Minutes
Racial Profiling Prevention and Data Oversight Board Regular Meeting

Pursuant to section EXECUTIVE BRANCH 20 ILCS 2715
Racial Profiling Prevention and Data Oversight Act
(625 ILCS 5/11-212)

February 23, 2026
10:00 am- 12:00 pm

Location
Via Zoom

Call to Order and Roll Call

Jermaine Harris (CHAIR) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The CHAIR announced a roll call of members.

Board Members Present & Absent

Member Names	Present	Absent
Bieneman, Holly (IDOT Designee)		x
Curran, John (IL State Senator)		x
Davis, William (IL House Representative)		x
De Jesus, José (IL State Police Designee)	x	
Futterman, Craig (Member of the Illinois Academic Community)	x	
Guzman, Dulce (**CO-CHAIR** Community Org. Representing Minority Interests)		x
Garcia, Delila (Law Enforcement)	x	
Harris, Jermaine (**CHAIR** – Law Enforcement)	x	
Jordan, Elizabeth	x	
Logan, Phyllis (Community Org. Representing Minority Interests)	x	
Sheehan, Patrick (IL House of Representative)		x
Thompson, Amy (Community Org. Representing Minority Interests)	x	

Also present were:

IDOT – Jessica Keldermans
IDOT – Holly Bienman
Morreale Communications – Ashni Pabley
Morreale Communications – Mary McIlvain

Meeting Summary

Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The approval of November 2025 meeting minutes was tabled until the February 2026 meeting due to meeting attendance at the start of the meeting.

Discussion Items and Updates

Mandatory Compliance Trainings

Mr. Harris covers the first agenda item which calls for an update regarding compliance trainings for board members to complete. Jessica Keldermans of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) stated that she emailed the IDOT ethics officer in November requesting the status of trainings. The ethics officer said that they will send out reminders for the board to complete the applicable trainings. The email will come from the ethics officer whose name is Ellen Bruce.

Mr. Harris noted that as board members receive the training notice, some may encounter difficulties with login credentials or password access, since much of that is system controlled. He added that having someone available to provide technical support will be helpful in ensuring members are able to complete and update their required training.

Mr. Harris asked if there were any additional comments on the matter. Hearing none, he stated that the board would move to subcommittee updates, beginning with the Law Enforcement Compliance Subcommittee.

Subcommittee Updates: Law Enforcement Compliance

Amy Thompson provided an update on behalf of the Law Enforcement Compliance Subcommittee, which includes Chair Jermaine Harris and Holly Bieneman. She explained that the subcommittee's recent focus has been on developing agency focus groups to build upon the results of the previously conducted survey of law enforcement agencies. The purpose of these focus groups is to better understand the causes of noncompliance, identify best practices from compliant departments, and determine what training, tools, or resources may improve data submission compliance statewide.

She noted that the subcommittee selected 17 agencies using a balanced set of criteria: compliance status (compliant, incomplete, and noncompliant agencies), geographic representation across the 10 Illinois State Police troops, agency size and population served, and the volume of traffic stops conducted. This approach is intended to ensure a diverse range of perspectives and operational contexts.

Ms. Thompson further explained that the focus groups will be led by IDOT's law enforcement liaisons, who have established relationships with many agencies through grant partnerships. These liaisons will conduct outreach and facilitate in-person discussions with knowledgeable department personnel. Draft focus group topics include agencies' policies and procedures for data collection and submission, their internal reporting processes, and the technology or resources that support—or hinder—their compliance efforts.

She stated that feedback from the law enforcement liaisons on the draft focus group questions is due Monday, after which the subcommittee will review and refine the questions as needed. Outreach to the selected agencies will follow, with the goal of completing all focus groups by May. The subcommittee anticipates reviewing results over the summer and presenting a summary to the board in preparation for the August meeting. Ms. Thompson then invited Mr. Harris to add any additional points and welcomed questions from board members.

Mr. Harris thanked the subcommittee for the thorough summary and expressed his appreciation for the work completed thus far. He emphasized the importance of framing the focus groups as an opportunity to inform and educate the board, rather than as an effort to penalize or single out any department. He noted that the board intends to send correspondence to participating agencies to clarify the purpose of the outreach and to set expectations, underscoring that the goal is to better understand agency needs and ultimately improve the board's ability to support and serve them. He opened the floor to questions.

