuing communication and a backbone organization and we're going to talk a lot about those principles tonight and we invite your engagement in those efforts so that we have efforts that are truthful, effective and really address, not just window dress but really address the long-term issues that we have all known are here and now we must act. So we plan on calling for collective action and collective impact and we welcome your engagement and input, I think you'll find this evening the Commission's agenda to be one in which hopefully you will learn and find ways to engage moving forward.

And at this stage I'd like to call back to the podium my co-chair Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Again as we talk about where we transition to tonight we've been intention penly to say that the calls to action that we have made for, the more than 200 that have been made so far are publicly available at
stlpositivechange.org, some of you were with us at
our August 7th meeting where we had the opportunity
to both bundle those prioritized actions into a
bundle of about 30 and so all of that information
and those calls are public currently. Where we
transition as Rich noted on tonight is towards
follow through. If I was at church I'd say let the
church say follow through so I'm not at church so I
won't do that. Follow through is critically
important and so we'll use terms like
implementation and translation but we are reminded
over the course of the last couple of weeks that
there are calls to action that we have already made
that without the follow through we have not seen
the difference. We made a call to action coming
through our community law enforcement relations
working group led by Chief Isom and Brittany
Packnett for rules of engagement around mass
protests that called on police to be accountable
for how they engaged to give warning to people and
to provide space and we recognized because we have
not yet seen the follow through that the incidents
of last week with the shooting of Mansur Ball-Bey
with the community that gathered grieving, if they
had follow through on that recommendation perhaps
they would not have been tear gassed.

Recognize that we have not yet gotten to the point that we desire and we know that that will take some time but we also understand that there should be greater urgency about these matters in the community and among our elected officials and so on that day when we recognize the disparate treatment of this 18 year old boy in north St. Louis we also recognize that there was also a stand down with someone who was not 18 years old, someone who was not black who was in St. Charles and they were arrested and they yet lived to see a day in court. This kind of disparate treatment reminds us that this is still about follow through, it is still about race and racial inequities, it is still about police accountability, these are the things that brought us to this conversation on August 9th, 2014 and these are the things that must remain the center of our conversation and we must follow through.

We're thankful that since the last time we gathered some things we should point to in the community where there's been some follow through, we are appreciative of the work of the municipal court judge in Ferguson, Judge McCullin,
who today followed through with the setting aside
of warrants of people as an act of reconciliation,
perhaps getting us the healing and we recognize
that there must be some acts by those in authority
of reconciliation to allow people to be in better
relationship with their courts and with their
police and so we're pleased for that follow
through. We shine a light, if you have not seen
the campaign called Campaign Zero the follow
through of young activists who have gotten together
to make public and now national their desires for
police accountability in 10 wide windows that we
could go through so I invite if you have not seen
to go to Join Campaign Zero on the Internet or to
search the hash tag in order to see what follow
through looks like. And this is what we're all
being called to so collective impact is a method
and a methodology we will talk about tonight,
implementation and translation will be the language
we will use tonight but what it's really ultimately
about is getting our region and our respective
areas to follow through. And so we'll talk about a
budget, what we plan on doing once the report is
released in mid September, how we plan on following
through to get to implementation and how we will
invite you into that work on tonight. We'll talk about some other recommendations, some work that is not yet done in the area of child wellbeing and some in racial equity and reconciliation where we will need to do some follow through and we'll invite the community to do that with us as well and we'll invite all of us to recognize that this is all of our responsibility but ultimately this will only get done if we commit to follow through.

We're now in the hands of Monique Thomas who is our assistant director of the Ferguson Commission of the staff team and she would provide us guidance as we do our audience polling at this time.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you Commissioner.

Good evening everyone. So this is the part where you participate, we have a couple of sections for you to participate and this is the first one and it's audience polling so if you haven't already, see a show of hands, has everyone received a keypad? Raise your hand if you haven't. All right, let's take care of the folks in the back.

So essentially how this works is it's our tradition that we like to get a sense of who's
in the room, we've been doing this since our first meeting and this is meeting 16 and so generally what we do is we ask certain questions, typical questions, standards, so it's demographics, you know, things like age, where you're from, where you work if that's applicable and then we also go into more topical consideration, consistently we've been talking around the issue of trauma and toxic stress and so we're collecting data on that so we're going to ask you to express your views on that and then the last set of questions we have are on engagement, your experience here with the Commission and you have to pay attention to the questions I'm asking because there are specific instruction for the last one especially so I can make sure you get the last answer in.

All right? So who has never used the keypad before? It's all right, raise them high. That's good. That's fine, I'll just walk you through.

So eventually you'll see, I'll ask a question and then there'll be answer choices and if you look on the keypad there are numbers slash letters and those will correspond with the answer choices so you select the best answer choice for
you, okay, it's really low pressure, you'll have a
time window, usually about, what, 30 seconds, 20
seconds, but if you change your mind within that 20
seconds it will keep the last answer choice you
added, that you pressed. Okay? So to decrease
your stress we're going to have a test question to
get you warmed up. All right?

So really starting with the
hard-hitting one, what is your favorite color?

You'll observe that that bar that was just moved to
the top or right-hand corner has the number of
responses and indicates that polling is now closed
in the red box to the right, when polling is open
it will say polling is open so don't be answering
yet, don't enter your answer choice if it's closed
because it won't keep. All right? You got that?

All right. So what is your favorite color, polling
is now open, you have 30 second for this.

What is your favorite color? A is
black; B, brown; C, blue; D, green; E orange; F
purple, G, red; H, yellow; I, white and J other,
it's not an answer that your color's on there. You
have about 10 seconds left.

Okay. And so we have the answer
choices displayed. And once again blue is the
favorite color. So we've been doing this for a while and it's always blue but this is the first time that red has come really, really close at 21 percent. Interesting. Well, good for you guys. Also last thing I'll note there are going to be some questions that ask you to pick multiple, you just press each one that's applicable, all right? So now is the real deal. Okay. Are you ready?

In what geographic area is your primary home or residence located? A, St. Louis City; B, St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County; G, Madison County; H, Monroe County, and I, Other. Polling is now open. About 10 seconds left.

All right. 66 percent St. Louis County followed by 30 St. Louis City, a little representation from St. Charles, four percent. Next. In what geographic area is your primary work and/or school? If you're retired you can check Other, it's just not applicable. A, St. Louis City; B, the County, St. Louis County specifically; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County; G,
Madison County; H, Monroe County; I, Other.
Polling is open. 10 seconds left.

Okay. Most again consistently are either in St. Louis County, St. Louis City and we have a number who applied other. 20 percent, significant number.

Those who just joined do you have keypads?

With which gender do you identify?

Here we're asking you to select one. A, female; B, male; C, Other; D, decline. Polling is open. 20 seconds.

Okay. Hey, seven out of 10 of you are female, have identified as female and the men are following along with 31 percent. Okay.

Now this is the sensitive question where we get a little real. I'd like you to know that it's all anonymous, okay? In what age group do you belong? Tell the truth. A, 21 and under; B, 22 to 34; C, 35 to 44; D, 45 to 54; E, 55 to 64; F, 65 and over; G, decline. Polling is open. 20 seconds.

Okay. Yeah, 35 percent 65 and over, actually a significant majority is 55 and over.
Have a couple under 21, five percent.
Next. How would you describe your ethnicity or race? A, white; B, black, African American; C, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin; D, Asian; E, American Indian or Alaskan native; F, native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; G, Other; H you choose to decline. Okay, we're open. Less than 10 seconds.

Okay. 63 percent are white followed by 30 percent African American with some representation in Other and those choosing to decline. American Alaskan Native represented at four percent.

Okay. So actually this is the 16th meeting of the Ferguson Commission so we're asking you how many previous meetings have you attended? So please note that we're not including working group meetings, so thank you, I see some familiar faces so if you went to working group meetings we're not counting those, we're counting all meetings where we have all the commissioners present, at least a quorum. So this is the 16th, how many previous ones have you attended? A, none, that would be true if this is your first one; B, one to two; C, three to four; D, five to six; E, seven to eight; F, nine to 10; G, 11 to 12; H, 13
to 14, I would say to 15. If you've attended all
of them nearly. Okay? Pooling is open. 20
seconds left.

All right. Okay. Welcome. Most of
you this is your first time, welcome, 36 percent.
29 have hung in a couple of times, no one has
committed to every single meeting, I'm a little
disappointed but that's fine, thank you for
representing that.

I think we're ready to do the next
question. So how did you learn about today's
meeting, check all that apply. So this is where
you actually can note different answers, not just
one, okay? So A, Facebook; B, Twitter; C, e-mail;
D, newspaper; E, radio; F, word of mouth, that's a
friend, a co-worker, relative, et cetera; G,
Ferguson Commission website which is
stlpositivechange and then H is Other, some other
way. Okay? So don't enter yet -- okay. Polling
is open now. About 20 seconds left, you can
capture all the answers that are applicable. Five
seconds.

Okay. So many of you found out via
e-mail followed by word of mouth, have a good
friend or other co-worker, you've been to the
website and others have found out in other ways.

All right.

So now we're going to content related so bear with me, this is interesting, it's content related, finished with demographics. So I am confident the St. Louis region will see improvement in race and ethnic relations. So here is a statement and you get to choose whether you A, strongly disagree; B, disagree; C, unsure, if you're unsure: D, you agree and E, you strongly agree that you're confident that we'll see change in race and ethnic relations. Choose one. Polling is open. About 10 seconds left.

Okay. Most of you are unsure followed by 36 percent of you who agree.

Now we're moving into the topic of trauma or toxic stress. Before I ask let me just note the definition if you can't see it from here. Trauma or toxic stress will be defined here as one time or ongoing deeply disturbing experiences often brought on by physical, economic, cultural, emotional or environmental assault.

Would anyone like me to repeat that again before we go on?

Okay. So that's the definition that
we're using here. Have you experienced trauma, you, experienced trauma or toxic stress? A, yes; B, no; C, you're not sure, I don't know; D, you decline to respond. Polling is open.

More than half of you indicated yes, 36 no, 36 percent no rather, 10 percent don't know.

Do you think the community you live in has experienced trauma? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond. Polling is open now.

Okay. Seven out of 10 of you nearly think that your community has experienced trauma.

Next question. Do you believe someone can be traumatized by racism? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond.

Polling is open. Less than three seconds left.

Nearly all of you in the room very strongly believe that yes, you can be traumatized by racism.

Now just a few more questions left.

Have you experienced any trauma due to racism, you specifically? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond. Polling is open.

You can choose decline to respond or you don't know.
Okay. 51 percent say yes, 42 percent say no, then a few are not sure.

From your experience how many people in your community are coping with past trauma or toxic stress? This is just obviously approximate but A, very few; B, some; C, in your estimation a lot. Polling is open. 10 seconds left.

Over 50 percent of you say a lot followed by some.

Please select the most applicable ending to this statement: So here we're asking you to choose one, okay? So the statement is trauma and toxic stress are, A, just a part of life in my part of town. We deal with it; B, not that big of a deal. People need to deal with their own problems; C, keeping our community from thriving; D, keeping me from thriving. Polling is open.

Five seconds left.

Okay. Almost 80 percent describe or finish the sentence trauma and toxic stress are keeping our community from thriving.

