



ETHICS REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Ethics Review Board
City of New Orleans

IPM Working Group Public Meeting

Monday March 26, 2018
2:30 P.M.

Norman Mayer Library
3001 Gentilly Blvd.
New Orleans, LA 70122

AGENDA

1. IPM Quality Assurance standards (see attached) (Michael Cowan).

To: IPM Quality Assurance Review Working Group

1. Per the IPM ordinance external review of the IPM shall include annual review by quality assurance review advisory committee and triennial peer review.

“Completed reports, inspections, performance reviews, public reports of investigations, and other records, shall be subject to an annual quality assurance review by a third-party advisory committee, known as the quality assurance review advisory committee.”

“The quality assurance review advisory committee for the office of the [IPM] shall include a representative appointed by the city council, who shall serve as chair of the committee; a representative appointed by the mayor; and a representative appointed by the ethics review board.”

Note: The language above can be read as calling for a separate quality assurance review advisory committee from the one that oversees the OIG and ERB. That appears to be the IPM’s understanding. As the body charged with oversight of the IPM, the ERB must resolve this.

2. “The office of the [IPM] shall be subject to peer review every three years. Such peer review shall be paid for by the office of the [IPM]. When completed, the recommendations and findings of the of such peer review shall be submitted to the ethics review board and [IPM]. The office of [IPM] shall comply with the recommendations of the peer review within 90 days, provided that the recommendations and findings are accepted and approved by the ethics review board. Copies of the final written report resulting from this peer review shall be furnished to the ethics review board, city council, and office of the mayor. This report shall also be made available to the public, when such process is completed.”

Note: The OIG ordinance specifies that triennial review of that office shall be conducted by the national Association of Inspectors General. The IPM ordinance contains no such specification. As the oversight body, the ERB should choose the organization to lead the review after review of available options and appropriate consultation with the IPM and others.

The IPM has stressed the importance of preparing the Quality Assurance committee so that it can properly review the office’s work, which is different from and has different standards than the OIG. She believes that was not done properly in the last iteration of the process. This concern highlights the importance of the next point.

3. The OIG operates according to a set of standards (the “Green” and “Yellow” books) adopted by national professional organizations. The IPM currently utilizes guidelines from Los Angeles, the monitor’s previous workplace.

Note: A set of standards adopted from some credible national organization and modified if necessary will supply critical benchmarks for the IPM’s work and external and internal evaluation of it. If these are not available nationally, or incompletely so, they will have to be created locally.

4. Both the IPM and police chief describe the relationship between the two agencies as working positively. Both also commented on ongoing differences as regards direct IPM access to NOPD

data. They agree that some of these have been resolved and others remain. Superintendent Harrison indicated that, while NOPD is usually given the opportunity to review and comment on IPM reports before they are published, that opportunity is not always afforded in a timely manner and, when it is, final reports sometimes do not reflect NOPD's feedback.

Note: In addition to the pre-publication dialogue that now takes place, the IPM should adopt the OIG's longstanding practice of affording an agency subject to a report to review and respond timely to a draft before a report is published, and include the agency's response as an addendum to the report.