Phyllis Logan asked whether the board could receive a list of the 17 agencies selected for the focus groups. She also inquired whether the draft data collection forms currently under development would be incorporated into the focus group discussions, specifically to gauge how agencies might respond to the proposed changes and whether that topic would be part of the conversation.

Ms. Thompson explained that the subcommittee has identified the 17 agencies for potential participation but has not yet conducted outreach to confirm their willingness to take part. As a result, the list remains tentative. She indicated that the board could review the list, with the understanding that it is not final.

Regarding the draft data collection forms, Ms. Thompson clarified that presenting the forms has not been a central component of the focus group framework. Instead, the discussions are structured to concentrate on agencies' existing policies and procedures for data collection and submission, how those processes are implemented in practice, and what resources, tools, or technological support may be needed to facilitate compliance. She then invited Mr. Harris to add any further perspective if needed.

Mr. Harris clarified that the subcommittee's work is specifically focused on compliance, with the primary objective of achieving 100% data submission compliance across agencies. He explained that the focus group questions are centered on the technical aspects of data entry, including the systems, software, and submission platforms agencies use. The emphasis is on understanding the practical and operational challenges that may affect agency's ability to comply.

He further noted that the subcommittee did not want to publicly release the names of selected agencies before notifying them directly, in order to avoid misunderstandings or unintended strain in relationships. However, he stated that the list could be shared with the board, with the understanding that the agencies have not yet been contacted and that participation has not been finalized.

Ms. Thompson asked Mary McIlvain to share the screen with the agency list.

Ms. Thompson directed members' attention to the list displayed on the screen, noting that the agencies were categorized by size (small, medium, and large) and that additional details were provided for each. The chart included population served, current study submission status (complete, incomplete, or noncompliant), the applicable Illinois State Police troop, and whether the agency already has an established relationship with an IDOT law enforcement liaison grant administrator.

She explained that agencies without an identified grant administrator would represent new outreach efforts for the liaisons. Ms. Thompson then invited questions from the board.

Mr. Harris echoed Thompson's call for questions. There were no questions. Mr. Harris moved onto the update from the Data Collection Forms subcommittee.

Subcommittee Update: Data Collection Forms

Phyllis Logan stated that she would briefly address the matter. She noted that much of the prior discussion is reflected in the meeting minutes and that the subcommittee has not met since that time. She added that a meeting is being scheduled for March, at which point the group can revisit and review the information documented in the minutes.

Craig Futterman offered several questions for consideration. First, he noted that a small number of the proposed changes required legislative action and recalled that materials had been prepared for Representative Davis to introduce. He stated that he was unaware of the current status and asked whether the legislation had been filed or advanced.

Second, he emphasized that the board's recommendations would benefit from law enforcement input regarding feasibility, potential modifications, and practical implementation. He asked Chair Harris and other members for suggestions on the most effective process for obtaining that feedback.

Finally, he referenced additional board feedback related to technical or "cleanup" revisions, rather than substantive changes. He explained that the subcommittee had taken careful notes but believed it would be prudent to obtain broader input from law enforcement before implementing those refinements. He invited responses and further discussion, particularly regarding the legislative update and the best approach for engaging law enforcement in meaningful dialogue.

Jessica Keldermans provided an update regarding the legislative matter. She stated that she had not received a response from Representative Davis. She explained that she initially sent him the proposed changes either during the week of the last board meeting or shortly thereafter, followed by an additional update just before Christmas. She also sent a follow-up email approximately one week prior to the deadline for submitting proposed changes to the Legislative Reference Bureau (LRB), which is responsible for drafting and finalizing legislative language. She noted that the deadline was in mid-January—approximately January 13 or 16—but she has not received confirmation as to whether the proposal was submitted.

Keldermans also shared that she had recently spoken with Jose and Lieutenant Andrew Kazenski of the Illinois State Police regarding the draft form. She noted that Lieutenant Kazenski raised several concerns and that they were exploring the possibility of having both individuals participate in an upcoming subcommittee meeting to discuss those issues directly. She invited José De Jesus to comment further, noting that she had her notes available and could summarize the lieutenant's feedback if needed.

Mr. De Jesus explained that Lieutenant Kazenski works in a division of the Illinois State Police that is heavily involved in data collection across multiple areas of the agency.

He noted that the purpose of their meeting was to review the draft form and identify potential improvements based on the lieutenant's practical experience. The lieutenant offered several suggestions aimed at making the form more effective and facilitating the collection of accurate information. Mr. De Jesus confirmed that they had met to discuss these points and expressed hope that the suggested revisions would be thoughtfully considered. He then deferred to Jessica to provide additional detail.