All right, this is the last question, we almost made it. Okay? This is going to set us up for our next meeting so just, you know, get your appetite wet for the next meeting 9/9 where we'll
be engaging with larger policy discussions with you at the center. But do you see a role for yourself in acting on the Ferguson Commission calls for action? How would you define that? Do you see a role for yourself in acting on the Ferguson Commission calls to action? A, yes; B, no; C, unsure; D, this one, before we open polling note that this is a mistake, D is not actually a choice so we're really asking you to look at A, B, C. Remember in the beginning I said pay attention to me, this is where it kicks in, just here, so your answer choices really are A, B, C only. Don't choose D. So do you see a role for yourself in acting on the Ferguson Commission calls to action? A, yes; B, no; C, unsure. All right? Polling is open. Give it about five seconds.

All right. 70 percent say yes, 26 are unsure, four percent no and no one picked D which is I think a perfect way to end.

Applaud for yourself, go ahead.

So now we have our public open mic, those of you who have had a chance to sign up -- so now we have Emily Johnson who joins us from the Institute of Public Policy at Truman School and she will give us a recap and then we have public open
MS. JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

We just wanted to take a few minutes and review some of the polling data that we have to date just to kind of give you an idea of what some of the trends are saying so just very quickly I'd like to go through some of those questions that we thought were interesting. And just a couple of things to keep in mind, this includes 14 meetings worth of data, meeting 15 we did not do any polling and obviously we don't have this evening's numbers factored in yet and at meeting two there was also no public polling so that's information for you to have. So in terms of attendance, and I'd also like to mention that these numbers reflect the people that were in the room and chose to participate in polling, so if someone chose not to participate then those numbers aren't reflected here.

So first of all total attendance in terms of polling information about 1,100 people have participated in polling, the highest attendance was 165 at the December 15th meeting, lowest attendance was 39 in April and our average attendance is about 85 people.

Next attendance by race. On average
attendees were 45 percent black or African American, 44 percent white, one percent Hispanic and seven percent representing other categories. So a lot of time information has been combined together here to give you a sense of the overall picture.

Next is attendance by age. On average attendees were in about the 22 to 35 which is a fairly large age range but youth attendance spiked in January and more recently in July at the presentations from the Youth Arts Speak.

Okay. And you answered questions this evening about where you live and where you work, 86 percent of attendees live in St. Louis City or County, 81 percent work in the City or County and then others, smaller representation from some of the other areas.

Next is frequency of attendance. 70 percent of the attendees attended infrequently which would be the zero to two meetings, this is specifically Ferguson Commission meetings. 24 percent attending regularly, three to eight meetings and five percent attended what we considered frequently and that's nine to 12 meetings.
Okay. So some of the questions we've asked at different meetings and different times so the ones that we've compiled here you can see at the bottom what meetings those questions were actually asked so one of the things we wanted to know is how does everybody find out about the meetings so we know what kind of media or word of mouth or what is being used actually to get the word out and as you can see this is one where you can select every one that applies so overwhelmingly to this point it's been word of mouth, e-mail and the website that have given the people information about how to find and attend the meetings.

Next is about perspectives on race. This is in response to the question I tend to avoid conversation about race and a majority of attendees indicated that they do not avoid conversations about race.

The next one is the question that had probably some of the most division in terms of responses and the question was the goal of our work should be achieving a color blind society and as you can see on average 64 percent were in disagreement so that includes everything that's strongly disagree and disagree. 10 percent were
unsure and 25 percent were in agreement that the goal should be a color blind society. So an interesting slide there.

Next the question was the achievement of the civil rights era successfully eliminated racial barriers and created an even playing field. A vast majority indicate there is more work to be done to eliminate racial barriers.

And then trauma and toxic stress as we just answered some of those questions but I wanted to give you sort of an overview of what has come out at other meetings so similar to the question have you experienced trauma or toxic stress a majority of attendees before and this evening have experienced trauma or toxic stress. Has the community in which you live experienced trauma and once again overwhelmingly a majority of attendees also believe their community has experienced trauma or toxic stress, and then the next one do you believe someone can be traumatized by racism and that has been 100 percent of responses have said yes. More than 60 percent have experienced trauma due to racism as you can see in this slide, and then finally I call this slide moving forward so it kind of gives you a
perspective. We asked this question again this evening but it is the I'm confident the St. Louis region will see improvement in race and ethnic relations and this one kind of has sort of a different curve if you look at it. 40 percent believe the region will see improvement, 27 do not and 34 are unsure. So there's definitely room for people to have their minds changed or to get more information in order to get moving forward.

So thank you very much.

MS. FRANKS: And as we are getting the podium ready right now we're going to take about 10, 15 minutes for the public open mic session, this is an opportunity for the audience to give their input, as you know if you've been to a meeting we start off with these and we definitely take your input and your commentary, suggestions, questions very seriously so this is a time to address the commissioners. I do have a couple who have signed up and we will start with the first one. Please forgive me if I pronounce this incorrectly, Jerac Burks.

Went to the bathroom, okay. We'll hold off on that one. We always seem to find the one that sneaks off to the restroom.
Welcome. So you'll have about two minutes to address the commissioners. You'll have two minutes, I'm timing so don't go over. I'll have a timer for you and you have an opportunity to address the commissioners.

MR. BURKS: Hi everybody. My name is Jerac, my family is from, well from here in St. Louis, Berkeley mostly, Ferguson area and then my parents divorced when I was about six so I moved to Massachusetts and I lived in Arizona also, graduated high school and then I've come back here. I've been in Massachusetts a lot of my adult life, South Carolina as well and these aren't just problems that are going on here, so you know, that gives me like some hope, you know, that change can happen. I mean there's so much that I could talk about but really right now what I'm facing is strong employment and, you know, I don't come from a very fortune family that was able to afford college, you know, I've worked hard, many jobs but my dad and mom and stepmom both, or all three wanted to be, you know, they serviced social services, human services and volunteer work and so I kind of saw that at a young age and I knew that giving back and feeding the poor and things like
that is what I wanted to do, you know, as I got older and so now, you know, my passion is social work and I can't get in and I know I can help and, you know, everybody wants to get paid but money isn't color blind but there isn't opportunity for everybody to have an equal chance to make money and there's not good chances for people who have been incarcerated whether it was a misdemeanor or a felony and this is nationwide but I'm so frustrated that, you know, I got into a little fight and I wasn't able to get a job helping kids back in 2003 that came from rougher situations than me but I knew how to talk to them, you know, and I've done volunteer work for many different organizations and I just want to help but that's where I'm facing a lot of frustration, but, you know, there's a lot.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you Jerac.

MR. BURKS: Thank you Jerac.

MS. FRANKS: Now we are going to hear from Reverend Dr. Dietra Wise Baker, and after Reverend Baker we will have Mae Quinn.

Again two minutes.

REVEREND BAKER: Greetings Commission. My name is Dietra Wise Baker, I'm a
pastor and I also have served juveniles for the last 12 years in the City of St. Louis, City and County and also residential treatment facilities in St. Louis County. I am here to ask the Child Wellbeing and Education Equity Committee to amend its digital call to action to specifically call for the elimination of laws, policies and cultures that bolster the school to prison pipeline in St. Louis and encourage the Missouri juvenile justice system to innovate and create once again and earn the right to become a model of juvenile justice.

Ironically the kid's story that I wanted to tell you, his made is Jarod, that's a made-up name but how ironic is that?

Jarod was upstairs in the County courtroom for a gun charge, what he didn't know was that downstairs there was a school meeting and when he got out of County court he was going to be expelled out of school, not for a conviction but for charges, and so what we have to do is reform Safe Schools Act so that children are not expelled from school when they haven't even been convicted yet. The MCU Students For Change have asked for a moratorium on school suspensions, we also have heard from the DOJ that there needs to be
aggressive reform of juvenile courts in Missouri
particularly focused at St. Louis Family Court
given its lack of representation for juveniles,
legal representation of youth during their entire
time in court and I'll just tell you my first
experience of being in the court of seeing a deputy
juvenile officer being with the kid, having lots of
access to the kid and the family and then going and
sitting in court and then the deputy juvenile
officer sits on the prosecuting side. To someone
who's not a legal person that was very startling
and very clear that that was a conflict of
interest.
These are the kinds of issue that
have to be addressed.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you Dr.
Baker.
MS. FRANKS: Thank you Reverend.
Mae Quinn and after Mae Quinn we will
have Jowan Ross and after Jowan Ross we will have
Bob Miller.
MS. QUINN: Hello again. Thanks so
much for giving me the opportunity to speak with
you yet again and briefly the same point that I
believe I did touch upon in January of 2014 when I spoke to the full Commission, I believe I did touch upon in a memo that I provided to the working group of the Municipal Courts Working Group. I believe I touched upon it in dealing with the child welfare working group that juvenile courts need to be looked at by the commission along with municipal courts given the overlapping jurisdiction and the overlapping issues and now that we've heard from the Department of Justice it seems more appropriate for this unflinching body to take on that issue as well. The Department of Justice in its report echoed many of the things that my students and I have experienced, that Reverend Wise has pointed out that, I've written about in an article that I provided to a number of members of the Commission and the staff and I would just break them down into five different matters worthy of the Commission's attention and that is the right of and provision of counsel for minors who are in conflict with the law in our courts. Second, that that right of counsel be respected, that there be a culture created within our court systems whether it's municipal or juvenile that just doing your job for a younger person does not get met with resistance or
retaliation, that three, this issue that was just raised of DJOs or deputy juvenile officers get looked at or addressed, we are an outlier in this country, one of I think it's perhaps only two states who have a role similar to this where there's actually an individual who works for the court that is the party who is the opposition for the child and so this idea of the deputy juvenile officer is outdated, presents a conflict of interest and there's separation of power issues around that role and the role needs to be right sized in terms of the power that they wield. Four, this due process for young people in these courts and fifth, just dignity and racial justice, respect for those sort of fundamental concerns and I'll let the DOJ report speak for itself on those issues.

Thanks.

MR. ROSS: Good evening. My name is Jowan Ross and I'm here on behalf of the Purity program, it's a nonprofit organization that I'm starting for youth and adult families and I'm from Berkeley and Kinloch area, raised in the streets and whatnot and I've done my time and done things in the streets growing up as a teen myself so I
have teenagers myself now and I'm trying to
basically give back to the community from me
growing up being a teen and doing things that was
negative and give back some positivity and kind of
be a spokesperson for those young teens and role
model, you know, and basically coming from the
streets a lot of those guys really don't, are not
susceptible to hearing leadership from guys that's,
you know, I'm not trying to be funny, with suits
and everything and no disrespect but it's like I've
noticed they take more to me for me just me looking
like who I am and so I'm willing to take that
energy and try to guide them in a better direction
plus I have teens of my own. So they would need to
be a part of this program also and I'm basically
just trying to get some type of background, info on
how to start this company because it's fresh, it's
been maybe two months since I got it and anybody
that's willing to volunteer or donations or
anything for the company and I know Ferguson, I
spoke with Ferguson City Hall earlier this week and
I'm working with Chief Anderson trying to get a
program out there actually in the Ferguson area so
if anyone has questions I have a little literature
and I could pass it out for everybody to check it
out if anybody is interested in it.