Ms. Keldermans summarized some of the specific feedback provided by Lieutenant Kazenski. She noted that he raised concerns about the use of free-form text fields, explaining that such entries can result in inconsistent data. He recommended replacing certain free-text fields with dropdown menus where possible, in order to standardize responses and improve data quality.

She also shared that he suggested incorporating GPS markers, as this would facilitate mapping and enhance the ability to analyze location-based data more efficiently.

Ms. Keldermans also noted that Lieutenant Kazenski raised a concern regarding the collection of use-of-force data. She explained that, according to the lieutenant, the Illinois State Police already require officers to complete a separate form whenever force is used. She asked Mr. De Jesus to confirm that understanding, indicating that duplicative reporting could be a consideration in evaluating the draft form.

Mr. De Jesus confirmed that the Illinois State Police utilize a field report system that captures relevant data through designated fields. He explained that when force is used, ISP requires completion of a separate use-of-force packet, which includes additional documentation. He noted that this process ensures that all relevant use-of-force information is formally recorded and categorized. While he acknowledged he was unsure of the specific procedures used by the

Chicago Police Department, he stated that it is likely that most agencies maintain similar reporting mechanisms.

Ms. Keldermans added that Lieutenant Kazenski also expressed concern about minimizing the amount of time officers remain on the roadside during a stop. She explained that expanding the form could lengthen the time required to complete documentation, thereby extending the duration of traffic stops.

She further noted that he pointed out variations in terminology across law enforcement agencies, indicating that agencies may use different terms to describe similar actions or categories, which could create inconsistencies in reporting.

Ms. Keldermans continued by noting that Lieutenant Kazenski suggested using the term "canine" instead of "police dog" on the form to align with standard law enforcement terminology. She also referenced his observation regarding the structure of the form, specifically that if a respondent answers "yes" to the final question in Section D related to a pat-down or frisk, Section E is triggered. He suggested that the board may want to consider reducing certain data points to streamline the form and avoid unnecessary expansion.

Ms. Keldermans explained that she has invited both Lieutenant Kazenski and Mr. De Jesus to attend an upcoming subcommittee meeting so that the lieutenant could directly share his additional concerns and recommendations.

She further proposed leveraging the law enforcement liaisons in a manner similar to the planned focus groups with the 17 selected agencies. She suggested distributing the draft forms to the liaisons for their feedback. She noted that the lead liaison, Scott Kristiansen, along with another former police chief who works within the Bureau of Safety Programs and Engineering, had previously provided helpful feedback during the survey process. She added that many of the other liaisons are former chiefs or retired officers and could offer valuable practical insight. She offered this as a potential starting point for gathering additional law enforcement input.

Mr. Futterman expressed support for the proposed approach, stating that, in his view, it was a constructive path forward. He emphasized the value of engaging in direct dialogue with law enforcement rather than relying solely on written feedback. He noted that collaborative discussion would allow the board and law enforcement representatives to work through concerns together and identify practical solutions.

Mr. Futterman underscored the importance of ensuring that any revisions are workable in real-world settings while still advancing the board's objectives. He framed the effort as one focused on partnership and problem-solving, rather than positioning the board and law enforcement in opposition.

Ms. Keldermans asked for clarification on next steps, noting that the Forms Subcommittee was tentatively scheduled to meet on March 11. She inquired whether the board preferred to first meet with representatives from the Illinois State Police to discuss their feedback, incorporate any necessary revisions, and then circulate the updated form to the law enforcement liaisons for further review. She invited guidance on the preferred sequence for moving forward.

Mr. Futterman stated that it would be beneficial for members of law enforcement to attend the next subcommittee meeting to provide feedback and engage in a collaborative discussion. He emphasized the value of working through the issues together in real time rather than limiting the exchange to written comments.

Mr. Harris offered an additional point for the board's consideration. He emphasized the importance of coordinating communications as members engage with law enforcement agencies, noting that the board should present itself in a unified and professional manner. He cautioned against duplicative or inconsistent outreach and suggested that members consult with one another or across subcommittees before making requests to ensure alignment.

He expressed confidence in Ms. Keldermans' ability to help coordinate these efforts across subcommittees and highlighted the value of the law enforcement liaisons, describing them as an outstanding resource based on prior experience. He stated that he was encouraged that all members would now have the opportunity to leverage that support.

Mr. Harris asked whether there were any additional comments or updates from the Data Collection Forms Subcommittee.

Ms. Thompson offered a brief comment expressing appreciation for the work of the Data Collection Forms Subcommittee and the thoughtful revisions under consideration. She noted, in response to feedback shared from Lieutenant Kazenski, that while other datasets such as arrest data or use-of-force reports may already capture related information, those datasets are not always easily reconcilable with traffic stop data. Drawing from her experience working extensively with the data, she explained that it can be challenging to link a specific traffic stop to a related arrest or use-of-force incident when the information is housed in separate systems. For that reason, she expressed support for including key indicators within a single form to improve clarity and analytical consistency.

At the same time, Ms. Thompson acknowledged the importance of being mindful of the reporting burden on officers. She emphasized the need to balance operational practicality with the board's broader objective of collecting accurate, comprehensive data to better understand what occurs during traffic stops.

Mr. Futterman added a follow-up point, noting that he agreed with the concerns raised. He clarified that the objective would not be to require officers to enter the same information multiple times. Instead, he suggested exploring whether existing reporting mechanisms such as Chicago Police Department tactical response reports or Illinois State Police forms could be harmonized.

He explained that, ideally, if agencies are already collecting certain data elements, those data points could be standardized and electronically imported into the required form. The goal, he emphasized, would be to ensure consistency and completeness without increasing the time burden on officers in the field.

Jermaine Harris shared his perspective based on his experience, noting that one of the primary challenges is that internal systems often do not communicate effectively with one another. He explained that difficulties in integrating data across different platforms can hinder the board's ability to obtain a complete and accurate picture. He further observed that proprietary software, contractual limitations, and administrative processes frequently complicate efforts to align systems. However, he highlighted the standardized traffic stop report as a potential area of opportunity, noting that it is universally used by agencies across the state. He suggested that the board consider how this common reporting tool might be leveraged to improve data consistency and streamline reporting efforts.

Mr. Harris asked whether there were any additional comments regarding data collection. Hearing none, he stated that the board would move on to the next agenda item concerning model policies and training and inquired whether anyone could provide an update from that subcommittee.

Subcommittee Update: Model Policies and Training

Ms. Keldermans responded that Mary had reached out to the members of the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee and that they are in the process of scheduling a meeting in the near future.

Mr. Harris noted that the board had previously encountered challenges in forming the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee but expressed appreciation that additional members had since joined. He stated that he looked forward to the group beginning its work and providing updates in the near future, and he thanked those who volunteered to participate.

He then asked whether there were any final subcommittee updates. Hearing none, he stated that the meeting was proceeding on schedule and transitioned to the next agenda item regarding updates on logo options for the board.

Oversight Board Logo Development

Mary McIlvain provided an update on the board's logo development. She explained that they had been tasked with creating a logo to be incorporated into official materials such as meeting minutes, presentation templates, and agendas.

She noted that several design options are currently being developed and will be shared with board members via email. Members will be asked to participate in a survey or poll to provide feedback on the proposed designs. Ms. McIlvain indicated that additional details would be circulated prior to the next board meeting in June and encouraged members to look for the forthcoming email, adding that she would follow up as needed to ensure feedback is received.

After discussing the logistics and next steps, Mr. Harris asked whether there were any additional questions. Hearing none, he acknowledged the discussion and moved the meeting forward.

Open Discussion

Jermaine Harris noted that the meeting was progressing ahead of schedule and announced that the board would move into the open discussion portion of the agenda. He invited members to share any additional comments, revisit prior topics, or raise new matters for consideration before the board.

Phyllis Logan inquired about the status of the legislative proposal previously discussed with Representative Davis. She asked whether there was a projected timeline for when the agreed-upon legislative change might be introduced or advanced. She noted that only one of the board's recommendations required a statutory amendment and sought clarification on any anticipated response or next steps from Representative Davis.

Jessica Keldermans responded that she had not received any update from Representative Davis and had hoped he would be present for the meeting. She explained that, from IDOT's perspective, there is no established timeline, as any action would depend on the representative's plans. She added that if members of the board wished to reach out to Representative Davis directly for clarification, they were welcome to do so.

Phyllis Logan responded that she could attempt to reach out but was mindful that IDOT had already initiated communication and did not want to appear to overstep.