Thank you.

MS. FRANKS: And last but not least

we will have Bob Miller.

Bob you're familiar with this. Two

minutes.

MR. MILLER: I really don't need any

announcement of name and I'm off the chart when

they talk about age and attendance, I'm off, but

anyway I remember the first meeting in south St.

Louis right off of 44 on Kingshighway I believe it

was and I was allowed five minutes, now it's down

to three before and now it's down to two but I

really appreciate what all of you people have done,

the amount of time. I've spent a little bit of

time because I'm retired and I know many of you

aren't, otherwise I couldn't be here, my job

wouldn't have allowed me what your job has allowed

but you've done a tremendous job and as I said the

first night, I was in Detroit during the riots and

that was big time stuff and I said read, read the

report, the Kerner report and I hope all of you did

and we haven't come a long ways, very far since

then.

As far as I see the main problem
which Reverend Starsky mentioned there a few
moments ago and I think I saw him a few weeks ago
in the paper but anyway things haven't changed much
but I see a couple over here that worked on the
President's 21st Century Policing and they worked
quick didn't they, and we're seeing results already
and here now, my, the great job that Ms. Hatter
did, all of these things somebody mentioned here
the family children's court over there, they're
under the eye of inspection now too, they should
have been much, much sooner but it's been in the
paper over the last few weeks and yeah, that's
where the problem starts, that's where the problem
starts and getting back to, you know, I've been in
education a long time, from Washington University,
St. Louis U and then I was sent up to Detroit and
then came back but you know we've got a good report
there, we need Pre-K, Universal Pre-K, like
President Obama said, we spend more money on
incarceration, somebody in the prison over there in
Guantanamo where I go a lot, Cuba, a million
dollars a year and President Obama said we can get
rid of some of this incarceration not just in
Guantanamo but some incarceration we would have
enough to support uniform quality, quality Pre-K.
We've got to get to these kids young and we've got to. The court stuff's moving along pretty good I think, maybe Senate bill number 5 as someone mentioned just getting started but the Federal stuff was kicked in a long time ago but I'm getting back to brotherhood and sisterhood, that's something we haven't gotten very far on. You ask, you think there's going to be much change, well I can't get much change, it can't get much worse as far as brotherhood sisterhood. Getting along with one another, seeing everybody by a human being, a human being, you're a human being, everybody's a human being, let's forgot about all of the other whatever, whatever. And income and equality, that means we need to get education, education, we can't educate these kids up in north St. Louis with unaccredited schools, why did DESE, why did the State Department of Education allow for something like that to happen and it's been going on for years and years and years.

MS. FRANKS: Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER: I know, I know.
MS. FRANKS: At this point he's one of our seasoned attendees so you kind of just let him go but thank you Mr. Miller and now we will
turn to Bethany and we will continue on with our report.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Thank you very much to the audience that commented and we don't take your communication lightly. Through time Mr. Miller and others we've developed some relationship with over time and we do honor the voices that have spoken and for those we didn't have time to hear we acknowledge your thoughts and feedback. If you have additional feedback you were not able to vocalize there's an e-mail address contact@stlpositivechange.org, we'd be more than happy for you to shoot us an e-mail for feedback as well.

This portion, and forgive my seat today, I've had some pain on the left side that I need to watch myself, I've been talking too much in the past week, so if you excuse my seat we're going to transition now into the Commission planning portion of our agenda so for the audience you will always be able to see what we see on the screen and there are two monitors for Commissioners as well.

The first portion of this part of the agenda will be to approve the remaining calls of action that we have before us in your packet so at
this time I would ask co-chairs if they would
shepherd us through this process of approving the
calls to action.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: The first is
additional calls in action in the child wellbeing
and education equity space and so we'll go to
Commissioner Becky James-Hatter to come to the
podium and present those please.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Good
evening Commissioners and community, thank you so
much and so many people that are in this room as
we're nearing the end of our calls that have been a
part of the child wellbeing and education equity
task force.

I think we just want to take a moment
when we say the word child and education in the
same sentence to take just a pause to remember
Jamyla Bolden who our task force work group, Dr.
Scott Spurgeon and the members and the children of
the Riverview Gardens, if we can just take a
second.

So we have two calls to action but
perhaps I just want to add at this time hearing the
comments from the community that our work group
will certainly undertake and listen carefully to
that and come back to the Commission as we kind of think through the juvenile court piece and in concert with our other colleagues and municipal court piece so I just want to acknowledge that as we stand here tonight.

So we have one call to action tonight that we've certainly presented a number of times as a placeholder but tonight we have our final call and then the second call is really just for a clarification on something that was inadvertently left off in the meeting.

So the first one, and I could just take a little bit to talk about it, it is to create an education design and financing task force and we could read this and the task force charge is to design a system where all children are given the opportunity to succeed and the financing model that will support equity and innovation. I just want to stop and just kind of talk to you a little bit to kind of frame what this means. We did not really as our work group want to come here and ask for a task force. We're wrapping up our work as a commission but this issue of education is so massive, we were doing our best to hear testimony on a lot of topics and there was no reasonable,
smart or responsible way to make one single call
and as we look at this call to action this is a
very long play for this community and we heard from
experts, we read research all over this country
that really a task force has to undertake. The
first issue that we have to consider responsible in
this region is whether you consider the
consolidation of schools or the unification of a
school district. We were not in a place where we
could sit back and just make that call. There is a
lot to think about and so we're not making this
call but this is a major topic this task force must
consider. We know what is going on in New Orleans,
we know that there is a recovery school district,
that there are charter schools, there's roles for
charter schools but simply to call for St. Louis to
create a recovery school district also seemed to be
irresponsible. There are open enrollment zones
going on in Colorado and other places, some great
ideas but again we couldn't make a call. We are
the Missouri foundation formula where too many
schools are not being funded correctly but to
simply say to allocate $400 million and if you put
money there it's all going to be solved, we
couldn't make that call and the last one is to
simply stand up and say let's change the collection and distribution of property taxes, we'll get that done, it will all work out magically, couldn't figure that one out and last and certainly not least not a single one of these calls guaranteed that we would end with a school district that would continue with a segregated school district under funded and so we think this is perhaps the biggest most important call for us to make to say that this task force must be put together, the members of this task force seriously have to be considered and that we would like to see an education for the City and the County of St. Louis designed and have a financing package or model to go with it. We know that these issues exist, there's no great examples in this country around where poor children are being educated and is, as unfortunate as where we are our work group believes that St. Louis really can take the lessons of this country and come back with a new way of educating children in this region and not leaving a single child behind and also making sure that there's equity and innovation. So I ask for you not only to approve it but we ask for you to prioritize this call to action.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So you've heard
from the chair of the working group and we'll take
that in the form of a motion on this one
particularly so we'll just take these individually
if that's okay.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

Please.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Hearing a second.

Are there questions or discussion for Commissioner
James-Hatter?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So question. Under
the accountable bodies I see we've noted several
that are moving into the space or spoken on the
space, I wonder whether we should add for the sake
of accountability if not engagement regional school
board members and superintendents as well, a
friendly addition?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER:

Commissioner, I'll tell you this accountability
body piece is really hard and in fact I want to add
Ferguson Commission because the first part of this
is we're going to have to move this along and there
are lots of people in this space and I don't know
that there's really an accountable body other than
us to call for and start working and adding the
school districts and superintendents certainly, but there is, we're all responsible for this one and it's really going to take all of us so I don't, there's not, nothing I can imagine you can put on this list that I would take off but I'm not too sure other than to say the Ferguson Commission's going to have to lead some of this.

    CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay.

    CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we'll make those amendments to the accountable bodies then.

    COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I have a question.

    CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Commissioner Packnett.

    COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: So the friendly amendment is, so in this second to last sentence about the task force's membership, just given our intentional attention to racial equity I appreciate the language about broadening its perspective and would want to add also racially diverse just given the needs of the community, so I offer that as a friendly amendment and my question given the membership is if the work group gave any thought to, I'm sure you know what question's coming next, to how folks would be appointed to
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So the answer is to your friendly amendment we absolutely would accept and that language be added to it and Commissioner when we, I don't know how many millions ago, the answer is we did not spend a lot of time making decisions about how to pick the task force, we saw that as the conversation that got into implementation so I'll just leave it at that. I could give you a lot of background but we really thought that became the responsibility for the full Commission to talk about, I can't imagine it will be any simpler than trying to figure out this Commission. This is a massive project, we have already identified experts across this country that can speak to some of these issues but it's, I don't imagine it's going to be much smaller than what we've gone through.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Just so I understand, so you're asking that the Commission call for the task force and initially the Commission hold responsibility to make sure that it is not only appointed and seated but actually has a call or a charge that we design that charge or
asking us to design what this task force would be
and then give it to the accountable bodies to
execute? Do I understand that?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So I

think we're doing several things already tonight.
We are saying, asking the Commission to approve and
prioritize this call to action, this call to action
is to create a task force that looks at the design
of education and in St. Louis City and County and
the financing of education in this region and the
call to action is to build that new model and to
consider all of these different models that have
some promise in each one of them but no answers in
all of them and how we move from you accepting this
call to implementing this call is what we have to
undertake just like we have in every other call.
We have lots of calls that have to go through the
implementation process so if you accept and
prioritize this tonight then we'll move over the
coming weeks and months of how do we put this in
place, what does it need to look like but the call
is here, what it is and what it needs to
accomplish.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So let me say it
back now in a way that I heard it to see if this
helps. So we're going to have a discussion about
networks and nodes of groups responsible for
engaging and collective impact and how this fits
into that we don't know yet but it clearly by this
recommendation rises to a priority in that process.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions or
comments?

Seeing none then we'll call for a
vote. All those in favor please say aye.

And opposed.

Okay. Passes.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So I just want to
be clear about something. You asked us to do two
things and I don't know if we did both with that
vote or whether we did one. You asked us to
approve but then also to prioritize.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I did.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: And so we have
taken those previously in two different processes
so perhaps we should take a separate vote as it
relates to the priority to add this to the bundle
of 30 that we identified last week. So if it, if
I'm hearing that right then perhaps Mr. Chair at this point we should actually take a separate action to prioritize this particular call to action.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So I'll take that as a motion?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SLY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Are there questions or discussion about prioritizing this and it may or may not fit into a bundle that's already out there.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Yes Gabe.

Commissioner Gore, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER GORE: So I'm just trying to understand. So this task force, like we're a commission appointed by the Governor.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GORE: This task force would be appointed by whom?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So the, the interesting part of this is the accountable
body and so as the Ferguson Commission we have made lots of calls to action and we see that we have the authority, the responsibility to call for the task force.

COMMISSIONER GORE: So are we calling for like say the Governor to appoint a task force?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: At this time we, I mean you can add the Governor's name to the accountable body if you want to but if the Governor fails to make the call it doesn't mean that, or that we're not going to work on this as a Commission and make, bring this task force together. So that is where we struggled with the accountable body piece so we, that's why I said to Commissioner Wilson is that this may have to add the Ferguson Commission has called for this and who of the groups, the individuals that need to get in the room to have this conversation is still the conversation we need to have.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I just don't feel like I can make a decision about where to prioritize it unless I know what authority they're going to have. Because if it's going to be a think tank that's going to have no real authority then that would be a lower priority than some of the
other things we have so I feel like that's part of
I need to know before I can say this is a priority
item.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So I
would just ask, so I appreciate it, I wish I had a
great answer but I think that this Commission's job
is to prioritize the education of children and this
call to action is fundamental to every problem
we've run up against whether it's the accreditation
system, whether it is poor children being left in
and behind in schools and so Commissioner Gore I
hear exactly what you're saying, I wish I had a
simple answer but I think that we've got to
prioritize children and education and if we have to
stay behind and figure out who's going to lead the
charge then that's just what we're going to have to
do but to leave off the state of education in this
region and not make it a priority I'm just going to
have to stand here why, because we have to do this.
And I get the accountable body, I wish I had a
simple answer but I'm looking at 16 of us.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll lead it. It's
not about race, it's about the human race.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Can I ask a
question?
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Commissioner Pulliam?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: About timing.
So I'm clear in terms of the prioritization and what you're asking us to do, what I think I'm hearing is that this task force should be designed, created and put to work before we sunset 12/31. So you're asking for implementation of this specific piece from this body between September 15 and 12/31 to get this done, that's what we're saying, correct? Is that what I'm hearing?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Let me say it back to you and you tell me if I got close to what you want.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you.

Yes.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: You're exactly right, our sunset is at the end of this year, we need to do, and what are the specifics, I'm not too sure but we as a Commission need to get this moving and what moving looks like if that is the framework, if that's membership I don't want to say I'm too sure but this task force needs to be called and it needs to get moving before we do sunset and I think we can, when we get into
implementation of this we can talk about the
specifics.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: That's what I
was asking. Thank you for clearing that up.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions or
comments?

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: I just wanted
to make a quick reminder because I know we're not
quite sure how everything is going to work. If we
do put together this task force, but I remember all
of us saying that after September 19th that's not
it, all the recommendations and all the ones that
we prioritize we're going to work on so what I'm
hearing you say I think Becky's putting the
recommendation that we're going to prioritize and
after the 9th we're going to make sure that it's
actually done so it kind of follows the steps that
we have already been working on and just quickly I
heard a comment that we're not sure that the task
force is going to really have power but to be quite
frank and honest we're not quite sure that we're
going to have power either so we have to go out on
a limb and hold these spaces so people can talk.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other comments?

Okay. We have a motion and a second
on the floor and do let me ask all those in favor
please say aye.

And opposed?

Motion passes.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we will now take the second one and thank you for the clarification on prioritization.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank you very much.

So the second one is a call for action that was actually had the approval or was forwarded to the Commission and somehow it was left off, it was a bullet under the early childhood call to action which was, or is, was and is now a priority and when we had the final vote and when we set priorities this one sentence was left off and so it was intended to be there but just I would call it more of a clerical mistake so I'm asking you to put it back into that call, it was just inadvertently left off.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So clarifying question. Was this a prioritized recommendation that this go on to as part of the bundles?
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes. And it goes to the early child so under early child there's several elements of it, this one was mistakingly left off when we voted on it and to clean it up from the past to get it up to speed this is just more of a clerical error on this, we just need to vote for it.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay. So I'll take that as a motion. Is there a second please?

COMMISSIONER SLY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So questions or comments?

Commissioner Windmiller?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: I'm sorry, I just need to make sure I understand. So this is a technical correction to a call to action that is in our 200 calls to action or has been raised to the priority calls to action?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: It has been raised to the priority. So this is a --

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: And it's a technical correction.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: It's a technical correction.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: There's an early
childhood bundle recommendation.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes. And this was just inadvertently left off.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Any other questions?

Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

And opposed.

Commissioner James-Hatter before you leave, and maybe this is a question for the staff team as well, so would it be possible, it would help me at least as an individual commissioner to have the issues raised by Reverend Wise Baker and Professor Quinn which had some specificity in both cases to have those laid out against the current calls of the issue so that we can, some of the staff team over here are nodding their heads vigorously so that's always a good sign, so that we can compare what we have already done versus what has been requested and what has been provided to us previously so that we make sure we understand that fully?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes, I think that's exactly the next appropriate step.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: With that I'd also
like to ask, note, that we post, we reference
Department of Justice reports in this community now
as if there's the one uniquely. There are so many
and the report to which Professor Quinn and Dr.
Baker referred was an investigation that began in
November 2013 even before the events of August 9th
and there have been folks working on these issues
for years, hence including some of them, so perhaps
it would also be helpful for us to have the
Department of Justice report on the St. Louis
Family Court both posted to the stlpositivechange
website and distributed to all the commissioners so
we can familiarize ourselves directly with these
issues and not confuse it with the unfortunately
several Department of Justice investigations that
are going forward in our community. So ask staff
if they would do that as well.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank you
very much Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We have two
additional calls to action in the racial equity and
reconciliation area, this is an area that the
co-chairs Reverend Wilson and I have spent some
time thinking about together and talking with
others about and based on those conversations and
some thinking we have done with our staff
leadership we have these two calls for your
consideration and co-chair Wilson will present
them.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Sure.

Commissioners thank you for your consideration
here. If you recall in our previous calls to
action we had, we have since the beginning really
discussed the role of faith, we have centered it in
our respective work together and talked about the
work of the faith community in helping us to get to
this concept of reconciliation which we speak of in
financial terms and sometimes we speak of in social
terms but in many ways it's something that we
access through the transcendent capacities and so
we didn't want to engage this work and finalize it
without giving an opportunity to invite those who
guide us on our respective journeys to weigh in
with some accountable action as well, and so what
you have here is two calls to the faith communities
specifically around racial equity and
reconciliation, first to develop and to work
together to develop multi-faith set of assets and
resources for us to inform a racial equity and
reconciliation not just conversation to inform the
work in our community, to say that there are a set
of tools for many of the things that we're talking
about, there are resources that we're able to
default to but what we need in this space is a set
of resources for racial equity and reconciliation
work that speaks for faith as well. So very
specifically we're calling on and asking
theological institutions, which we have several in
our community, and their respective alumni leaders
to develop new and provide existing assets to the
region with a multi-faith set of resources for
racial equity and reconciliation informed by
various theologies and accessible for use in
diverse units of faith. These of course may
include statements of faith, liturgical resources,
litanies, et cetera. We recognize that there's
some of this work going on now, we're just asking
and calling for the aggregation of such and placing
it on a platform to be accessible for the region.
So this is our first call to action in this area of
racial equity, well additional call to action in
this area of racial equity and reconciliation.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we're going to take this as a motion to put this on the floor and we will take a separate motion with the question of prioritization as we did previously. Is there a second for this?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Second.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Are there questions or comments from member of the Commission?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Point of clarification. Is this the first time we're seeing this or that was published on the website?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: This is the first time you're seeing this with this language. You saw a placeholder before for racial equity and reconciliation call to action with faith leaders as an accountable body but this is the filling out of that placeholder.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The same is true of the prior point also?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: The prior one didn't have a placeholder, the prior one came out of a working group. We don't have a working group around racial equity.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you so much for your leadership in this space Reverend Wilson. We have been waiting for this much anticipated inclusion for our journey to racial reconciliation so I appreciate what you've done to pull this together. So for the accountable bodies I'm wondering could we add interfaith partnership, interfaith partnership and the cabinet because they've been, you know, they've got a foundation.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yeah, I would accept that as absolutely a friendly amendment.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: That will be added to the accountable bodies.

Other questions or comments?

Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

And opposed.

Okay. So a separate question of prioritizing and the request will be to prioritize both of those I assume Reverend Wilson, we'll want both of these prioritized?
CHAIRMAN WILSON: I'm of two minds about that. If we could take the second one as an action and then come back. I'm recognizing the limited landscape we have in prioritized actions and if I had to chose between the two I'd actually choose the second to prioritize versus the first.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Well, an alternative suggestion would be to bundle them and put them in one.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: This is true. Perhaps we should have discussion about that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay. So we'll go to the second one now and have a prioritization discussion separately.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: The second one quite frankly calls for and invites clergy and faith leaders, so we note the term authorized faith leaders as accountable bodies but it calls for faith communities and authorized faith leaders to call, to engage directly in networks and tables of policy discussion across the region to shape how we work together and inform the conversation directly. This is quite frankly a call that in many of the, we're using this terminology tonight, in many of the networks that engage around public policy
issues also we lack faith community voice directly from its authorized leaders. We do not believe of course that it takes someone with a collar or with a stole to be a person of faith but we do believe that the present engagement and public engagement from authorized faith leaders and policy discussions perhaps based on a certain bias advances the discussion or at least seeks to frame it in a way that gets to the core of a lot of our values and so this call is really to our faith leaders to say this is your work and we invite you to do so publicly around these respective civic tables. So that's really what this is about.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we'll take that as a motion, is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Second. Then what discussion or questions would you have?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: What is an authorized leader?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: That's why we used the term. In different faith communities authorization takes on different forms. Authorization may be ordination within a particular Christian community, it may be licensure in another
and quite frankly because we recognize, we want to be considerate of the various approaches that to use the term clergy actually has both the Christian bias and a judeo-christian bias as we consider this broadly so we use the term authorization to speak to those who are sent forth and set apart by communities of faith to guide and provide them leadership.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Question?

Commissioner Windmiller?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: One more question and that would be is the conversation about policy directly related to racial equity and reconciliation or is it a broader set of policy issues? Because I'm unclear from this.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Great question. It would be a broader set of policy issues. So what we're saying is to the point, to use the last example that we shouldn't have a discussion about the funding and design of public schools without faith leaders around the table. So we shouldn't have discussion about economic inequity without faith leaders around the table or at least those faith leaders should feel both compelled and called
to those tables to frame that conversation from perspectives that inform people's values.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So I see this as a way to invite authorized faith leaders to the table to have the conversation about how to discuss and implement calls to action, all of our calls to action as opposed to just racial equity and reconciliation? I'm wondering why it's in specifically that sphere?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I think part of the assumption, there is an assumption here that bears speaking perhaps that, at our core, and our core values we believe that, speaking, try not to speak in faith language here, we believe that all people deserve equitable opportunity and some of that is informed by where we believe we all sit, Sub specie aeternitatis, under the gaze of eternity, and so faith leaders have the capacity to inform these broader discussions with our values and those undergirded beliefs and that if we have those discussions with those things in mind then we get closer to equity and reconciliation. So that's, again it's unspoken here but we believe that at our core as identified by many of our kind of polling questions that if we frame these things in a larger
context, not just who gets what, when, where and
why, you know basics of politics but faith leaders
would help us get to equity if they were in these
discussions.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Thank you.

That helps.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not everyone
practices faith though.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: This is true Jerac,
you make a great point which is why we try to be
open about this, we kind of speak to multi-faith.
I was held to this in a conversation about women
named Faith the other day when I suggested exactly
this, that we come to this work, some people from
their respective faiths, some people without faith,
what they suggested to me I offer to you as well,
that in order to get the kind of work we've got to
get done done it's not that you have a certain set
of beliefs about God but faith is rather your
capacity to suspend the rules of logic to get
beyond the stuff that reasonably you would think
you can't get done.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But not every
authorized faith leaders don't have as open of a
mind as you do on that kind of topic.
CHAIRMAN WILSON: I agree with that, you know, I wish everybody could be like me, but.

You left yourself open Jerac.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Frightening as that might be.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Frightening as that might be, you know, my wife does not wish that but the reality is, I mean I think there's got to be open and diverse tables quite frankly and there are people who should come in from different points of view, whether they, you know, it's going to take all of us sitting down and folks who have faith beliefs that I wouldn't agree with should be at the table as well.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you.

So any other questions or comments from commissioners on the second call to action here?

Okay. Seeing none all in favor please say aye.

Any opposed.

Okay. So we shall speak to the prioritization question.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I think this is an open question perhaps for discussion again. I
think my own set of beliefs would say based upon
the work that I know is happening in faith
communities right now because there's a good amount
of work happening around these liturgical
resources, litanies and the like the aggregation of
them is really the work here. I think the higher
return on engagement is really in the second space
and so personally I would invite us to be
thoughtful about prioritization of the second and
inviting, it may be some work in implementation to
get someone like the interfaith partnership just to
pull together some of the stuff that's happening in
the first but prioritization would call on perhaps
the second, that is my own opinion, I am not making
that quite frankly as a recommendation, as a
motion, just opening discussion with that
perspective.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Comments or
thoughts in this space before we entertain a
motion?

You and I haven't talked about, this
is my own thought would be I'm very comfortable
with bundling them together so that both points get
made. Your concern is that the second one would
get lost if we had the first one prioritized?
CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yeah. I mean if we would bundle them then perhaps we just, this would be the header, I would lead with the second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Lead with the second and follow as a bundle.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Just a question. If they were bundled would the convening of these tables and dialogs, would that be considered one of the assets that we're asking for in the development and providing of these new assets? I guess I don't know --

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So you push me back toward decoupling. So the first one is to source current activity.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: For communities who already gather.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: My bias is not to source new dialog groups. We do well at that. But to remember our call to make policy recommendations and the second, really the first call to action is much more about, has a capacity to frame and form people for policy discussions but the intervention
is much further away from policy and so the second
is really about getting at how we shape the
collective work and how we order what we do as a
community together. And so I would, Commissioner
Pulliam, she's pulled me away from you Rich.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I move that we
prioritize both of them.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So motion on the
floor is to prioritize both.

Commissioner Gore does your motion
include Reverend Wilson's thought that the second
one becomes the lead?

COMMISSIONER GORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: There's a second
to that effect.

Already there's a motion and second.

Further discussion or comments?

Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Okay. I know
I called the question but are they bundled or
separate at this point?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Your motion is
Commissioner Gore?
COMMISSIONER GORE: Yeah, that we prioritize both of them.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: But number two is number one.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Number two is the lead.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: All right.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions or comments?

Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

And opposed?

Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I wanted to pause here and thank my co-chair, my colleague and my brother for his thoughtful work on this. He and I have been in several meetings together where I have seen him very thoughtful with diverse groups of faith leaders and talking and challenging them to respond to their call and he's been in a number that I have not been in where I know that this is very thoughtful and I think this is a very relevant group for us to be speaking to with our prioritized
calls to action so I wanted to publicly thank you
for your work and your passion and your commitment
here.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay. We're going
to move along on our agenda and next is to review
the transition phase of our work and there are some
slides on this that commissioners have in their
packet and they would be on the screen for the
audience and our manager director Bethany
Johnson-Javois will lead us through this.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Good evening again to Commissioners, I'm going to
ask staff to help me to advance the frames.

This community and Commissioners is
the framework for change I'd like to present to you
this evening, these slides can be found on our
stlpositivechange.org website as well.

If you'll advance to the next slide.

We extrapolated this quote from
Governor Jay Nixon as we were called into being in
November.

"Their most important work will be
the changes that we see in our
institutions and our work places and
our units and in our interactions
with one another. Change of this
magnitude is hard; but maintaining
the status quo simply is not
acceptable."

Here we've done some research to
learn that in fact as we looked at other
commission's work we have found that there has not
been a commission within our time frame that has
had the magnitude or scope of charge as we have and
the magnitude of the body of work and interaction
with community so with this I just wanted to show a
digital picture of our experiment called The
Ferguson Commission To Date where we have paired
research, expert testimony, diversity in terms of
not just racial makeup, geographic makeup,
perspective, age difference as we can see in the
prior data that has been reflected this evening,
all of which together over 100 regional leaders,
over 60 public meetings to date that David I think
we're at how many attendees total? 2,000 plus,
close to 3,000 at this point if you combine the
working group totals with our commission totals and
all of this together including your hours that
you've put into work are including about $20,000 of
volunteer hours which has yielded the 200 calls to action and tonight that puts us about 210 plus, 210 calls to action that we have done the work of signature priorities as well.

In this I wanted to show you the buckets of the overall team that you will see reflected in the report and how we have rolled up all of the work that we have done together. Our overarching theme in our community that's resounded from the feedback we received is racial equity, the need for that and the need to focus as that, or our priority in the region.

Up under that, under these headings we find Justice For All which we call for police reform, court reform and consolidation, youth being at the center, thank you for sharpening that work and up under that early childhood development, talking about the whole child and the environment around the child needing to be whole and education infrastructure and then the third area within our signature priorities have been captured under the heading Opportunity To Thrive which those sub bullets you see Medicaid expansion, employment, financial empowerment, housing and transportation are all key components of that Opportunity to
Thrive.

Back to this for community all lists of calls to action can be found at bit dot L-Y forward slash fcsigCTAlist.

It's the easiest acronym you ever did see.

You want me to do it again? H-T-T-P colon, forward slash forward slash, they say bitly but that didn't work for me, bit dot L-Y --

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Can we put it on a board on the side?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Forward slash fcsigCTAlist, Ferguson Call To Access List is what that stands for. We're putting Starsky to work.

As I move forward leveraging regional capacity is going to be very important again, the Commission's charge was to develop policy calls to action and so although we do not want to show that change is magic in the linear equation we do see key elements to change according to our charge which is policy plus the necessary infrastructure has to be in place in order to advance policy in a thoughtful and meaningful way undergirded with financial infrastructure as well as human capital
and community investment so these three things, policy infrastructure and community investment over time equals change. There are opportunities for us to leverage existing capacity in some areas and in others very little infrastructure remains in which we need to work together.

So Change Now, what is it we can do right now that we need to be thinking of in helping and community to think through. That racial equity clearly is important, that we need to embrace that and to ask organizations and even individuals to define that and to operationalize what movement looks like in that whelm, that alignment both internal and external for organizations needs to happen, that we take a generational approach as our lens is reflected and that policy investment which is different than programmatic investment, that's connected to policy is very important for the long term sustainability.

So here I present to you the time line with which we work. This slide is particularly important. Our work from November through September 15th of our time together has been heavy community engagement and commission leadership so beyond report release we see a
transition in our role. From September 16th to the
rest of our time together as we sunset December
31st we shift community leadership with commission
facilitation and guidance which we kind of saw in
the call to action and the education space of
needing some transition to make sure that things
are set up well and then we see implementation from
January 31st to generations is that last word where
community in fact is ready, engaged and supported
to take ownership of the body of work that we have
left as our legacy.

So this slide is a slide that shows
collective impact approach, answering the question
how do we go about sustaining this change beyond an
appointed entity and what you see in the middle are
some key elements of collective impact. Common
agenda, mutually reinforcing activity, continuous
communication, some way to be able to measure
impact, the so what of the work and the backbone
infrastructure support that manages as we have done
over the past few questions.

These circles behind you which Serena
Muhammad is coming right behind me to explain more
in depth if necessary, you see general public has a
role, we are particularly sensitive that young
people, their voices need to be articulated in their own area, issue based networks is important where people have already engaged in this and we need to capitalize on that, community based organizations as well as business leadership and governmental leadership so this is a way of being able to channel energy across the region recognizing that there are some areas that need to be developed and some that are happening right now.

So here I'd like to offer to you what the focus of our work and our time together will be now through December 31 and this is not an all encompassing but I think it fits us well.

Number one, as we are together through December we will have another chance as we look at the legislative priorities to see which ones we prioritize again, to work with our elected officials to confirm for the 2016 session.

Number two, this will be our opportunity to participate in the speakers bureau, all of us will be expected to go out and to engage with those who have questions, answers or need for further discussion or facilitation.

Number three, to provide leadership to develop the collective impact approach to
sustainability. What this means, and we'll talk about tonight is the selection of the backbone function and the selection of the monitoring functions of that collective impact approach and other opportunities, example one came up tonight that spoke to the need to look at this task force and some work to make sure that that's shaped well.

So with that what I'd like to do is this is straight forward and due to time is to transition to the work that we're really set to do tonight, Serena Muhammad is coming behind me, Serena has been a champion and an advocate particularly for children, she's a founder, she can tell you about this, she asked me not to talk much about her, she can talk about herself, but currently she's the senior project director at St. Louis Mental Health Board and she's been, played a voluntary advisory capacity for the Commission so with that I'll allow her to do her introduction and take us into the next portion of our work together.

MS. MUHAMMAD: So just by way of introduction my name is Serena Muhammad, I'm the director of strategic initiatives for the St. Louis Mental Health Board. I'm also a member of the Collective Impact Funders Forum and it's a group
that's been meeting for about two years to study collective impact and look at the implications for solving complex social issues.

So we have about 30 minutes to talk about the backbone selection and I understand that you've already received some information about collective impact, you did some pre-reading, there was a video that was sent out specifically about community organizing and movement building --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I need to clarify, Bethany forgot to send the video but I'll follow up with the video. Sorry.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay. So one of the points that I wanted to make is collective impact is an approach to solving a problem and it's actually a rather recent lexicon for how to look at partnerships. So in 2011 there was a group that published a study about elements that they saw that were evident in partnerships that were successful so this is not something that is a new phenomenon, it's just another way to talk about something that's already been happening and that has worked in other forums. I think it's more to compare movement building to collective impact because we have lots of examples in our history of movements
that have been successful and look at some of those
principles that make movements successful because
what I wanted to submit to you tonight is that
moving the Ferguson Commission work forward is
going to be bigger than creating a collective
impact framework and so that kind of backbone, it
really is more about movement building and there
are some elements of movement building that are not
adequately addressed in the collective impact model
so I wanted to compare those two things side to
side.

So when you look at movement building
it's really about mobilizing the people who are
affected by an issue to actually challenge power,
dynamics and to look at ways to be inclusive of
everything in problem solving. So the problem is
not filed from the top down, it will involve
everyone in the community, even those that are
affected by the issue.

So two elements of movement building
that you don't have discussed as often in
collective impact, number 2 and number 3 on the
side, movements confront power and movements are
grassroots. So as you are designing your
collective impact initiative I think it's important
to consider how we accomplish those two elements of movement building in the collective impact framework. You'll notice that the other five conditions of collective impact also occur in movements so movements are actually more comprehensive, collective impact is usually focused on system building and structures so I think movement brings the people into collective impact.

You've already talked about having the common agenda, the shared measurement, the mutually reinforcing activities, the backbone infrastructure and continuous communications. Those are five conditions that have been identified that are as present in a successful partnership and I think it's important to call out that there are lots of partnerships, lots of collaborative efforts and the degree to which they are successful can be determined by whether or not these five elements are present so that's why the sentence collective impact has become so pronounced because we're trying to get down to a science of what has been, what have been the common elements that people have observed in some of these structures that have been successful.

So typically when you have a
collective impact process it starts with a relationship-based group, whether it's a committee, a task force, these are folks who are already working on a particular issue, they were in the same space in some way, they had a universal issue that was understood, that everyone knew what their role was to address, they had a network mindset wherein the degree that they wanted to come together to problem solve something as a group and they had key partners who are really leading this initial stage and I'm going to make a distinction between the typical collective impact process and what I have observed to be the process for the Ferguson Commission.

The second stage that usually happens is once you get this group together they develop an action plan and then members of that particular group actually step up and start implementing on that plan. So the second phase after the planning is that the group itself organizing to implement the plan and then the third phase which is where you get to the part where you really have a lot of work going and there's a lot of activity is you start to look at the structure that's necessary to actually carry a larger scale effort forward and
that's where you get to the backbone piece. So this is your typical collective impact process.

The Ferguson Commission process is a bit different because it started off focused on planning and there wasn't necessarily an expectation that the same people who came together to plan would be required to move the implementation forward and I think that's a very significant distinction to make. Because collective impact is relationship based you generally have the opportunity to, during your planning process to develop trust, to have an idea of who is the best organization or agency to take the lead on something, to establish those relationships where you actually feel comfortable taking on things that are risky or challenging and there's a bit more ownership and room in the implementation phase if you've gone through the planning stage together and I know many of us have been involved in planning efforts and there are lots of plans, especially in the St. Louis region, for just about any topic that you can name and one of our challenges that, you know, Starsky mentioned before about follow through is it's very difficult for one group to create a plan and then hand it off
to someone else to own it and do it. We have not been successful with that as a region so I think you want to call attention to what we can learn from past experiences where groups have created a plan and nobody picked it up so we can build into our process something that will mitigate against that risk because that's a real risk in this process.

So I'm going to talk specifically about the role of the backbone organization. This body of research that was done in the collective impact framework identifies six essential functions for backbone and I'm going to read this because folks in the back when I was standing in the back I can tell you can't really see this slide so the essential functions are to guide vision and strategy, support aligned activities, establish shared measurement strategies, build public will, advanced policy and mobilize funding. So your backbone has to be able to do all six of those things at a minimum.

The typical abilities that are needed in order for a backbone to be effective is they traditionally need to be a respected and neutral convener and they need to have at least one person
within that backbone structure that has a full-time focus on this initiative. So one of the things that happens in your traditional collective impact structure in the planning phase is people start to understand the plan as a part of their regular natural work. This isn't an additional thing that you're asking someone to do, they're already doing it, this is just a process that makes their work easier, that makes their accomplishments greater so they look at collective impact as something that benefits them and their work as well as the broader community. And I think that's a significant piece to hone in on because as soon as it starts to feel like something in addition to what people are already doing it has the tendency to become deprioritized so as you're thinking about backbone you want to have someone that has a natural fit, that this is something that they're already charged with doing.

The second ability is managing internal and external communication. When you talk about having that continuous communication that is a real challenge. The more stakeholders you have in a group the more sectors you're crossing and it's just not the formal communication of sending
out, you know, the information about meetings but it's talking to people between meetings, it's building up those relationships so that everyone understands what's needed and that they can really participate in the process fully.

The third is data collection and analysis. Now we're fortunate that there are a lot of people and a lot of institutions in our region who like to do data collection and analysis, however, we're all collecting different data, we're not sharing it with one another and we're not at a point yet where we understand data in the same way. So just seeing a number doesn't always represent the same information depending on who's the viewer so there's a lot of work to be done in this data collection and analysis space and the role of the backbone ability is to actually have in that neutral space for people to be comfortable sharing data with them because data doesn't always view, tell the best story about what's happening in a space or in a sector so people have to feel comfortable that when we give you their data that you're going to use it responsibly.

The fourth community engagement and relationship building, collective impact has to be
exclusive and we all start off inviting the people
that we know to be a part of a process, the
backbone organization or the backbone function has
to have the ability to get outside of the immediate
network, be exclusive and expand so that anyone who
wants to be a part of this problem solving or a
part of the solution has space to do that.

The fifth piece is advocacy. This is
tricky for a lot of organizations serving a
backbone function so I'm going to talk about how to
build in some safeguards around that but you do
have to have an organization that can speak up for
more than its own voice. They can't just always be
about a self interest of that particular
organization or that particular group, they have to
have the ability to speak out on behalf of others
who may not be in the fold immediately and then the
last function is they need to have the ability to
fund raise in addition to the ability to commit
organizational resources. So this is not simply a
pass through or someone who's managing funding,
they have to actually feel like this is a part of
their core work where they're going to commit staff
time and whatever resources they have as an
organization to see this move forward. It's not
just a contract with someone to implement this plan.

So here are some structural considerations. A backbone organization is not always one organization. There are backbone functions so you can have multiple entities servicing different pieces of that function and I'm going to talk about the pros and cons or just really compare what it would look like to have a single entity versus multiple entities.

I believe in order for this to work you would have to have a single entity that has the ability to convene, coordinate and implement, so they have to be a little, be able to do a little bit of all of it and one way to look at that is this single entity would have to have a mission or a scope that aligns with one of your major overarching themes, okay, so you, and I'll talk about how that might look. They have to be self-directed, so if you give it over to a single entity you're looking at very limited ongoing support from the Ferguson Commission, it's almost like you establish a partnership, they can't take it on as a part of their central work and they have the internal capacity to build on what you give to
them. You're not simply giving them instruction, they own it and they move it forward. One of the advantages of having a single entity is that it's a clear and visible authority so people know who's responsible, who it belongs to, at the same token they're highly visible and that creates a higher degree of risk that some organizations may not be able to survive. There's a lot of scrutiny into how well someone is able to implement something of this scope.

So then you look at the multiple entity piece. The first thing that's important here is understanding how power will be shared and balanced because whenever you have a group of players around the table with each person playing a role there is the risk of creating a true leadership vacuum where nobody feels like it's really owned and that they all are just kind of figuring out what their piece is so addressing the power issue is critical when you have multiple entities, especially because these are not necessarily multiple entities who have been working together up until this point so you haven't had the opportunity to do the relationship building. I would suggest that whatever process you use you
have some opportunity for relationship building but we'll talk about that when we get to the actual selection process.

If you have multiple entities they're likely going to need more commitment of support and direction from the Ferguson Commission up until the sunset date so you'll probably be likely, you'll probably be active with this group more so than with a single entity. Because they have a decentralized formation you may have to establish some level of a leadership group, it could be something that you appoint as an ad hoc group that meets occasionally, it could be that this group decides to check in with them once a year or members of this group but you will have to establish some type of accountable body when you have multiple entities working together but it does require significant relationship building, more so than the single entity.

So I'm going to dive into some of the characteristics for the single entity. They generally need to have broad mission and sophisticated structure with existing networks. Now this doesn't mean that they have to be able to do everything in your plan but they should have the
ability to do most of it and the way that you're able to determine that is if you were able to look at your signature priority and identify one common theme that crosses all priorities, let's say economic development, let's say somebody can make the case that if you can address economic development it touches most of your work then that would make it simpler for you to identify a single entity who's already working in that space, who already has capacity around economic development who could drive most of your agenda and for those pieces that don't naturally fit within their scope they would have the ability to identify new and essential partners to make sure that all of the work gets done. Going with the single entity is probably the simplest, most straight forward way to proceed but it would require you to identify that one issue that you feel could become a big enough umbrella to get most of the work done and I have some examples of some large institutions that could possibly play a single entity role depending on what priority you would select as being overarching enough. So you could go with someone like the St. Louis Economic Development Council if you went with an economic development lens, an organization like
East West Gateway who already does regional planning, the Regional Business Council, you know, but it would have to be something that's big enough that they have the infrastructure to do all of the supportive tasks that need to happen. And I'm just going to read these five bullets because I have to remember folks in the back, so.

They have to have a clear self-interest, authority to convene and align, ability to further shape and define the plan, public accountability and planning expertise. Because even though you've already created a plan there is going to have to be further refinement of steps and how to carry out the plan. And I'm going to give you an example of a single entity collective impact initiative.

So when I talk about the research that was done to identify the five key elements for what makes collective impact work one of the models that was studied was the Strive Initiative. The Strive Initiative focuses on college completion and really on improving public education or improving education in general. In the Seattle area their strive initiative is called the Road Map Project and this side depicts the process that they went
through in their planning process, they started off with alignment of all of the sectors that are involved in education and then they added parent and community engagement and then they started to look at data and they used all of that to create stronger systems for delivering public education. This was the, these are the steps that they took to reach their goals. The goals that they identified for them were healthy and ready for kindergarten, supported and successful in school, graduate from high school, college and career ready, earn a college degree or credential. So again with the single entity that you normally have one overarching focus but they're still convening all of the same sectors that you would typically convene just focused on one issue.

So now we're going to talk about the idea of having multiple entities. If you go with the multiple entity structure the middle circle more of an intermediary, they need to be proficient in managing relationships so again it's not just a contract or a vendor, and then you're able to hone in on highly specialized partners so you're able to say in this space of community engagement who do we really need that's already an expert in this space
to come into this structure to make sure that that's done well. Who do we have that's already in the capacity building space or the convening and aligning or the initiative specific. So if you have a specific action that you really want to make sure that the folks who are working on, you know, equity have their own leadership piece that's how the multiple entity would work. They would take direction from a coordinating body so again you would have to have some structure to offer direction to this group. It's not the intermediary. So it's not the person that's managing relationships, it could be that each entity has a representative that forms this leadership or coordinating body but keep in mind that there needs to be an accountable structure there.

The intermediary or the relationship manager would have to be neutral and respected, again all of these organizations have to have very high public accountability, they would have to have the ability to allocate resources, their own resources as well as fund raise and planning expertise. So some of the same skill sets just spread out across multiple entities. If at all
possible they should be politically neutral, not a
direct service provider and not dependent on
fundraising, if possible. I know that narrows the
field. But some options for that intermediary
could be the Greater St. Louis Community
Foundation, Youth Bridge Community Foundation,
Community Builders Network, you know, folks that
are in a position to convene that are neutral that
are not necessarily reliant on fundraising.

So any questions?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yeah. The
politically neutral piece trips me up.
Particularly when the work and even as I look at
some of the examples, we spent some time dealing
with this stuff together, the advancement of a
policy agenda requires some orientation around
political activity that may not be in the same way
with something like Strive so if you could say a
little bit about how one can be politically neutral
when the core of the work is advancing politics.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Right. So the core of
the work is not necessarily advancing politics, or
advancing policies. Advancing policies is a
strategy to get to a particular set outcome so the
way that I'm looking at it is you have your neutral
convener and you have partners, some of them are close partners, some of them are arms length partners and you coordinate with your partners to do those actions that wouldn't be a natural fit for your neutral convener. I think the thing that people have to be comfortable with is allowing people to excel in the space that is best suited for them and not to expect one entity to be able to do all of it because if that could happen it would have happened by now, we would have this one super entity.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: If there wasn't a political will for it, I mean so we're here with a political aim in mind and I say that not on a particular body, on a partisan kind of way but we're here because of problems with how people relate to one another which is politics and who gets what, when, where and why that we have structural, regulatory and legislative issues with how we order our lives together and we've set, you know, we've spent these months setting a policy agenda so I don't, I mean I think part of what we're talking about is an implementation strategy to get these policies moved and to build a will around them to get them moved.
MS. MUHAMMAD: Right. So when you look at this multiple entity structure your issue specific action you could have a partner whose specialization is policy but this middle relationship manager person is probably not going to be that person. The middle relationship manager person is going to be someone who's neutral, that people feel comfortable, that they're not going to go too far one way or another, that they can invite people in as needed, that they can make the space inclusive but that doesn't mean that you wouldn't have somebody in one of those circles who can really go in on a particular action or activity. That's one of the advantages for having the multiple entity is because you can specialize, when you get to the single entity it's much more difficult to do that.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay.

MS. MUHAMMAD: So here's an example of a collective impact initiative that uses multiple entities. So the way that this is structured Memphis Fast Forward is the overarching collective impact initiative and they've identified five sub initiatives that are coordinated under Memphis Fast Forward and each of these sub
initiatives also has its own backbone organization.

So this is a much larger initiative than the Strive one that we looked at, there's more infrastructure, a lot more planning went into it, a lot more partners but this is what multiple entity could look like.

So now I'm going to talk about a process for selecting either one of these, either a single entity or a multiple entity. So as I mentioned the single entity is the least labor intensive, so this is a simple, well I shouldn't say simple, it's the least labor intensive way to get all of this done. It puts most of the responsibility on whoever the backbone might be to figure out a lot of the work on how to move things forward so it will start off with that concept of identifying a unifying priority so that you can say if we want to look at economic development who should be in this space, if we want to look at this as an education issue who should be in this space. Possibly you could have more than one issue but once you get beyond that you're not going to find too many single entities who are really working in a focused way on those issues. So once you identify that priority you would host a technical
assistance meeting with the candidates based on that priority. So you would say we really want to talk about organizations that are working in the space of economic development, this is our, these, this is our call to action plan, this is what we would like to see happen, tell us how you would approach moving this plan forward and those candidates would actually just submit a proposal addressing your key considerations so they would talk about how their core activities already support the work, what they would need to add as far as capacity and leadership to address the full scope of the work, so again if they're focused on one area and it doesn't hit the other two how would they accommodate that, which parts of the work they would not want to do directly, so that speaks to that piece about being neutral. The things that then are limitations for them they would have to disclose it up front. How they would secure ongoing resources and then of course there would be other questions that we would want to determine to ask in this application process that perhaps the Commission and staff look at. When you go through your plan aside from those six core functions of a backbone there are other things that you're
accustomed to that you would want to see carried forward. The staff would then narrow the list based on the proposals that are received and invite the top candidates to do presentations at a public meeting like this and the Commission would select a top candidate. So it's a pretty straight forward process like most calls for qualifications. It should be noted though even if the single entity is collected it shouldn't appear as if the entity is selected and the Ferguson Commission vanished. There needs to be some communication of transition for how either key leaders or volunteers with the Commission will stay engaged, perhaps even staff of volunteers can stay engaged for the first phase or so. If it looks publicly like it was done and handed off I think that that might diminish the confidence that people might have in that group who takes on the work to move it forward. So that's just something to consider.

So then this is the multiple entity selection process. In this process you may be able to identify that neutral relationship manager without going through a long process because that is going to be a finite universe of intermediary type organization who are in a position to manage
collectives. So again you would establish your selection criteria and prioritize your key values, tasks and outcomes for all of the partners that would be involved and what I would suggest in this is that I believe closest to movement building is that you would actually host a series of sessions or meetings and you would invite stakeholders to plan together how they would design a collective impact model. So the distinction would be that when you get to these key tasks about inviting partners you would say we're hosting a session on this particular signature priority around child welfare, all of the organizations who work in this space we invite you to come, talk through these recommendations with us, talk with one another because you're all working in this space and then design a collective impact approach to moving these recommendations forward. I think what this does is it gives everyone an opportunity to buy in and to see themselves as a part of moving the solution forward and it also allows you to establish some of the relationships that may be necessary to actually design this collective impact approach going forward, so it's not one organization going off and coming back and saying here's what we will do but
it's you putting a charge to a sector to say we've identified these issues in your sector as a group, how do you think these issues should be addressed.

It does require more work from the staff and perhaps even the commissioners to actually convene these meetings and to have these conversations, you may have to provide some technical assistance as people are thinking these issues through but it creates a space that's more like a think tank where people are coming together to problem solve based on the actions instead of people asking you what should we do with this, they're telling you this is what we can do with this if you create that type of space.

Once the sectors have discussed the calls to action that are relevant for them then your request is that they design a collective impact team based on the relationships that are established through that process and then you could have the same, you know, present what your idea is and how you would do this and you still whittle it down to the top three and select, I believe at this point if you were to have a panel to select that should also include members of the public, there is an opportunity for them to be involved throughout
the process so that they understand collective
impact, they understand the calls to action and
they get to see who's already supposed to be doing
this work. I think a big part of collective impact
is holding people accountable because in every
sector there's someone who says I'm working on this
issue and I think if we elevate the work that
they're doing and we give them some assistance by
bringing together other people who may also be
working in that space but for whatever reason
haven't communicated then it might strengthen their
ability to move something forward together so then
the final decision of course is made by the
Ferguson Commission on who that intermediary is and
what that collective will look like.

I didn't include this as a slide but
Glasgow Smith Kline just did a process similar to
this, not to this scale at all but where they asked
businesses to actually form their collective and
talk about how they would address an issue together
as a part of their proposal process.

So that is all I have and I know we
have five minutes, so.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very
much. Because this is kind of a process that we'll
be going through together over the course of our
time post report we wanted to have this kind of
educational opportunity for commissioners but then
also, so in presentation but also in response so
are there other questions as we kind of think about
how we go forward in this that commissioners have
of Ms. Muhammad?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: So I think I
heard you correctly but I want to make sure that I
did. When you were I think very helpfully talking
about the necessity of movement principles being
like involved in what we're doing here were you
saying that the multiple entity selection process
you think more allows for the implementation of
movement?

MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes. I think you can
do it in either but it's usually simpler in the
multiple process.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you. I
just wanted to clarify.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Other questions?

Responses?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So thank you for
your thoughtfulness in this and your continued help
to us through this process. You've been
instrumental and you've been involved in research and pulling concepts together not just for us but you've been working in this space for some time so that's immensely helpful to us so we're very grateful Serena for your willingness to do that and help us as a volunteer.

My question relates to examples, models. You've mentioned Strive in a couple of settings, you've mentioned Memphis Forward, you've mentioned something of Glasgow Smith Kline recently. Are the key principles from those models reflected here or is there some learning from any of those that perhaps a deeper dive would help us with?

MS. MUHAMMAD: The key principles are reflected. I think the biggest distinction is in most of these instances because they start off relationship based it's usually a very clear choice whether or not you go with a single entity or multiple entities but because in this instance you're passing the torch you have an opportunity to decide whether or not it makes the most sense to look at one unifying issue in that single entity structure or to really build out this multiple entity structure that can engage as many members of
the community and to the problem solving as possible. So a part of it is what is going to be your appetite for continuous heavy lifting over the next few months because as I said a single entity is a simpler solution but you may not get the same level of impact as you would get from the multiple entity only because it doesn't immediately engage as many people. You're really putting it up on that single entity to figure out how to do the engagement, how to implement and do it all whereas with the multiple entity process you're setting the space, you're convening around issues that are sector specific and then you're telling those sectors to come back to you with an approach that weaves all of their specific strengths together so, and that's really what collective impact is, it usually happens over a period of time based on relationships but because this is a condensed process you're kind of creating a pressure cooker where you can get those people together who might not already be talking to start forming those relationships and start doing some of the problem solving.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Two quick questions. The first question is, is you
gave us wisdom I don't want to lose in terms of
give us your advice on the hand off being
appropriate. To what extent do we transition this
baton without going too far because I'm in a
nonprofit where we were to receive recommendations
from another entity that when my board got it they
wanted to chomp on it their way and make it
their's. So what would be that appropriate hand
off based on your experience is my first question.

MS. MUHAMMAD: So I think as much as
you can be visibly involved as having some level of
oversight that would help. So if there's for
example an opportunity to say that the Ferguson
Commission will check in on the work of this
collective annually and we're going to be kind of
an external, I don't like to use the word watch dog
but some external group that's making sure that
these things actually happen, that raises the level
of accountability for whoever decides to take it on
but it also shows the public that there is a
continued interest of, and commitment from the
people who were at the table. So I don't know if
you can formally do that as the Ferguson Commission
or what that would look like but what I think would
be detrimental to the process is if it looks like
you handed it off and vanished because then it's really up to this new entity to move it forward with the same passion that was put into it and that doesn't always happen because in most collective impact initiatives the planners are involved in the implementation in some way, it's very rare that somebody creates a plan and then they hand it to somebody else to do.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: My final question is Glasgow Smith Kline, you talked about with engaging the process not as robust as ours but similar enough. Over what amount of time did it take them to do that?

MS. MUHAMMAD: So when Glasgow Smith Kline first designed their process and they bought it to St. Louis it actually didn't work so they had to retool it so when you look at all of the time together it took about two years for them to figure out how to invite people to participate in a collective impact initiative.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have to say something, I'm sorry, I don't mean to be a disruption. But I think multiple entities has been the problem we've all been having but at the same time we all have a problem with giving one single
1 entity all the opportunity so where do we meet in
2 the middle?
3
4 MS. MUHAMMAD: So I think the problem
5 we've been having is multiple entities that don't
6 talk to one another. What should happen in
7 collective impact is multiple entities who are
8 coordinating with one another so they're
9 communicating so that they're not duplicating
10 services and I'm going to go back to this slide
11 just so I can illustrate this point.
12
13 So the essential functions of a
14 backbone organization there are six, we're not
15 necessarily asking each entity to do all six, we're
16 saying that there's somebody out there who's
17 already advancing policy, we need to bring them
18 into alignment with the folks who are looking at
19 guiding a vision and strategy so as people playing
20 the role that they're best positioned to play and
21 not trying to do everything and the fact that there
22 are multiple entities means that they now have to
23 start talking to one another so that there's some
24 coordination but I agree that there is a problem
25 when you have lots of people working in a space and
26 they're not talking to one another.
27
28 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm sorry, isn't
this privatization by another name? At what point
do the citizens, the majority of which are black in
Ferguson actually have both? Because you're
talking a lot of corporate entities but no vote,
obody's been elected and to me this sounds very
patronizing and it's not dealing with police
criminality, prosecutorial overreach, I don't mean
to attack you but to me this likes like
privatization by another name.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So I'll say a
couple things appreciating your comment. First I
don't think, if you look at the examples, Memphis
Fast Forward that I'm familiar with most of the
tentities that are engaged there both in the
leadership of the initiative and anchoring them are
public. So we've not discussed particular
tentities, there have been some models that have
been pointed out who can anchor the work but most
of those people are not also specific to any
particular industries, I think the examples that
we've heard if you're dealing with something in
economics then maybe the economic development
partnership is specific as anyone got. So when
we're talking privatization I think, that's not
where I'm going, right? So just note that what
we're talking about is a process and we're talking about publicly how we plan on engaging a process to figure out how to embed long term work that is regional, not city specific because our work has always been regional, to address the issues that are identified in our managing director's report and those four big chunks, Justice For All, so that's clearly primary still for us, youth at the center around these long term social issues, recognizing that it's generational and opportunities to thrive. That's still the work. What we're talking about right now is a process by which we assure that someone is accountable to the public, and I think that word continued to come up, accountable to the public for this work when this body arises by virtue of an executive order.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess I'm having a problem that you're not dealing with the actual black majority in Ferguson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So part of what we're dealing with and I think, again we believe that these issues are regional, to Jerac's point quite frankly they're national, our charge has always been regional and so we have been very intentional to work in Ferguson, to work in south
city, quite frankly where we saw these issues to work to speak in St. Charles because our respective fragmentation is part of how we got here so that's -- at this point we're in Commission discussion, I'm trying to be respectful, we're in Commission discussion and, but the reality is, and I think we'd be pleased to have this conversation with you about our approach and ideology over time but for the sake of everybody's time particularly people like Bob who have been to 11 meetings and who understand that we have been working regionally and advancing not just core conditions but socially underlying conditions because that's our work that we should have that conversation off line.

So any other questions from Commissioners?

MS. WINDMILLER: Specifically I wanted to ask when organizations whether we decide on single entity or a multiple entities when they come forward with ideas about how to move this, move our work forward do they also come forward with their ability to, with a plan for accountability? Because what I'm concerned about most is once our recommendations are out and once the community has the ability to absorb them and
think about which ones they would like to prioritize who is the accountable body for whatever gets moved forward?

MS. MUHAMMAD: Right. So I think that the entities that come forward can propose what accountability should look like but I also believe that before you even make the request you should have an idea of what you would like to see in place so a part of this process of designing the application when we're figuring out what questions we want to ask, that's where that type of discussion would take place. So we would say that these are the things that, these are the elements that we believe we need to see in order to ensure accountability and then you would ask the applicant how they would address that.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Serena, I would just like your thoughts around the need for ongoing engagement by the Ferguson Commission. So what I'm hearing you say, what I believe that I understand from what you're saying is that that engagement is important not only for accountability but it seems to me that further authorizing the work, further authority? So in your work here and
understanding of collective impact models how
unique it is that we would take our plan and pass
it off, you're saying we need to stay here sort of
as a monitoring despite which pathway we take,
single or multiple, anticipate that in terms of
some management and authority, is that what I'm
hearing?

MS. MUHAMMAD: So what I'm suggesting
is that either members of the Commission take that
responsibility or that you actually design an
accountable body so you could decide that, I don't
know, a majority would annually convene to review
what is happening with whoever moves the work
forward but I think that there needs to be some
intentional connection between the group who did
the planning and whoever's going to implement and
you have to figure out what your comfort level is
for doing that because I understand that people
signed up for particular assignment and a
particular period and what I'm recommending may be
beyond that so I understand --

CHAIRMAN WILSON: It is.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: All right. I
was just, I just wanted to be clear about that and
so that recommendation is not dependent on our
selection of a single or multiple entity but in the
design of the follow through, that consideration is
how this body stays engaged in some capacity to
move it forward. Monitor.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Or, I mean I know that
you have a brilliant team that's been working with
you that entire time so they may figure out a
communication strategy that mitigates that. The
thing that's important is that people understand
that the work wasn't just passed off, that there's
still some investment and interest from the
original planners so how you do that could look
differently. What I'm proposing is that you can do
that in the selection process and in the structure
that's established but there may be other ways to
do that as well.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Maybe one more
except -- I'm sorry, I can't take more from the
public, we're already 15 minutes over and we have
other business we have to do.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Can you just real
quick just talk a little bit about is there
anything in the research that you've looked at that
talks about what goals are most achievable through
collective action and what those goals look like,
how defined are they, just those sorts of issues?

MS. MUHAMMAD: So the wonderful thing about collective impact is that in theory it works with everything, it works within any space so when you look at examples of issues that have been addressed with collective impact they range from seniors aging in place to addressing a heroin epidemic to childhood obesity, collective impact is just a way of organizing, it's not necessarily issue specific so when you think about those five conditions what we're basically saying is for any group to get together and figure, and decide that they want to work together successfully these are the things that they need to have, a common agenda, so it can be any common agenda, shared measurement, a way to figure out that they're all looking at the same thing and they're tracking it in the same way so again you can be measuring anything as long as there's a shared measurement. Mutually reinforcing activity that everyone is aligning and putting their best forward for the collective so you're not outside of your lane, you're really focused in and you're able to specialized, that you have the backbone infrastructure so that there's some entity that has made the commitment to carry out those six
core functions and you have continuous
communication. So the idea is if these conditions
are met you can use collective impact to work on
any issue. And there is no best issue or most
suited issue.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I wanted to thank
Ms. Muhammad for her guidance and her leadership.
I invite at this time Commissioners
to consider in your packet the October through
December 15 transition budget, asking our managing
director to come forward now giving us some
guidance. We invite you if you really want to be
prepared to also get handy your August 7th minutes
so that we have those minutes ready to act upon
following the work on the budget.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Thank you.

Action item one, directing your
attention to the transition to implementation
budget. It is forecasted that the Ferguson
commission will be $519,000 remaining from the
1.267 million in revenue to use for implementation
planning activities for this period so as we've
discussed today the work of collective impact, this
is a projection as to how we need to work together
in terms of the existing funding we have from October 1st through December 31st, 2015. This forecasted amount consists of both private and public funds, private funds are approximately $63,800 and obligated public grants are in the amount of $455,000 and we are working to ensure with the public grant funds that all of our activity is connected to what is eligible to be expended as well under the guidelines.

I want to take you through projected expenses, it's really pretty simple. Under independent contractors I'm projecting retaining the managing director through December 31st, the media and community relations function and one of the strategic planning services contracts in addition to Truman who has supported us with their evaluation work with three deliverables left to provide, that total dollar amount is a little over $157,000 in that line item.

The second expense line is professional fees and with professional fees that specific piece is dedicated to resources the support of dissemination so as we've talked about the platform that is the final report this would allow us to continue with that resource to be up
and to allow for additional education and awareness of that platform, the projected amount needed for that is 50,000 plus dollars.

Office operations we've budgeted 4,000 which is for the telephone, copy supplies and some food that supports our meetings and then as we discussed today the backbone planning function we have added a line item different than what we've done in the past for $100,000 to support the infrastructure for sustainability of our work.

Under Commission report and dissemination that's all the way on the right-hand side of your document, phase two, this is what we're calling phase two of the report platform so what keeps community engaged between report release and the infrastructure that we set up is making sure that we have a robust platform that allows for momentum and capturing public feedback on the calls to action as we put the infrastructure in place. This would give us functionality to help increase civic engagement within the report so that it's not just one way and then finally you'll see here community engagement and commission meetings is a placeholder number of $156,726. This I put in as a placeholder, we have five public confirmed meetings
October through December with which we will use that time to discuss as we are today the backbone structure, should it be that we provide space in kind, if we get other in kind donations that amount can be smaller than what you see but overall this is the budget that I'm projecting to ask for approval with your discussion tonight.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I have a question about when will we select the approach to the backbone? Is it -- what's the process and when will we decide?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: That's a great question. I think in a sense we've begun the process tonight of the shift to think about the design of that structure. I think to stay to our commitment of making sure that we have as much as we can before our sunset we'll need to be aggressive in the September/October time frame but we have through December 31st to make all those additions.

COMMISSIONER CARR: So selecting a particular model is down the pike?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: The model and the entity or entities as we've discussed tonight is down the pike, yes, sir. Good
CHAIRMAN WILSON: Other questions or comment?

So one thing that we note, I know this is work the staff is doing is identification of various revenue sources, streams and the numbers related to them. I see this is October through December? Do we have a sense that before, or between now and the September 9 meeting that we'll be able to identify more clearly how much is the grants and how much is the private funds?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

We've been working over the past week or so to define that and we need about another week to make sure that those numbers are down to the cent on each these so yes, by the 9th meeting we should be able to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: If there's no objection for the sake of this being balanced with both revenues and expenditures that perhaps we could take this as information under consideration so if staff does that additional work and what we get a chance to see in the September 9th meeting is both sides of the ledger here then we take action at that point.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I think that would be very helpful as well with the United Way, there is a transition there, we have leadership in place so that would give us some time to be able to get that number.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay. Any other questions or comments related to this?

Thank you very much.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I'll take that feedback back and I appreciate the Commissioners weighing in on that.

Second in your packet is the minutes from our last meeting on August the 7th. Requesting approval of the minutes for public posting.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Moved and properly seconded that the August 7th meeting minutes be approved for posting.

Any further discussion?

All these in favor please notify by saying aye.

Opposed same sign.

Any abstentions.

Motion carries.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
With that the final part of the managing director report is actually to provide an update to Commissioners on our final report and its process and the status so at this time I would Nicole Hudson to come to provide you with that report.

MS. HUDSON: So we have a couple extra calls which fit nicely into our previously established bucket so we'll not hold up our progress on getting out the draft the report which staff are reviewing some actually I believe as we meet tonight. Commissioners should be getting your first round of documents to review probably tomorrow, those will come again digitally with directions on how to go in and comment and thank you for those who have come forward and volunteered to be readers. We are still looking at the end of this week to have everything pushed out at least in the first phase of draft so it may not make it to Commissioners until early the following week but we are still looking at the end of this week to have a first draft at least of everything pushed out. Again those will not be linear, those will be coming as we're working on them, we're starting at the bottom, at the C-Span layer with all the background documents so that's the stuff that
you'll be getting first. We've got the CNN layer and the PBS layer and the C-Span layer. So we are on schedule to have the digital platform probably ready to start poking around beginning of next week and we'll be identifying a time when we can share passwords for you guys to start to review what that looks like and we're looking at having the report finalized by the 10th so everything is moving along on schedule.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Do you need more readers?

MS. HUDSON: So when the first round goes out it will go to all the commissioners so we have a handful, I think six who said they would read everything and everyone will get the notice and there will be a deadline on it so whoever wants to get in and jump in is welcome to.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you Nicole.

Nicole and the entire staff team have been laser focused this for some time as you might expect and support team at Truman and many other places are there so a lot of work to be done but they are moving at pace and on schedule and we appreciate the help of the Commission.
So our next meeting is one September 9th which will be at the Ferguson Community Center where our first meeting occurred and we look forward to seeing everyone there.

We're going to close now, thank you for your patience, we are beyond time, we're going to stand as we have in the past and observe a tradition which has become ours for those that are here for the first meeting we have been closing our meeting just in moments of silence asking folks to just pause and reflect in silence in your own way on the circumstances in our region, on the events of the past week with thoughts and prayers for safety and for comfort and for peace and we will ask that each of us do that in our own way and we will pause here and then we'll be adjourned.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.)
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