She then raised a broader question regarding the board's strategic direction. She asked whether there is a clearly defined strategy, set of directives, or written plan outlining the board's overall goals beyond revising forms and improving law enforcement compliance. Specifically, she inquired whether there are established timelines, measurable objectives, or projected milestones for the next 12 months across the various subcommittees.

Ms. Logan emphasized the importance of having defined end goals and progress benchmarks, stating that she did not want the board to find itself years from now continuing to revisit the same issues without measurable advancement.

Mr. Harris acknowledged Ms. Logan's concern and stated that he agreed with the importance of establishing clear direction and measurable progress. He explained that, from the perspective of the Compliance Subcommittee, the guiding objective or "North Star" has been achieving 100% data submission compliance across all agencies. He noted that this goal serves as the framework for the subcommittee's current and future work.

He further shared that, at the subcommittee level, discussions have included longer-term considerations such as potential incentives for compliance and possible consequences for noncompliance. However, he emphasized that those steps would come later, as the board works progressively toward full compliance.

Mr. Harris also acknowledged structural challenges, including the limited frequency of full board meetings and the competing professional responsibilities of volunteer members. He stated that maintaining momentum and setting measurable benchmarks within each subcommittee would be critical to ensuring progress. He concluded by affirming that the board's efforts should be purposeful and goal-oriented, rather than repetitive, and agreed that defining clearer objectives and timelines would be beneficial moving forward.

Ms. Thompson expressed appreciation for the question raised and agreed that it was an important discussion for the board to have. She noted that while the current subcommittees are engaged in meaningful work, the statute establishing the board provides broader authority and responsibilities that could support additional goals and initiatives.

She referenced statutory language outlining the board's powers and duties, including coordinating the development, adoption, and implementation of plans and strategies to eliminate racial profiling in Illinois, as well as creating public awareness programs in minority communities to educate individuals about racial profiling and their civil rights. Ms. Thompson suggested that the board should consider whether additional subcommittees or a strategic shift in focus may be appropriate as existing subcommittee objectives are met.

She also highlighted the related Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Study: Data Collection and Use Task Force, noting that it is beginning to advance recommendations developed in the prior year. As a member of that task force, she emphasized the opportunity for collaboration and alignment between the two bodies. Ms. Thompson concluded by encouraging coordination to ensure both groups collectively advance the overarching goals for which the study and board were established.

In response, Mr. Harris acknowledged the suggestion and reiterated the importance of strengthening coordination between the board and the task force. He noted that efforts are already underway to build stronger connections between the two bodies, including recent discussions with task force leadership. He expressed optimism that improved coordination potentially including attendance at one another's meetings would foster more productive collaboration.

Mr. Harris further emphasized that the statutory framework provides significant opportunity for meaningful impact. He stated that his motivation for serving on the board is to move beyond simply documenting disparities and instead work toward tangible solutions. He agreed that the discussion underscored the need for measurable progress and concrete outcomes, rather than revisiting the same issues year after year without substantive change.

Ms. Keldermans followed up to clarify that IDOT is not formally advancing or sponsoring the proposed legislation. She explained that, for that reason, it may be appropriate for a member of the board to reach out directly to Representative Davis to inquire about the status of the proposal and determine his intended next steps.

Mr. Harris stated that if a member of the subcommittee could connect with him to provide additional context on the specific legislative request, he would be willing to assist with outreach to Representative Davis to follow up on the matter.

Ms. Keldermans asked Mr. Harris whether he would like her to forward the most recent email she sent to Representative Davis so that he could review the correspondence and have the necessary context for follow-up.

Ms. Harris agreed.

Public Comment

Mr. Harris transitioned the meeting to the public comment portion of the agenda and invited any statements, updates, or remarks from guests in attendance. Hearing none, he moved the discussion forward.

New Business

He then opened the floor for new business and requested suggestions for agenda items for the next board meeting, scheduled for Thursday, June 4. He also asked whether there are any guest speakers requested or additional updates beyond the standard subcommittee reports that members would like included on the upcoming agenda.

Ms. Logan asked whether a legislative calendar would be available indicating the status of the General Assembly around the time of the June 4 meeting. A response was provided that the schedule should be available by June.

Ms. Keldermans explained that the meeting had been moved from May to June specifically because the General Assembly was expected to be in session in May. She noted that by the June meeting date, the legislative schedule should be clearer and more readily available.

Mr. Harris asked whether there were any final thoughts, concerns, or questions from members. Hearing none, he noted that the board did not have a quorum and that the approval of the minutes would therefore be tabled until the next meeting. He then adjourned the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation.