A. Of the

Ed Kangethe: Got it? Okay, that was loud. I'm getting everyone and welcome to the

Ed Kangethe: January 2020 third meeting of the Johns Hopkins Police Accountability Board.

Ed Kangethe: The theme of this meeting tonight will be board structure and governance.

Ed Kangethe: I wanted to first start off

Ed Kangethe: and just give some thoughts on the

Ed Kangethe: public town Hall meeting that we had in in December First, I want to thank Erica Bridgewood for moderating. She did an excellent job.

Ed Kangethe: Secondly, I wanted to thank all the members of the public that commented.

Ed Kangethe: And just know that your comments we took them to heart, and we're listening, and

Ed Kangethe: we are working on a way to properly address what has been asked to last.

Ed Kangethe: So
Ed Kangethe: i'll just say that for now.

Ed Kangethe: first of all, I know that the meeting minutes from

Ed Kangethe: November and December were forwarded to board. Members have had a chance to review those minutes.

Ed Kangethe: I see some hidden on it. So okay

Ed Kangethe: at this time when members like to offer up any amendments or corrections to the maintenance for both months.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, I see

Ed Kangethe: no one's.

Ed Kangethe: So okay.

Ed Kangethe: At this time I entertain a motion to approve the minutes from November.

Ed Kangethe: They have a motion to it to to approve the minutes from November.

Michael Wilkinson: second

Ed Kangethe: we have motion and property. Second, all those agreement

Ed Kangethe: sing a while by saying I,
Ed Kangethe: although the

Ed Kangethe: all those opposed Nay.

Ed Kangethe: thank you. The meetings from November will be

Ed Kangethe: the meetings from a number are adopted.

Ed Kangethe: Did anyone have any objections or corrections for the meeting from
the December meeting?

Ed Kangethe: objection to that, I make a motion that we approved the minute
from the December meeting.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you most. It has been

Ed Kangethe: presenting, and property. Second, all those in the group signify
by saying, I

Ed Kangethe: appreciate all those opposed. Nay.

Ed Kangethe: say the motion car, the meetings from December minutes will be
adopted.
Ed Kangethe: Thank you. Everybody for
allowing us to get past that little house, that brief housekeeping.

Ed Kangethe: So the first topic on new business on tonight's agenda is review your finalization of the bylaws.

Ed Kangethe: So have all members have a chance to review the bylaws in the current drafts format.

Ed Kangethe: Okay.

Ed Kangethe: And Michael, I'm coming to you, just want to make sure everybody has a chance to review.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, seeing as though it seems like everyone has had a chance to review.

Ed Kangethe: Are there any questions or any proposed addition to the or any proposed changes to the bylaws. And, Mike, I see you have your hand raised first, so the floor is yours. Yeah, thank you all for allowing me to talk on this. So one of the I guess revisions I would like to propose. And this is something that

Michael Wilkinson: Elisa and I have been specifically privy to is the fact that the term limits for members are 2 years for non-stud members in one year for student members that doesn't come from anywhere specifically in the Charter.
That's just something that the board, or whatever this was, first of the post came up with.

Michael Wilkinson: and what I would like to propose is revision, because my understanding the one year for student members was. If students are graduating, they could still serve, although I I would argue that graduation is just like any major life event, and to restrict everyone who might want to serve for multiple years. It might not be graduating

Michael Wilkinson: to one year just because of the subset of folks who might be, it seems, a little bit unfair, or a little bit kind of seclusionary of students who want to serve for multiple terms, especially if you have, you know, mid career or younger students who might be able to provide valuable feedback over multiple years.

Michael Wilkinson: I know. Obviously, graduation happens more commonly that for students and other major life events for other folks. But it seems odd to arbitrarily cut it shorter for students, because they might graduate

Michael Wilkinson: before their term is over, where, if they serve 2 years and they have to leave halfway through, then we'd find a replacement for them, just like we'd find a replacement for any position when a member moves on as we recently had to do is I, I I forget you. But one of our members was

Michael Wilkinson: elevated to a different office, and they had to leave. So I don't see why students would be any different in this, and why we are making them different by de facto.

Ed Kangethe: if nobody else wants the floor, only thing I would respond to that, Michael is maybe someone from the administration could chime in on that, because

Ed Kangethe: that wasn't something that was put before the Board members. So we didn't have any. Input As to why

Ed Kangethe: the student term was a year as opposed to 2.
Branville Bard He/Him: If you, if you're looking for from me to time, and i'm. I'm not sure where the term one came in for students, and I I have no objection to that recommendation.

Ed Kangethe: Katie. I do. You see your hands raised the floor? Yours.

Katie O'Conor: and I would just add that I think we did ask

Katie O'Conor: fourth year, or, you know, final year students to participate. And so I would just echo everything, Michael said, which is that there's a lot of value, and you know people leave all kinds of jobs, and so I think I would second

Katie O'Conor: or be open to Michael's proposal. If that is amenable to the Board.

Ed Kangethe: would anyone else like to comment on Michael's proposal.

Ed Kangethe: At least I see your hand raised. The floor is yours.

Elise Favia (she/her): Yeah.

Elise Favia (she/her): So

Elise Favia (she/her): I know that there had been some stuff in email. So I wanted to

Elise Favia (she/her): put that in the background as well. Part of the reason why
this had been brought up with

Elise Favia (she/her): that

Elise Favia (she/her): both Michael and I were kind of blind cited by the need to reapply it wasn't made kind of obvious.

Elise Favia (she/her): and it didn't seem that there was given any priority or due to the fact that people were already on the board. So in in case people aren't aware they're neither. Michael and I are returning. Next year

Elise Favia (she/her): there will be new student board members, and

Elise Favia (she/her): both Michael and I would have liked to return.

Elise Favia (she/her): but Aren't being given the opportunity to return.

Elise Favia (she/her): and so

Elise Favia (she/her): oh!

Elise Favia (she/her): We had thought that if

Elise Favia (she/her): the option to move it to 2 years.
Elise Favia (she/her): like everyone else, and then give people the option to resign or make it one year, but make it so that people can optionally extend to a second term without having to go through an application again. Just some sort of recognition that you know, people are ready on the board. and they can have the same, you know, input as everyone else. And it just I mean it just kind of the way it was handled this year was just a bit hurtful, honestly. So it was a bit hurtful, honestly. So we're kind of making sure that student members get the same input, and if they don't want to continue, that's one thing. But...
Elise Favia (she/her): student members that want to continue should be given the opportunity.

Elise Favia (she/her): I think.

Ed Kangethe: Is there anyone else that would like to speak on Michael's motion?

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I I just simply want to say that

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I think there was a discussion where I was present.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: and it was simply said that

Sonja Merchant-Jones: the reason there is a difference

Sonja Merchant-Jones: was to give students other students an opportunity

Sonja Merchant-Jones: to serve, and I'll just end it right there. That was kind of

Sonja Merchant-Jones: the answer.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I can't recall exactly

Sonja Merchant-Jones: where they came up.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: but

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I was. I was. I was concerned, as well as the differences and the changes, and I believe
Sonja Merchant-Jones: that is what was offered.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: That's all.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, my son, for that point of clarity.

Ed Kangethe: Lori, I see your hands raised. The floor is yours.

Lorraine Dean: I think that at least it just brought up. Actually, it
makes me think there are actually 2 issues to address here. So I agree. I don't
think that the student members need to necessarily be only allowed for

Lorraine Dean: one year, especially if they're continuing on a students. So
maybe it's, you know, one year for student members only, if graduating, or
something like that, right, but otherwise. But even then I mean.

Lorraine Dean: they're still carrying some institutional knowledge with them.

Lorraine Dean: But I also think there's this other question. It like, she was
saying, even for existing members.

Lorraine Dean: this possibility for board members to optionally extend without
the need to reapply. There is a second thing

Lorraine Dean: that for me is coming out of this conversation.

Lorraine Dean: and that could apply to students and on students.

Ed Kangethe: So.

Ed Kangethe: and I see Michael and Katie Hand is up, and the interested keep
Ed Kangethe: keep us moving. I'll just say that, Lori, you're right. Those are 2 separate issues, and I guess we can. I would say the second piece about the reapplying for existing members. We can maybe table that to another meeting, and just concentrate on Michael's motion.

Ed Kangethe: and my apologies. I saw Michael, Kate, Michael, and Katie. I saw your hand go up at the same time. I believe so.

Whoever like to go first out of you, too?

Michael Wilkinson: sure. So I I was thinking, like also following on Orange's point, that the appointment process itself is not actually laid out in the Bylaws. It is somewhat opaque to me, I think, to many of the members here which kinda gets to a Lisa's point of and I, you know, part of this is also over email discussion of like.

Well, is there any priority being given to current board members. Are they just looking at each slate completely fresh, and not considering that you know who's actually making the appointments? I know some of that is detailed out in the actual, the the charter, but especially in the bylaws. It is not clear to me how the actual appointments are being made other than specifically the one community member or the the one elected by the mayor and the one elected by the City Council President.
Michael Wilkinson: The all it says at the end is that all 13 are subject to confirmation by the Maryland State Center.

00:12:58.860 --> 00:13:01.039
Michael Wilkinson: But there's no further follow up on like

00:13:01.110 --> 00:13:04.940
Michael Wilkinson: what in the criteria who's doing the appointing any anything like that.

00:13:05.270 --> 00:13:06.410
so

00:13:06.540 --> 00:13:15.410
Michael Wilkinson: we can maybe table this for next time, but also maybe adding, and some are be as of making that more clear of who is doing the appointing? What are the criteria, and so on, and so forth.

00:13:16.610 --> 00:13:19.889
Ed Kangethe: in the interest of keeping us moving. I'll. Dr. Bart.

00:13:20.030 --> 00:13:33.189
Ed Kangethe: You'll be the kind of close I'll let you respond from administration, and then, if we we choose to move on, Michael's motion will do that. So, Dr. Bart. So. I think the the appointment process is

00:13:33.200 --> 00:13:41.550
Branville Bard He/Him: something that's given to the university, and I don't know that it necessarily should be covered in the bylaws. However.

00:13:41.790 --> 00:13:44.760
Branville Bard He/Him: we're committed to make sure that that process is

00:13:44.990 --> 00:14:00.520
Branville Bard He/Him: transparent, and I I think that already stated that I don't oppose my most recommendation. So I think there's something that the Board, it may be best handled with the Board, just making a recommendation to the University about.

00:14:01.730 --> 00:14:03.950
Branville Bard He/Him: and and to consider

00:14:04.510 --> 00:14:08.389
Branville Bard He/Him: already existing members in a reappointment process when we move forward.
Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Dr. Barford, I suggested, and just noted

Ed Kangethe: so.

Ed Kangethe: and it's the mike. I see your heads up. Do you have additional comment, or I just forgot to lower it.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, so i'll recognize you. This is your motion.

Ed Kangethe: I just want to make sure I got the spirit of it. Your Your motion is to have the student members terms be 2 years is scheduled. One year is that

Michael Wilkinson: Yeah, I would. Yeah. I motion to change the verbiage to 2 years, for all members get rid of the extra clauses and all that.

Ed Kangethe: That. Well, since you put it on the floor, i'll second it.

Ed Kangethe: So we have emotional forward. That's been properly introduced. In second.

Ed Kangethe: all those in agreement signify by saying I

Ed Kangethe: all those.

Ed Kangethe: all those opposed. Nay.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, the motion is carried. The garbage will be updated.

Okay.
Ed Kangethe: in the least. I see your hand is raised.

Elise Favia (she/her): I don't have an objection to passing based on this. So that's why I voted for it. But we want to make sure that

Elise Favia (she/her): with updating it that we clarify that people that are graduating before the 2 years would be up, would still be eligible to apply

Elise Favia (she/her): so they could. They could leave their term early.

Elise Favia (she/her): So I don't know if that has to be specified

Elise Favia (she/her): in the bylaws, but just would want to make sure that that didn't get

Elise Favia (she/her): we? We can figure out how to

Elise Favia (she/her): best. You know. Figure that out later.

Elise Favia (she/her): but I just want to make sure we don't forget to make sure that

Elise Favia (she/her): isn't affected.

Ed Kangethe: I appreciate that, and i'm sure that'll be captured in the notes.

Ed Kangethe: But thank you for phrasing that this year.

Okay.
Ed Kangethe: So

00:16:20.340 --> 00:16:24.499
Ed Kangethe: being as though we’re revealing to finalize the bomb last night out there.

00:16:25.050 --> 00:16:27.060
Ed Kangethe: Michael, and I appreciate you.

00:16:28.110 --> 00:16:36.680
Ed Kangethe: Go on to just the appointment process going through the appointment process so kind of following the bylaws template as is laid out.

00:16:37.250 --> 00:16:38.700
Ed Kangethe: We could talk about

00:16:39.660 --> 00:16:44.500
Ed Kangethe: board, elected, elected positions, and I know previously.

00:16:47.940 --> 00:16:54.739
Ed Kangethe: I know Previously there was some discussion about

00:16:54.890 --> 00:17:00.330
Ed Kangethe: the structure of having a flat structure versus a hierarchy structure.

00:17:00.390 --> 00:17:02.260
Ed Kangethe: So I just kind of wanted to

00:17:02.720 --> 00:17:04.710
Ed Kangethe: revisit that conversation.

00:17:08.290 --> 00:17:10.629
Ed Kangethe: Is there any members that has

00:17:11.540 --> 00:17:13.099
Ed Kangethe: any thoughts.
Ed Kangethe: Hey, Logan? I see your hand is raised. The floor is yours.

Logan Weygandt: Thank you, LED.

Logan Weygandt: So I think this is an area that probably is one of the main areas for focus this evening.

Logan Weygandt: what we have written down that we voted to include elected positions is something that we don't have, and I think we need to sort of finalize our structure. If we're gonna build one in in order to sort of keep the Ford movement in progress.

Logan Weygandt: we need to sort of

Logan Weygandt: finalize our structure. If we're gonna build one in in order to sort of keep the Ford movement in progress.

Logan Weygandt: I would say, you know, having watched how the board has worked over the last several months, I think.

Logan Weygandt: and you've done a fantastic job of being sort of the de facto spokesperson, and I would again

Logan Weygandt: sort of support the idea of a flat structure with somebody who is designated as a speaker, which I think is sort of the role that you've been
taking on in the last several months. So i'm just gonna put it out there that I would

Logan Weygandt: suggest that we have a flat hierarchy, but with somebody either
named voted for, or simply who becomes the speaker. Spokesperson, etc.

Ed Kangethe: And Logan. I definitely appreciate the cool. Thank you

Ed Kangethe: so. The way I saw it is at least.

Ed Kangethe: Katie the Noa. So at least the floor is yours.

Elise Favia (she/her): I agree with keeping things relatively flat, but I do
think

Elise Favia (she/her): I just mentioned the outstanding having some like people
in charge of various things with various titles, is probably a good idea, like
having, if we set up

Elise Favia (she/her): different committees, we should have.

Elise Favia (she/her): you know, like

Elise Favia (she/her): almost like committee chairs. So like a point person for
me, communication is, we somewhat have a Communications

Elise Favia (she/her): Committee. So there should be one person in charge of
the Communications Committee as like the

Elise Favia (she/her): on that kind of like the speaker for it.
Elise Favia (she/her): If

Elise Favia (she/her): so like the agenda setting lead, you might be heavily. The communications lead, I think, having an open meetings at Compliance officer would be a good idea.

Elise Favia (she/her): Oh.

Elise Favia (she/her): I apologize for that.

Elise Favia (she/her): So I think, having you know, people in charge of various things might be a good idea, but not necessarily

Elise Favia (she/her): having people that are

Elise Favia (she/her): necessarily above others in hierarchy, just

Elise Favia (she/her): on equal footing, but

Elise Favia (she/her): to kind of spread the workload better

Elise Favia (she/her): and make it clear who's

Elise Favia (she/her): it, so that you know who to go to? For what? When we're

Elise Favia (she/her): discussing things or like emailing about things?
Elise Favia (she/her): If that makes sense?

00:20:34.830 --> 00:20:36.720
Ed Kangethe: No, it makes absolute sense.

00:20:38.760 --> 00:20:43.660
Ed Kangethe: And Kate, if released. This friend, it's with our comments, Katie. The floor is yours.

00:20:44.820 --> 00:20:54.169
Katie O'Conor: So I was in my hey? This period when the discussion originated about having a flat structure. So I would like to know a little bit more about

00:20:54.760 --> 00:20:56.800
Katie O'Conor: why?

00:20:57.240 --> 00:20:58.480
Katie O'Conor: Because.

00:20:58.890 --> 00:21:07.139
Katie O'Conor: like, I am very aware of the idea of, you know, silent power, and how people can have, you know, implicit power and all that. But I feel like

00:21:08.130 --> 00:21:15.490
Katie O'Conor: even just assigning people to titles and responsibilities. Doesn't necessarily give them more power

00:21:15.620 --> 00:21:17.420
Katie O'Conor: like.

00:21:17.680 --> 00:21:20.610
Katie O'Conor: and I just feel like some of the

00:21:20.760 --> 00:21:39.599
Katie O'Conor: a lot of our positive progress has come from us, having people with certain roles like LED, for example, and a lot of our delays of doing things may be attributable to us not really having anyone instilled with certain roles and responsibilities. And I don't know that just having roles and responsibilities

00:21:39.710 --> 00:21:41.360
Katie O'Conor: should conflate

00:21:41.410 --> 00:21:46.310
Katie O'Conor: with like undo or imbalance of power. So i'm just wondering if we could

00:21:46.710 --> 00:21:50.030
Katie O'Conor: explore that a little bit more instead of just

00:21:51.080 --> 00:22:00.940
Katie O'Conor: leaving that as a blanket statement. And maybe it's because I missed the long discourse that happened already. And so I apologize. If it's just because it was inherited from last year

00:22:04.430 --> 00:22:07.639
Ed Kangethe: no worries. And just to kind of add to that I

00:22:08.070 --> 00:22:19.280
Ed Kangethe: The discussion was more so, I think, to at least point just to kind of make sure that we were equally spreading the responsibilities around. I don't think necessarily

00:22:19.630 --> 00:22:20.930
Ed Kangethe: it was about

Ed Kangethe: being power being concentrated in any one or 2 board members hands. But that was just my

00:22:27.030 --> 00:22:34.820
Ed Kangethe: take away from that discussion. Other members can chat in when, at the appropriate time, Noah. You on deck, sir.

00:22:36.030 --> 00:22:36.950
Noah Patton: Thank you.

00:22:37.020 --> 00:22:39.130
Noah Patton: Yeah, I just say I I mean.

00:22:39.380 --> 00:22:49.189
Noah Patton: I'm very much opposed the idea of any you know single member, regardless whatever title they lead. They have having a greater, some sort of greater voting power.

00:22:49.290 --> 00:22:59.900
Noah Patton: you know, over others, and i'd i'd say that that wasn't imagined by the legislation that created this board. However, i'd say, you know.
Noah Patton: I think, that this

Noah Patton: The flat structure, works for quite a few organizations that are similar to our own. And so, I think, having

Noah Patton: excellent individuals in charge of various aspects, is the way to go.

Noah Patton: I I don't. I I just worry about overthinking it a little bit.

Ed Kangethe: and know if you're finished with your comments, Terry. The floor is yours.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Yes, hello, everyone. I agree with the whole process of exploring

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: the flat versus hierarchical. I I'm. A proponent of just making. Certainly we have some level of structure. I don't know I mean the difference between fled or hierarchical is probably something that I would

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: like to understand a little bit more about, because I believe that

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: we could all have a different perspective on what that means, but I do think the structure is really important, I think. Then, having board training and understanding, you know, being real clear about the bylaws understanding, you know, just basic Roberts rules. And if we're going to be, you know, more

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: loosely structured in that versus
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Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: making certain that we are real clear about how you make a motion, and you know what we need to do in terms of the voting process. I think all of those things are important, which is another part of structure that has nothing to do with the actual offices.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: per se. And then, lastly, I think, when we think of structure, we need to think of a balance like it. You know it is.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I I agree he's been doing a a great job in the time that I have been here. But when we have like, say, a person who is quote unquote lead, then if there is a co-lead, then that should potentially be a student, or that should be a faculty or staff member, so that there is some consistency as far as messaging, and that we're coming from different vantage points, so that you have different perspectives when you have the the person who is in the quote Unquote speaker role.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: quote Unquote lead, then if there is a co-lead, then that should potentially be a student, or that should be a faculty or staff member, so that there is some consistency as far as messaging, and that we're coming from different vantage points, so that you have different perspectives when you have the the person who is in the quote Unquote speaker role.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: and that's all

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I have to share for the moment. Thank you.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Terry, for your comments, Lori. The floor is yours.

Lorraine Dean: Sure this is actually Terry. You made a great segue. So when I think when we were first talking about this, one of the reasons we talked about a flat structure was because we were trying to avoid a couple of things. One is that we're trying to avoid. Essentially.
Lorraine Dean: one person ended up in the ending up being kind of the spokesperson to speak on behalf of a large group of people. So one there is this element of influence, and that's what we mean by kind of making sure everybody has equal power so wanting to make sure we set things up so that there wasn't just one person, for example, that you know that the media or the institution would go to who's speaking on behalf of all of us. That was one part, I think the other part is making sure that the the workload is spread around, and to make sure that it doesn't fall on

Lorraine Dean: 1 one person or 2 people. But it's something that is spread across a couple of different people, and potentially have some, for example.

Lorraine Dean: some co-chairs, and some committees. And we make this like, you know. There might even be committee leads that do the reporting. But essentially even the committee leads are this are equal to all of the committee members.

Lorraine Dean: So, Terry, to your point, I thought about a structure where maybe we have to like a pair of co-chairs, one that's essentially representing the community, one the community members, and one that's representing Hopkins members, and then, beyond that, we'll still have committees and things like that, but at the very least

there's a couple of people who are kind of visible.

Lorraine Dean: But again, that's the work should fall on them because the work is actually happening in the committees.

Ed Kangethe: You finish your comment, Laurie.

Lorraine Dean: Yes, yes.


Michael Wilkinson: I think it's clear that we all want people in like set positions, and I think probably a first important step that it seems like it's probably better to get to sooner rather than later, is actually deciding what those positions are, and that comes from deciding what the needs are right, you know, as I think, to other people's point.

Michael Wilkinson: the difference between hierarchical and flat for most people probably is just whether, like, who is the spokesperson, or who, if there's a existence of a president in a co-chair. However, that might be which is important to think about. But and I don't want to just circle keep circling on that specific piece of it. And I'd rather focus on what are the actual things that need to get done? What are the actual positions. We need outlining that and being very clear on on that. And then, as we're kind of outlining those, then it becomes a discussion of okay, well do we need a co-chair, or do we need a spokesperson, and how that contribute to any hierarchies, instead of discussing kind of the theoretical difference between the hierarchical or flat, though those are very important discussions. I just haven't quite seen things get laid out as far as like. What are the specific things we need, and I think that's probably a better use. In my opinion, a better use of our time is laying out what specifically we need, and what role? Specifically we.

So

Michael Wilkinson: I you.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Michael Logan. The floor is yours.
Logan Weygandt: Thank you, LED. So a couple of quick thoughts. I love the discussion.

I think.

Logan Weygandt: sort of following up on what Michael said. I agree. It would be nice for us to get to the positions like the structured positions that we need. I think I have a little bit of an objection to what is written in the bylaws currently, which is the Board, is to include elected positions, and I think that's where some of us may be having a bit of a stumbling block like. Thus far it seems like most people who have stepped onto committees or been spokesperson have been volunteer. So I wonder if maybe that's the distinction that we need to make is that people can volunteer for these positions as opposed to being voted in. And then the second thing I absolutely think we should get hopefully after we sort of make that subtle distinction move towards figuring out exactly what positions we need and how those roles are filled.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Logan. That's a good point, Terry. I saw your hand was up for a while. But you put it down. Did you still want to make a comment?

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: No, I hadn't lowered it when I initially made my comment, so I

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: lowered it. Thank you

all right.

Ed Kangethe: No worries, thank you to I, Michael.

Ed Kangethe: Did you have another comment, or just saying it? Sorry.
Ed Kangethe: Got it.

Okay.

Ed Kangethe: So I think it is important to to exactly define roles as to what exactly is that? Well, we're going to have a chair person co-chairs.

Ed Kangethe: the spokesman, and then far as standing committees like. Right now we have 2 committees. We have the at. We have the agenda setting committee, as well as the 100 and 50 Communications Committee.

Ed Kangethe: I I know personally myself I would like to see, like a governance committee that committee that could help us, You know further out. If we need to amend the bylaws, that sort of thing in the future, then that committee will be charged with making those sort of recommendations.

Ed Kangethe: Are there any other recommendations that any other committees that members would like to see?

Michael Wilkinson: And, Michael see your hands up first. Our floor is yours. Yeah. So I guess my recommendations somewhat come down to. Of what are things that Board members are going to be doing versus what we're going to have help in doing right. So, for example, like communications, I know we've talked about a lot of a lot about like hiring someone to handle like
Michael Wilkinson: the emails and the communications on our behalf. Right so should that be a board member, Should that be someone we hire out. But likewise, you know, I don't know if we're gonna have any kind of budget? Or if we would need a budget for anything but like, would we need a treasure? Or again, is that something that you know someone who would manage

Michael Wilkinson: for us. I think, besides, that the committees you mentioned already like an agenda setting committee

Michael Wilkinson: Communications Committee are pretty good, and and a governance committee are pretty good and self contained. But I think some of these things might come down to what are we going to be doing internally? Versus what are we going to hire out

Michael Wilkinson: to do or have extra help from the exterior people to do?

Got it loaded?

Ed Kangethe: No, I saw your hand go up next the floor is yours.

Noah Patton: Yeah, just to

Noah Patton: second what was just said. But yeah, I definitely think, like you know, agenda governance comes, and then perhaps, of finance. But again, I think that that really depends on kind of what the nature of our finances would be.

Noah Patton: And then, perhaps, like a community.

Noah Patton: you know.

Noah Patton: like community based communication or some sort of organizing kind of committee on that side of things. But those would be kind of.
Noah Patton: you know the main ones, and I and i'd i'd throw in a function just to like create a new committee if if the need arises as well like at all committees, and so on, and so forth.

00:33:09.860 --> 00:33:10.849
Noah Patton: And i'm done.

Ed Kangethe: Laura. I see your hands up. The floor is yours.

00:33:17.440 --> 00:33:25.459
Lorraine Dean: Yep. So I I think what I've heard so far is agenda setting governance communications, legal or oh, finance

00:33:25.660 --> 00:33:32.560
Lorraine Dean: some, maybe something external, facing also thought about something around. I mean, ultimately what we? What we're going to be doing is

00:33:32.590 --> 00:33:35.099
Lorraine Dean: reviewing

00:33:36.100 --> 00:33:52.210
Lorraine Dean: actions or challenges that we see with policing that come up. I think it would be nice to have some sort of kind of legal authority. I don't even know what to call that. But some sort of legal committee, or something like that. Someone who can kind of help us think through.

00:33:52.410 --> 00:33:53.120
Lorraine Dean: You know

00:33:53.160 --> 00:33:57.080
Lorraine Dean: What are the things that are happening, lawful or not? Those sorts of things

00:33:57.110 --> 00:34:02.200
Lorraine Dean: that may or may not be a committee that might be something we need to outsource, depending on, I guess, what sort of

00:34:03.200 --> 00:34:05.960
Lorraine Dean: capacity we have within our our board.

00:34:07.400 --> 00:34:14.800
Lorraine Dean: but I all that to say. I think also some of this will evolve. So as a preview for next month we have somebody coming in to talk about
Lorraine Dean: the actual legislation, and what we are tasked to do in the legislation which we haven't actually talked about yet. And I think maybe even after that conversation we might want to revisit the idea of committees that will help us get a sense of what we actually will be doing, and then what we'll need committees for. So I I agree. I like this initial set that we've brainstormed so far.

Ed Kangethe: You finish your comment. Lord.

Lorraine Dean: Yep.

Lorraine Dean: Okay.

Noah Patton: Yeah, just in brief, I I just combine like finance, slash, legal, or something like that, because those are both to like external facing would likely deal with external experts on a thing that we are not necessarily experts on. So I think that makes sense.

Ed Kangethe: read this back to the Board to make sure I got the spirit of the discussion.

Ed Kangethe: So right now for committees. We would have

Ed Kangethe: finance, legal, I guess. Committee and outreach committee. That committee would be charged with, like, I guess, community organizing that sort
of thing. We have the Communications Committee which that committee will be charged with

Ed Kangethe: drafting all the correspondence that we receive and answering all emails and that sort of thing.

Ed Kangethe: and a governance committee that would be charged with

Ed Kangethe: occasionally reviewing the bylaws. That sort of thing updates and that sort of thing is that pretty much the spirit of

Ed Kangethe: what we've been discussing.

Ed Kangethe: and I see Lori.

Ed Kangethe: And you, said the Lord. I saw your hand first, so you had the flow first

Lorraine Dean: I was also gonna go back and say, I think the other thing LED to the one we agenda setting. He didn't say that. And then there was also this Oma Compliance officer, which may or may not be a committee, but it sounds like it's a role that people are interested in someone having.

Lorraine Dean: And the other thing. Remember also, we should discuss whether or not they need to be elected or volunteer.

Lorraine Dean: That was another thing that someone brought up. I don't remember exactly Who?

Lorraine Dean: Sorry.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you for your
C Gross: Yes, I'll be quick because I'll be.

364
00:36:47.360 --> 00:36:50.739
C Gross: Leave me very soon, but I just wanted to say it

365
00:36:51.370 --> 00:36:56.490
C Gross: when it gets down, and I probably Won't Be on the phone call when you know sales to this for various.

366
00:36:56.720 --> 00:36:59.079
C Gross: just to remember or to recall

367
00:36:59.120 --> 00:37:02.330
C Gross: that someone has said, the work is going to be done in the committee.

368
00:37:02.440 --> 00:37:08.059
C Gross: Any kind of decisions that are made. The committee meetings will have to be

369
00:37:08.700 --> 00:37:13.169
C Gross: opening at compliance. No matter the number of people that you have in them.

370
00:37:13.390 --> 00:37:15.970
C Gross: So as you get to these working committees

371
00:37:16.000 --> 00:37:24.300
C Gross: and decisions, the different things are going to be impacted that needs to just be worked into

372
00:37:25.590 --> 00:37:26.580
C Gross: the template

373
00:37:27.110 --> 00:37:31.579
C Gross: if there is going to be one, or how the committees actually have to function.

374
00:37:31.800 --> 00:37:35.689
C Gross: So I'm just gonna get off now because I'm gonna leave.

375
00:37:35.850 --> 00:37:37.029
C Gross: But

376
00:37:38.030 --> 00:37:42.280
C Gross: I just wanna make sure people are aware of that. You know. People just can't gather over a call and make decisions, it didn't present it to a board. It has to be open this meeting at Compliant, which would assume that there might be some coordination with the administration.

C Gross: So that's all I wanted to say, and I will be leaving so hopefully. I will catch the live stream later. Have a good night.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, messenger. You do the same.

Lorraine Dean: Just a clarifying point. The work being done in the committees. I wasn't necessarily saying that committees are making the decision. I was thinking the committees are doing the background work so that they can bring a set of solutions or options to the Board to make decisions. So

Lorraine Dean: I guess that's what I was thinking in terms of the the work being done in the committees. I'd also like to only half jokingly nominate Cynthia to be our own May Compliance officer, because she seems so passionate about this.

C Gross: No, actually, I will not take that a nomination. But I also realized, too, that it was a standing committee. Lori. It has to by by open meetings, that regulation. So if you're making committees by this board.

C Gross: just how to add my committee, it is a standing committee.
C Gross: So again, go forth and multiply, but understand that there are state rules and regulations that.

C Gross: that's it. Thanks.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Miss Sathia. Is there any other members before we? I guess if it takes a motion that any other members like to provide some feedback or comments on this topic.

Ed Kangethe: Michael, I see you, hey?

Michael Wilkinson: Yeah, I think my like comment specifically, with reference to like the volunteer or elected thing, I think.

Michael Wilkinson: regardless of what we do.

Michael Wilkinson: we just have to make sure that there's a way of like officially designating a person, because what we don't want is someone who's just like volunteering AD hoc. And then suddenly, it's like, I don't feel like doing this anymore, but then.

Michael Wilkinson: like no one's really stepping up to do it. So then it suddenly goes to the wayside like we don't want to make sure whether it's volunteering to do it you're going to be.

Michael Wilkinson: unless the extenuating circumstances are going to be doing that. And that is your role just to kind of clarify, and to make that more official which is usually what elections do. But I understand why we might not want to do it elected style.
Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Michael, for the comments. Is there any other members that would like to make office of comments or any feedback?

Ed Kangethe: So from the discussion.

Ed Kangethe: I think the first point, should we should decide is whether the the actual positions will be elected by the members, or will they be volunteer positions?

Ed Kangethe: So With that they said, do I have a motion for that?

Logan Weygandt: I'll motion to change the wording from elected to volunteer?

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, and i'll second your motion.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Just say something quickly and

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: just some. I I just kinda i'm a stickler around this when it comes to making a motion the phrases you're making a motion. But you say I move.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: and then once somebody says, I moved, then you know you can say it's properly moved and seconded, and many times within the committee

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: make some motion. Oftentimes you don't always need a second. But I think that in this structure, since we have a smaller group that you know that would be fine. But the the
00:41:38.240 --> 00:41:39.340
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I move.

00:41:40.710 --> 00:41:43.560
Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Carrie. I appreciate the point of clarity.

00:41:44.310 --> 00:41:45.570
Ed Kangethe: Thank you so much.

00:41:45.860 --> 00:41:52.680
Logan Weygandt: Thank you very much. In that case I moved to change the
language from elected to volunteer.

00:41:54.290 --> 00:41:55.710
Ed Kangethe: Do I hear a second

00:41:57.480 --> 00:42:02.830
Noah Patton: second?

00:42:02.900 --> 00:42:07.129
Ed Kangethe: All those in favor signify by saying, Aye.

00:42:07.590 --> 00:42:09.790
Doris Minor-Terrell: bye, bye.

00:42:10.020 --> 00:42:11.259
Ed Kangethe: those are the polls

00:42:13.060 --> 00:42:14.779
Ed Kangethe: signify by saying, Nave.

00:42:16.330 --> 00:42:19.910
Ed Kangethe: we have. The motion has been probably move a second, and it has
been carried

00:42:20.000 --> 00:42:20.870
Ed Kangethe: all right.

00:42:22.460 --> 00:42:26.750
Ed Kangethe: So the next point is, we need to add in again.
Ed Kangethe: Members are welcome to raise their hand and let me know if I'm also based on this. The next point is, we need to decide

Ed Kangethe: the committee, they said committee structure. So where the committees just have a spokesperson that will report out to the remainder of the group, or will they be a chair, vice chair, that sort of thing.

Ed Kangethe: So do I hear a motion for the actual committee structure.

Lorraine Dean: I'm going to try to explain this so I move for a committee structure

Lorraine Dean: that has board co-chairs and committee co-chairs.

Lorraine Dean: co-chairs.

Thomas Judge: I second Dr. Dean's motion.

Ed Kangethe: I just want to make sure I understand the motion that's on the floor so the board, if the board itself will have co-chairs, and each individual committee would have co-chairs. Is that the motion?

Michael Wilkinson: I think my concern to that is do you have enough people for that?
Michael Wilkinson: Given the number of committees we have, and the number of folks we have. We have enough to have 2 co-chairs and 2 committee members that are not repetitive per committee.

Ed Kangethe: And my son yeah, I see you raising your hand.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: Yes, I I just wanna just for my own personal clarity.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: there was discussion, too.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: about a leadership team, and I did here.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: about

Sonja Merchant-Jones: having one represent

Sonja Merchant-Jones: representative from the community.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: Then you have someone from the staff.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: Then you have
Sonja Merchant-Jones: a student representative and one of the medical professionals.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I thought that it would be sort of a team instead of something, some an elected, something more formal, such as chair, co-chair, parliamentarian. So you know did I is that something that's no longer on the table or not open for discussion.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I yield back.

Ed Kangethe: Well, miss on you. I think right now we're having that discussion as to how that structure is going to look.

Ed Kangethe: so I don't know if that was formally proposed. But if someone would like to formally propose that, then

Sonja Merchant-Jones: it was a lot going on around me. I'm trying to hook up, and I'm just running.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: So so okay, I just wanted to know if you know we were going to have a leadership team.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: and I I feel okay, asking this and for clarity for myself. If it's going to be a leadership team or someone say, take away the elected verbiage and just have it volunteer. Where does that mean with someone raises their hand and say that I want to be a part of the leadership team. I just need clarity for myself, because I did miss some things.
Sonja Merchant-Jones: So it's a lot going on around me that you can see, so I just wanted that clarity. But I'll go back to you and I'll listen to the discussion.

Ed Kangethe: And, Laurie, before we come to you. Let me see if I can provide a point of clarity in my son. Yeah, I think the way the discussion was going was that individual committee would have a speaker.

On one to maybe 2 people I don't know I that's probably what we're debating right now. But that individual committee would have a speaker unto itself, and then we would have for the board as a whole co-chairs. Now, I believe that was the idea that was debated earlier.

Ed Kangethe: at least from my perspective, that's what the discussion was.

Ed Kangethe: And Lori I'll give audio to you for additional comments.

Lorraine Dean: So just here, in the last couple of comments, I do think right. We are a 15 member board. So.
Lorraine Dean: you. You mentioned about 4 or 5 different people, which is a third of the board would be right. It would be on the leadership team, and

Lorraine Dean: maybe a different way to do it is

Lorraine Dean: so maybe I change my

Lorraine Dean: motion to be. Just have a set of committee co-chairs, and then maybe the person who's the agenda setting committee co-chair. Maybe they're the person that runs the meeting. I guess that's what I was thinking when I thought they're kind of board co-chairs and then

Lorraine Dean: committee co-chairs. But maybe there should just be committee Co-chairs.

Lorraine Dean: and

Lorraine Dean: that's it.

Lorraine Dean: I'm back.

Ed Kangethe: I'm a sonya, I see you, and then no you only you have to miss out you, miss, on your floor is yours

Sonja Merchant-Jones: quickly. I thought it was a matter of, and i'm fine with. However, it's set up as long as you know we all in agreement, but I thought, in order for those who come from different sectors like I'm. A community appointment. Then you have staff. Then you have the medical professionals.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: and I'm. I thought that to get a mix.
Sonja Merchant-Jones: That's why I thought there would be a leadership team with that kind of mix. But I'm good with what. However, it is decided as long as it works for everyone, but

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I thought there would be a leadership team where everyone would get representation from the different sectors that were selected to serve.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: on this accountability board. And so I yield back to you.

Ed Kangethe: No, and Log and I see you. I just want to add a quick point before I come to you guys, it's on your every board members. Perspective is important and unique, and that's why we're all here. So

Ed Kangethe: I think it goes without saying that everybody's will be heard in their opinion will be vague.

Ed Kangethe: so I hope that wasn't you know part of your concern. But if it is, I just want to personally say that I feel like with this group that everybody opinion you know whether you're for or just the police. We all listen to each other, and we all we're at in the day respect each other's opinion.

Ed Kangethe: So having said that

Ed Kangethe: Logan, i'm sorry. No coming to you then, Logan Venter.

Ed Kangethe: No, no, it's yours.

Noah Patton: Thank you. Yeah. I just say to the point of a leadership team. I mean.

Noah Patton: having selected out, like
Noah Patton: you know, shares of these various subcommittees, I mean kind of does form a de facto leadership team in and of itself, because you're covering, you know so many different aspects of

Noah Patton: you know, board operations, and and second, you know, as as was said.

Noah Patton: 5, you know, 5 board chair, 5 subcommittee chairs is, you know what a third of the of the entire board, so I I, you know, would be shocked if

Noah Patton: you know there wasn't a few community members, or a few students or a few staff member members. Part of you know. Whatever team does

does get created.

Noah Patton: and i'm done

Logan Weygandt: again. I'm just trying to keep track of things.

Logan Weygandt: And so I've been writing down, and and I just want to make sure i'm seeing what everybody else is seeing as we're building this structure. And so

Logan Weygandt: what i'm hearing is that instead of having a designated board chairperson or co-chair persons that the subcommittee Members are going to make up that sort of

Logan Weygandt: and when I was thinking, through the different committees that have been named
Logan Weygandt: I hear communications, governments agenda, setting finance and legal as a question mark as to whether or not that's a committee role within us, or whether that's something that we outsource and then outreach with another named role, being somebody who would be a single person, Oma officer.

Logan Weygandt: And then my question sort of follow up question to that is, if we wanted to specify some number of community members and or students that would fill these above roles. That that's what i'm seeing. And is there anything i'm leaving out there

Michael Wilkinson: the only thing I was maybe wondering to this point, because people at 1 point mentioned like media handling, and Pr. Would that be encapsulated by one of these, either like outreach or communications. Or

Michael Wilkinson: is that something separate? That's something I wasn't sure of like. Who Who would be, you know Fair fairly talking to the media, because I I imagine, as this ramps up, we're gonna get a lot more media in inquiries and whatnot.

Ed Kangethe: Well to you to? To to your questions, Michael. I had a vision that fallen under the Communications

Ed Kangethe: Committee.

Ed Kangethe: Now i'll just control me with that for us. But that was my thoughts.

Ed Kangethe: sorry you've been. Wait patiently. The floor is yours. Okay.
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: just to for a of clarity with the suggestion that I was making. And you know, I think, that we do definitely need to go with the majority, but my suggestion was that we should have someone from the community side as well as someone from the Hopkins side. If we decided to go with the co-chair kind of a process, and if we do that then the commitment to the individuals who are holding those particular roles should be.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: community side person, go to the community folks and ask what they have a need to.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: whether or not you'll agree with this. But basically that's basically having a if you will, e board or planning meeting prior to the actual formal meeting, so is that.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: committee? Or can that be something that we would remove, so that we wouldn't have to split.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: so many different efforts. And then
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: whoever is a part of whatever the next meeting.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: actual sharing would be, would come together and actually set up the agenda, because, in fact. There's going to be different levels of expertise and different topics that will be discussed each time. So you may actually need the support of different people in order to set an agenda each time.

Ed Kangethe: this discussion is really good. I just want to say, Michael, I see your hand raise. We'll be coming to you for the last comment in this, and then, after that, I would hope that we will have some motions to move forward on how we want this structure to be set up. So, Michael, the floor is yours.

Michael Wilkinson: Yeah, very quickly, I think to address part of Terry's concerns, and I want to log in questions. Maybe we should make it such that Outreach the co-chairs have to be a Hopkins person and a community person resp., just as that seems to make the most sense. And therefore you have people, you know, following the community, people following up with Hopkins folks.

Michael Wilkinson: and that kind of manages some of the initial concerns that Terry had. But that would maybe require. That'd be the one role that we maybe specify like it has to be
Michael Wilkinson: whoever volunteers to do it.

That's all I got.

Ed Kangethe: right. I should, Michael. So

Ed Kangethe: let me

Ed Kangethe: kind of

Ed Kangethe: kick the ball off. Let's

Ed Kangethe: Do we have a motion to establish set committees first.

Ed Kangethe: then we can move to the structure.

Ed Kangethe: do I hear a motion to establish all the four-name committees.

Lorraine Dean: Oh, sorry!

Lorraine Dean: Are we combining the outreach and communications, or those gonna be the separate committees?

Ed Kangethe: I thought those would be separate committees. But there's someone moved to commandos

Lorraine Dean: could maybe just explain what each does differently.
Lorraine Dean: I guess I'm thinking they're both externally facing. But

Lorraine Dean: so communications is email and media requests. But outreach is

Ed Kangethe: so outreach, and this is my opinion ours will be. There are a lot of community groups that want to interact with the board.

Ed Kangethe: So out East would be charged with building those in maintaining those relations external relationships.

Lorraine Dean: Okay, thank you.

Lorraine Dean: Gotcha.

The word

Michael Wilkinson: Thank you for sharing this, Logan, because I I motion to establish the the first 6 committees with the Oma officers in April.

Elise Favia (she/her): My second

Ed Kangethe: motion it has probably, and they move the properly. Second, all those and all those in favor signify by saying, I

Lorraine Dean: okay

Ed Kangethe: motion has been carried.

Ed Kangethe: Okay. Secondly, how we going to set up these committees? Will they be a spokesperson, or a chair, or will each committee have 2 co-chairs?

Can I have a motion for that

Lorraine Dean: each committee to have a spokesperson.

Lorraine Dean: but at each committee also must have representation from both Hopkins and community members.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, so just want to make sure I understand the motion. So what you're saying is, each committee will have a spokesperson that will report out like, you know, in the open meetings and that sort of thing.

Ed Kangethe: But every committee must have at least one community member and one hop as a member.
Ed Kangethe: So we have more committees and community

Michael Wilkinson: members. I think there we know we have Exactly. Because I think we have 5 community members at a at a given point, and the other 10 are either Hopkins faculty, student or staff.

Elise Favia (she/her): Are we restricting that people can't be on more than one committee

Lorraine Dean: or the people can't represent that both

Michael Wilkinson: that's fair. I I I thought you specifically met with like community member as someone who's like Non Hopkins affiliated.

Lorraine Dean: It was that each each subcommittee sorry

Lorraine Dean: each committee would have a spokesperson

Lorraine Dean: and

Lorraine Dean: representation from both Hopkins and community members.

Lorraine Dean: at least one person.

Lorraine Dean: But I think, Michael, saying the map technically doesn't work out for that
Lorraine Dean: if we, if we have a strict

Michael Wilkinson: it just just if we don't want to forcibly make someone have
to serve on multiple communities, because otherwise, then someone would have to
serve on which is fine. But I didn't want to force that upon anyone.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, so why don't We just move it without that piece.

Ed Kangethe: so we'll just have, so I guess.

Ed Kangethe: if

Ed Kangethe: we I can amend you, you can mend your motion

Ed Kangethe: that we would have. Each committee would have a spokesperson.

Lorraine Dean: I'm. In my motion.

Lorraine Dean: and I move that each committee should have a spokesperson

Michael Wilkinson: for a second.

Elise Favia (she/her): What if what if it's that?

Elise Favia (she/her): The it that whatever the the condition you wanted, if if
possible, or like you making condition that if

Elise Favia (she/her): if the math doesn't work out
Ed Kangethe: so what i'll get 2 and 2, we on this.

611
00:59:49.150 --> 00:59:56.790
Ed Kangethe: since I would say, humbly, suggest we move the motion, and then we could kind of come back and clarify that language a little later.

612
00:59:57.400 --> 00:59:59.080
Elise Favia (she/her): Sure, that works. Yeah.

613
00:59:59.240 --> 00:59:59.899
Ed Kangethe: Got it.

614
01:00:00.160 --> 01:00:01.240
Ed Kangethe: So we.

615
01:00:01.520 --> 01:00:06.840
Ed Kangethe: my second Laurie's motion. Thank you, sir, appreciate it. The motion has been

616
01:00:06.910 --> 01:00:11.309
Ed Kangethe: properly often. It's second all those in agreement signify by saying, I

617
01:00:11.350 --> 01:00:12.750
Noah Patton: bye, bye.

618
01:00:12.920 --> 01:00:14.270
Ed Kangethe: the polls may

619
01:00:14.420 --> 01:00:16.000
Ed Kangethe: motion carries.

620
01:00:16.140 --> 01:00:17.040
Ed Kangethe: Thank you

621
01:00:18.160 --> 01:00:19.149
Ed Kangethe: so.

622
01:00:19.750 --> 01:00:21.559
Ed Kangethe: and keep it with the bylaws.

623
01:00:21.630 --> 01:00:24.560
Ed Kangethe: The meeting requirements section is the next.
Lorraine Dean: Wait a second. Then we also need to make a motion for the homemade compliance officer role.

Lorraine Dean: Oh, I I I motioned that that was part of my question. Okay, yeah, I said. I said. The the 6 committees and the Oma officer was my motion.

Lorraine Dean: Gotcha.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you for circling back on that, Michael.

Ed Kangethe: the next section to finish up the bylaws is meeting requirements.

Ed Kangethe: I don't think there's much for us to go. I think we pretty much already decided this portion; but

Ed Kangethe: if any members have any suggestions or comments they like to make

Ed Kangethe: on this portion.

Lorraine Dean: So while i'm screen sharing, I lost my ability to raise my hand, so I apologize if I

Lorraine Dean: jump the line.

Lorraine Dean: But
Lorraine Dean: it, it says quarterly meetings. I think those are the required meetings, but I think since then we've decided that we're having monthly meetings.

Cool.

Ed Kangethe: correct. That's why I thought we pretty much had the solid this piece of it. But

Ed Kangethe: my fault. Look! I was just responding to Laurie's question. But now this year your hand was really so. You have the floor

Lorraine Dean: me.

Ed Kangethe: Logan had his hand, so I I was responding to your question. I just wanted to let no know. That's why I had jumped the mind. But

Logan Weygandt: so the only thing I was sort of reflecting on this section is, you know, by writing the bylaws. Now we are sort of setting the groundwork for future generations. And I wonder, you know, I think the general impression that I have from

Logan Weygandt: the meeting frequency that we've needed thus far is that we need the monthly meetings.

Logan Weygandt: and I feel like

Logan Weygandt: It's gonna be important to have at least monthly or by monthly meetings moving forward in order to have sort of appropriate oversight and make sure that the board's agenda is moving forward. So I wonder if we should consider
Logan Weygandt: setting some like minimum threshold. That's beyond the quarterly meetings that we as a board decide, you know, based on rules down below. A 3 quarters majority could.

Logan Weygandt: and then this later on. But I do wonder if for future generations or future board iterations. If we wouldn't want to set like a minimum of a by monthly meeting.

Logan Weygandt: Second piece to that is, it says quarterly meetings with essentially the Hopkins Administration side. So I also wonder if we're having monthly meetings do we have monthly or by monthly board meetings in the Quarterly Meeting, where we meet with

Logan Weygandt: 2 ideas. Sorry to put them both out there, but

Logan Weygandt: the administration.

Logan Weygandt: just a couple of thoughts.

Ed Kangethe: No, I saw your hand was up, but you put it down. Did you have a comment?

Ed Kangethe: Okay.

Ed Kangethe: all right. So in the interest of keeping this moving.

Ed Kangethe: Michael, you'll have the floor, then, Lori, and then we'll make a motion.

Michael Wilkinson: Yeah, I was just gonna agree with Logan's point that I think we should make. I preferably monthly meetings as like part of the actual bylaws as opposed to just something we're kind of doing for now, but isn't 7 stone, and could revert back
Michael Wilkinson: especially because at some point. We're going to be reviewing cases and stuff like that. So there's going to be a lot more on our plate to discuss. Besides, just our own structures and things like that. So I think I think, making it a a minimum of monthly, and then being able to call special meetings in between is is very important.

Michael Wilkinson: that's all I got.

Ed Kangethe: Laurie.

Lorraine Dean: I just want. I just want to note that I mean we'll have the monthly meetings. But now that we also have a committee structure. I imagine that committees members will also. The committees themselves will be having meetings. I still agree that we should have monthly meetings for us, as well as the required quarterly meetings. But just as a reminder this special meetings might just end up being committee meetings, subcommittee meetings.

Ed Kangethe: We're already meeting monthly. Do we need to move a motion on this one?

Michael Wilkinson: I I would motion to. I would move to change the bylaws to state that we meet a minimum of monthly.

Michael Wilkinson: as a board.

Lorraine Dean: I second, that
Ed Kangethe: motion will probably move a second. All those in agreement signify by saying, I

Noah Patton: aye.

Ed Kangethe: Oh.

Ed Kangethe: nay.

Ed Kangethe: motion has been moving, probably carried

Ed Kangethe: all right.

Ed Kangethe: Moving on.

Ed Kangethe: The next item

Ed Kangethe: is forms and voting.

Ed Kangethe: So the only outstand item that actually was the exact number. We wanted to.

Ed Kangethe: including the bylaws, to move board business

Ed Kangethe: there. Any members have any thoughts or comments on that

Ed Kangethe: peace.

Ed Kangethe: Okay.
Ed Kangethe: my Sonya, I see your hands raised.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: Yeah.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: When I conduct the Board meeting, we can't vote unless we have 2 thirds.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: So I thought that that was a standard that you back to you.

Ed Kangethe: But any member like to make a motion.

Yeah.

Ed Kangethe: Mike, Michael and I saw both your hands up at the same time. Are you comment on making a motion.

Michael Wilkinson: Just a quick comment.

Michael Wilkinson: My, My! But comment was that the only thing that's a special consideration in this case is that because of the fact that we have community members, and then Hopkins folks, you can technically achieve quorum with 0 community members because it's a 5, 10 split.

Michael Wilkinson: So I would be a little bit reticent to just do a two-thirds rule here because it's possible to do it completely without any community members Granted, I doubt that's ever gonna happen but just a thing to keep in mind.

Elise Favia (she/her): I I want
Elise Favia (she/her): just say that two-thirds usually does seem to be a standard, but I also wanted to second Michael's concern. So. But somebody remind the number has escaped my brain Again, how many people do have? So it's 15 total right?

Ed Kangethe: Yes.

Elise Favia (she/her): So a lot of times. It's.

Elise Favia (she/her): They say that two-thirds is needed.

Elise Favia (she/her): What?

Elise Favia (she/her): And then I would.

Elise Favia (she/her): But you have to have a certain

Hmm.

Elise Favia (she/her): Words Words are feeling me right now. Words are feeling me right now.

Elise Favia (she/her): Hey? That happens.

Elise Favia (she/her): I have thought, lost my train of thought.
Elise Favia (she/her): But

Elise Favia (she/her): I yeah, I would.

Elise Favia (she/her): I would say, just fully make sure we don't want to.

Elise Favia (she/her): We want to take into account the split.

Elise Favia (she/her): I forgot what I was going to also say. Unfortunately.

Elise Favia (she/her): if it comes back. I will raise my hand again.

Ed Kangethe: No worries.

Ed Kangethe: so you know

Ed Kangethe: it. Sorry I see your hands up. Do you guys have a question, or I mean, do you guys want to make a motion? Do you have comments?

Ed Kangethe: And

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I just need a point of clarity.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I don't have i'm trying to understand

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: the two-thirds

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: is needed for what
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I wasn't clear

Ed Kangethe: to move board business

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: that's in our bylaws or in our policy or

Ed Kangethe: no.

Ed Kangethe: that's what we're trying to enshrine in the bylaws. We don't have a number.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Okay.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: I think we should hold off

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: on making

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: that determination right now, until we see what the standard is, because a lot of times you do only need simple majority.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: or like have plus one.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: It. It oftentimes may be something like

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: two-thirds didn't get someone off of the board or something like that
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: or to do some type of big

request, but typically it is just a majority

just wanting to make certain that we're not

putting something in stone that we

we have a difficult time

walking back.

So what would that be? It said.

Is that a motion, or you just

comment

Is that a motion, or you just

comment

again I I still right on the fact that i'm trying to

learn as much as I can, so i'm not sure if this is a practice that was.

you know, instituted in the past, and just never formalized. So
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: that's why I was just asking for a point of clarity.

Ed Kangethe: Got it.

Branville Bard He/Him: Yeah, absolutely right. So I think the point of a quorum before you can move. Business means that you had to have a substantial number of individuals present with to do business. So having 2 thirds present having that as a threshold means that

Branville Bard He/Him: it the the other way. If you just had a simple majority, that means that 5 people could decide business for the entire board, meaning that you could only have 8 people present because person, body, and then only 5 of them vote on something. So you need a minimum threshold of

Branville Bard He/Him: that wherever you decide it is which I, which is typically two-thirds, and then of that both. It take, then, that where where the majority thing comes in, so it's about having enough people to do business. Not a simple majority and a simple majority normally isn't that threshold.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Thanks for clarifying that because I was wondering if we met there for every vote. I didn't realize that we were talking about it in order to establish a form. I missed that part. So yes, that is definitely

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Yeah, I am in an agreement with that. So thank you for specifying that.

Ed Kangethe: So I do see Noah, Michael and Laurie in that order. But

Ed Kangethe: I would just say

Ed Kangethe: it sounds like a good motion would be to adopt the two-thirds with

Ed Kangethe: their caveat with 3 community members present
Ed Kangethe: because we have 5 community members on the board. So 3 President, that's a majority of the community members on the board.

Ed Kangethe: Does that sound agreeable to everybody.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, so can someone properly move that motion.

Noah Patton: Yep. Took the words right out of my mouth. I'd like to move that Korum be established as 2 thirds of the board to include 3 out of the 5 community members.

Ed Kangethe: And do I have a second

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: a second.

Ed Kangethe: The motion has been properly move in second, although in agreement, say I

Lorraine Dean: bye. Bye.

Ed Kangethe: all those opposed. Nay, the motion has been properly

Ed Kangethe: moved.
Branville Bard He/Him: Okay, Can I make another point?

Branville Bard He/Him: Yeah.

Branville Bard He/Him: I think what you just did give any any 3 community members the ability to stop you from being productive as well. So you might want to think about it in those terms.

01:13:55.510 --> 01:13:59.129
Branville Bard He/Him: If that's something that I that's something that this committee can revisit. But thank you, Dr. Bar, for the insight. Appreciate it.

01:14:03.420 --> 01:14:06.109
Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Dr. But I appreciate the comment.

01:14:06.400 --> 01:14:07.300
Ed Kangethe: comment.

01:14:09.730 --> 01:14:11.220
Ed Kangethe: If that's something that I

01:14:12.870 --> 01:14:17.930
Ed Kangethe: That's something that this committee can revisit. But thank you, Dr. Bar, for the insight. Appreciate it.

01:14:19.390 --> 01:14:32.579
Lorraine Dean: and just quickly, LED, can I just make make a suggestion just very quick suggestion. Can we also then make sure that at the that meetings we do kind of a roll call at the beginning, just to make sure we we have the quorum present.

01:14:34.430 --> 01:14:36.449
Lorraine Dean: We decide that as a standing agenda. Item.

01:14:36.600 --> 01:14:37.360
Yes.

01:14:37.400 --> 01:14:38.320
Lorraine Dean: and thanks
well.

01:14:40.080 --> 01:14:41.150
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: and

01:14:41.780 --> 01:14:45.779
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: one question as well is

01:14:46.180 --> 01:14:47.309
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: shouldn't.

01:14:47.870 --> 01:14:49.809
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: We be parallel

01:14:50.080 --> 01:14:53.849
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: when we think of that, too, is that if there are 10

01:14:54.680 --> 01:14:57.769
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: members that are from the university

01:14:58.100 --> 01:15:03.749
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: and 5 from the community, then if we're saying that for the

01:15:06.090 --> 01:15:11.309
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: for the community we should also be saying that for the university

01:15:13.410 --> 01:15:14.780
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Are you following me?

01:15:17.620 --> 01:15:19.510
Ed Kangethe: Not

01:15:19.530 --> 01:15:30.699
Lorraine Dean: there we go, but I think the challenges. The community members are already essentially outnumbered compared to Hopkins people. So this it kind of balances the power a little bit more.

01:15:31.690 --> 01:15:34.480
Elise Favia (she/her): You You can't make a quorum

01:15:35.140 --> 01:15:37.810
Lorraine Dean: just community members.
Elise Favia (she/her): You can with just Hopkins people.

Lorraine Dean: you think.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, at least for that point of clarity.

Ed Kangethe: All right. If there's any other. You know the comments on this one, our last

Ed Kangethe: for the bylaws to be recused, Relaxed section is recusal.

Ed Kangethe: Are there any Board members that have

Ed Kangethe: any comments

Ed Kangethe: about this section.

Elise Favia (she/her): At least I see your hand first.

Elise Favia (she/her): or which section this would be. But going along with Dr. Bard's comment.

Elise Favia (she/her): I do think that something like

Elise Favia (she/her): just. I want to say it now before I forget about it. If

Elise Favia (she/her): a board member is
Elise Favia (she/her): repeatedly not showing up and obstructing board business.

Elise Favia (she/her): I think that would be something that would be able to as

Elise Favia (she/her): possibly able to sanction.

Elise Favia (she/her): I don't know if there's there was something about possibly sanctioning board members in part of the discussion in in there, but it's probably later in the discussion.

Elise Favia (she/her): But

Elise Favia (she/her): I just wanted to put that out.

Elise Favia (she/her): for I forgot about it.

Ed Kangethe: No worries. Thank you. At least that was removal of discipline.

Elise Favia (she/her): Right?

Michael Wilkinson: Yeah, I think the I think for the refusal section. I know there's quite like about whether or not it should

Michael Wilkinson: mandatory, for any instance, I think, really other than just, it being optional. The only case i'd specifically see it being mandatory, is, if we're

Michael Wilkinson: reviewing a case that involves a board member, or like someone the Board member knows personally, or something like that which I would hope at that point from an ethical standpoint. The Board member will just recuse themselves anyways from the discussion.
Michael Wilkinson: but I can't see any other

Michael Wilkinson: instances where it would be a mandatory thing that we refuse people as opposed to them just voluntarily doing so.

Ed Kangethe: So I just wanna make sure I got this correctly, You said recruiting. If if a member is directly involved in the given situation, or

Michael Wilkinson: yeah, like directly involved in the case or something. I granted that that early land pertains to when we're reviewing cases. But there's a lot of other business. Obviously, that members might be directly involved in that wouldn't require

Michael Wilkinson: recusal. That's the only thing I could see that would actually require recusal is, if it's we're reviewing a case, and the members directly involved in some way or another case.

got it.

Ed Kangethe: Okay, so

Ed Kangethe: at least I do see your hand. Then, after that i'll entertain any motions on this.

Elise Favia (she/her): I do think we should probably put something in there about other board members

Elise Favia (she/her): suggesting
Elise Favia (she/her): that people should be recused just for future purposes. I'm just imagining a situation where somebody has a conflict of interest and doesn't recuse themselves, and so other Board members might need to step in. Not that I think anybody on the current board would do that, but as this is going to be a document that's living on. We might want to put something about procedures of recusal in cases where there's a conflict of interest where the Board number doesn't recuse themselves. So like, if their business is involved, or if their family member is involved or
Elise Favia (she/her): something like that.

Elise Favia (she/her): Yeah.

Ed Kangethe: good point. Thank you, Elise.

Ed Kangethe: Is there any other members comments, or feedback on this?

Ed Kangethe: Michael? Is your hand up from last time when you have additional com. Okay, got it?

Ed Kangethe: So at this time. Is there any motions?

Ed Kangethe: Okay? Saying as though that we got through a good portion of

Ed Kangethe: the bylaws tonight, and I thank all the members. We still have at least 2 other items

Ed Kangethe: to get get to

Ed Kangethe: do. I hear a motion that we table the remaining items to the next leading to give members a chance to

Ed Kangethe: deliberate a little further.

Michael Wilkinson: I move to table the item.

Michael Wilkinson: the remaining items on this connection
Ed Kangethe: we have a motion that's move.

Ed Kangethe: I'll second that motion

Ed Kangethe: all those in agreement.

Ed Kangethe: If I was saying

Elise Favia (she/her): bye

Ed Kangethe: calls 9,

Lorraine Dean: Okay.

Ed Kangethe: motion is carried, so we'll revisit the remaining

Ed Kangethe: by law items at the next meeting.

Ed Kangethe: Thank everyone for their

Ed Kangethe: input. Tonight.

Ed Kangethe: We did cover.

Ed Kangethe: In this deliberation. We did covered the third item on the gender

Ed Kangethe: possible meeting structures.
Not here, so I don't wanna

01:22:05.060 --> 01:22:07.810
Ed Kangethe: We can. I guess we can table what

01:22:08.550 --> 01:22:12.549
Ed Kangethe: or exactly. She wanted to breathe the board on to the next meeting

Ed Kangethe: the next item the communications update. Lori. Would you like to

Ed Kangethe: brief communications, update?

Lorraine Dean: Sure, sure, just briefly, in terms of communications?

Lorraine Dean: Do we did have? We did receive, I think, a packet today, but it just came in today, so I haven't even had a chance to look at that. But in December, since our last meeting we had a couple of

Lorraine Dean: emails that came. One was from Doctors Zack Berger, and there was an early December, and it was a concerned group of faculty students and staff who felt like the the Town Hall meeting structure needs to be revisited. They felt like that 90 min weren't enough, and they were requesting to more information on why the meeting was virtual instead of in person.

01:22:59.490 --> 01:23:17.270
Lorraine Dean: There is another email by Rachel Schrodel that was requesting some information on the status of accountability. But board members emails and ability to reply to emails and to see emails directly as well as a few emails that were informational that I believe are just already answered by

01:23:17.280 --> 01:23:23.519
Lorraine Dean: the administration. Things like where meetings were concerns about Covid and flu risk, and those sorts of things.

01:23:23.580 --> 01:23:27.949
Lorraine Dean: So on actually those 2 points. One, the agenda Setting committee

01:23:27.980 --> 01:23:44.760
Lorraine Dean: has noted some of the questions about the Town Hall meetings, and we figured that's something that we could revisit. As we talk more about meeting structure and things that we want to do in the future, so that will
come up later. And in terms of the question about the emails, the Rachel Stodel's emails.

893
01:23:44.770 --> 01:24:00.769
Lorraine Dean: So currently, we don't have individual email accounts, and we had. We had it first set up a structure that the emails come through the J 2 Accountability Board email. And then we were going to reply through a Gmail account. But then

894
01:24:00.780 --> 01:24:11.809
Lorraine Dean: we sent that out to the group, and there were some objections to that approach, because people were concerned that if we are going to bring on a new admin, that then that might introduce yet another

895
01:24:11.970 --> 01:24:19.189
Lorraine Dean: email account or email situation. And until we have an Admin. And dedicated admin, we should just wait so that we can

896
01:24:19.310 --> 01:24:24.009
Lorraine Dean: design a system that's completely streamlined and respond. So, on one hand.

897
01:24:24.240 --> 01:24:37.680
Lorraine Dean: I think it's. I think it's a fair concern. On the other hand, we do need to get some administrative support sooner than later, so that we can respond to emails, because at this point we Haven't responded to emails. We have emails dating back from March. 2022.

898
01:24:41.760 --> 01:24:44.639
Lorraine Dean: Any questions or thoughts about that.

899
01:24:54.660 --> 01:24:56.539
Lorraine Dean: Okay, I'll turn it back to you. LED.

900
01:24:58.140 --> 01:24:59.750
Michael Wilkinson: I had a quick question because

901
01:25:04.990 --> 01:25:07.079
Michael Wilkinson: that like, and see.

902
Michael Wilkinson: Michael, we couldn't hardly hear you. Oh, sorry, quick question was, how quickly can we get admin, support? And what are any roadblocks that might be getting the way of doing that, like Asp.

903
Branville Bard He/Him: we may jump in that.

Yes, talking about. You can take that if you like.

Branville Bard He/Him: Yeah. So you know, thanks for submitting that proposal that you put together. I reviewed it, and I really think that the cleanest way is that

well, and of outsourcing those services, I think that is just easiest for us to hire administrative staff for you for whatever 20 h a week.

Branville Bard He/Him: I think that that admin person would have full access to the Accountability Board email will be able to communicate, You know, 2 way on behalf of the Board.

Branville Bard He/Him: The proposal really didn't provide a spoken work regarding specific, it administrative support. And and then I I think that there is some question as to

the Accountability Board being a non independent body, unable to enter into and negotiate contracts on on it, you know, only we have. So I think that the cleanest way it is for us to hire you a dedicated admin person, you know, for however many hours a week was necessary, I think

20 h might be enough, but

Branville Bard He/Him: I'm not stuck on that. I think that you should, as a board, have a role in in the interview and selection process.

Branville Bard He/Him: and you know I would expect that

if we move forward with that that you would set up parameters for assign.
Branville Bard He/Him: etc., because you know.

01:26:49.740 --> 01:26:51.800
Branville Bard He/Him: kind of hard having 15 bucks.

01:26:57.770 --> 01:27:13.529
Lorraine Dean: Lori, I see a Henry. So did you have a question to comment about Dr. Bart's proposal. If I remember correctly, the proposal did outline some very specific activities and request that we would need from the administrative person, and on one hand, I don't know if I'm really conflicted about

01:27:13.930 --> 01:27:23.979
Lorraine Dean: about an internal to Hopkins person. Right on one hand, we're trying to show that we are somewhat objective, and that we in some ways can be independent and make decisions independently and with less bias.

01:27:24.030 --> 01:27:25.409
Lorraine Dean: And so having.

01:27:25.770 --> 01:27:35.300
Lorraine Dean: I think it brings back up that question that people have been concerned about, which is that if it's an internal to Hopkins person is Hopkins doing something to filter is Hopkins doing something to

01:27:35.310 --> 01:27:49.760
Lorraine Dean: right, that something that kind of takes away our ability to be objective or get information in a timely manner in those things. And so I think that's part of the proposal. What the proposal was for an external per person, so we could really show that this is part of our independence as a board.

01:28:17.460 --> 01:28:20.799
Branville Bard He/Him: You know whether you're independent or not.

Lorraine Dean: I guess one of those things that kind of begs the question. If it's an internal Hopkins person right Are they having forces put on them that
govern the way they interact with our board, and that prevents us from, for example, getting certain information or things like that. I think that's the kind of community facing concern about

Lorraine Dean: having this all done through Hopkins, and that was the nature of the email that we received from Rachel Stodel was kind of, you know. Do you have something kind of independently that that we know that you are getting, and seeing that's unfiltered by the institution.

Branville Bard He/Him: Once again you can you? We, You know we've been made. They offer to set up the external email. I just think that the cleanest way is for

Branville Bard He/Him: dedicated

Branville Bard He/Him: staff member to be assigned to you. From Hopkins you can determine what that email account looks like and how those communications go.

Ed Kangethe: Do any of you, any of a board member has any input, or with Dr. Bonus proposed.

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: Do, Dr. Bar, how soon will be at the

Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: excuse me, how soon will we be able to begin this process?

Branville Bard He/Him: I think we should. We should be able to begin, and as soon as administratively possible I i'm hate to say within a week, and and the the we'll spend fast and up at the University to accommodate that. But as soon as possible, and, like, I said. I think that you should have a a pronounced role in an interview, and it's selected to get

Ed Kangethe: so

Ed Kangethe: not to believe this is costly because we run a little over, but it
Ed Kangethe: let me just put this point out. There is this something that the majority of the board members support.

Ed Kangethe: I think.

Ed Kangethe: Let's put that point out there first, and if that's it, then you know we can give the administration the green light to move. Move over here tonight. But is this something that the majority of the Board members support?

Lorraine Dean: I moved to hire an administrative support for the board.

Ed Kangethe: I mean as far as the

Ed Kangethe: they're posable for somebody external. This is would be an employee of hopping. So I just want to make sure we all understand that.

Ed Kangethe: So that piece. That's what I'm saying

Ed Kangethe: that to move on that piece of

Ed Kangethe: the board members good or moving on that piece.

Ed Kangethe: Yes, ma'am.

Ed Kangethe: I saw you.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: and I just wanted to. Sorry. What what would be the if it if the person didn't come from
Sonja Merchant-Jones: wasn't hired by Hopkins? Then what what would you consider

Sonja Merchant-Jones: to be appropriate. I just want to hear the other side of it.

Lorraine Dean: I guess we were just thinking they would still be paid by Hopkins right, but it would just be like we're hiring an external consultant. That's not necessarily a Hopkins employee.

Lorraine Dean: or or or who is governed by the leadership of Hopkins in terms of what they do, because they are independent consultants.

Lorraine Dean: So who would select the person with the board select with the we would. Still we would still select the person. Yeah. In fact, we've taken nominations before, and we only actually got one nomination from board members. But we did actually send that out there. Only one person responded.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: Well, I think your point I I I like your point because there are people who would say that you know Hopkins is more controlling. So I understand, and I get your point.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: I I really do, and I I could support that that Hopkins would pay the person.

Sonja Merchant-Jones: but then they would be hired

Sonja Merchant-Jones: by the board, meaning Hopkins wouldn't

Sonja Merchant-Jones: be with an interview. That

Sonja Merchant-Jones: person. That person would be interviewed solely by

Sonja Merchant-Jones: the the the the committee
Sonja Merchant-Jones: is that right?

Branville Bard He/Him: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. I think they should be an independent consultant still paid by Hopkins, but in an independent consultant structure. Yeah, because all the problems with that type of setup. As we talked about with the inability to sign that individual email on its email and and stuff.

Lorraine Dean: I don't understand how this solves the problem. They were already being told that we don't have that you don't have to get an admin support assigned to you right now, and we can do that.

Lorraine Dean: So if we get a dedicated admin support, then we can then use the Hopkins email account to respond to people, I think. Is that what you're saying?

Branville Bard He/Him: I'm saying that that individual would have access to it, and would be able to respond to people on our behalf.

Lorraine Dean: because when we've asked that before, we've said that we've heard that. No, that that can't happen.

Lorraine Dean: I didn't think it was. I mean, I understand some of it was a capacity issue, but I just thought it just couldn't happen, even if there was capacity because of other barriers.

Branville Bard He/Him: I'm not sure that we are talking about the same thing, or we're talking about same thing then, but that I just think it's the cleanest way, and I understand we? This is it's a
Branville Bard He/Him: it's a living thing. We can always change if

01:33:24.230 --> 01:33:36.619
Branville Bard He/Him: if we saw the need. But to get you the administrative support that you want in the quickest way. Right now. We will be to bring on somebody part time, and just have them dedicated to it, and then work for the board.

01:33:37.640 --> 01:33:44.249
Ed Kangethe: And Logan, I see I'm come to you quickly. I just want to level city, I think, without the barge is just saying, is it?

01:33:44.830 --> 01:33:48.249
Ed Kangethe: They're gonna the person would be the employee of pockets, but we would be

01:33:48.450 --> 01:33:56.550
Ed Kangethe: very involved in the hiring process. I think so. It wouldn't be like somebody that they pick for us. It would be someone we pick

01:33:57.350 --> 01:34:00.379
Branville Bard He/Him: and absolutely what I'm saying. Okay.

01:34:00.560 --> 01:34:01.980
Ed Kangethe: You just want to make sure that.

01:34:02.340 --> 01:34:10.069
Ed Kangethe: And Logan. And at least I see, you guys, you guys are going to be it for us this

01:34:10.460 --> 01:34:13.429
Ed Kangethe: topic, and then after at least we'll move.

01:34:13.990 --> 01:34:17.699
Ed Kangethe: and then a doctor. But after we move on that, then

01:34:17.830 --> 01:34:21.129
Ed Kangethe: the floor is yours to for your updates, Logan.

01:34:21.360 --> 01:34:27.940
Logan Weygandt: You just ever so briefly. I think you know, if we have oversight of an individual being hired on our behalf.

01:34:28.050 --> 01:34:42.700
Logan Weygandt: you know, we could certainly request, like automatic email forwarding, you know. Maybe there's a daily digest or a weekly digest. So that all members of the Board, like automatically receive updates without that person's like direct involvement. Like, I think

Logan Weygandt: I I would have the hope that we would have enough input that we could ensure that no data are being held from us by said person Being hired.

Ed Kangethe: Logan, If you finish your comments, at least is you, You'll be the last part on this

Elise Favia (she/her): definitely, I I mean, I think

Elise Favia (she/her): if I mean well, if they are holding data from us, it would be a fireball offense for one.

Elise Favia (she/her): But I definitely think

Elise Favia (she/her): that

Elise Favia (she/her): that would probably be the best option, because responding from the Hopkins's email would be easiest.

Elise Favia (she/her): because it's the email that everything was sent to.

Elise Favia (she/her): And and I

Elise Favia (she/her): I I was definitely under the impression, at least that was definitely the impression of the board was given that that
Elise Favia (she/her): that, you know, getting a Hopkins admin person was not an option. So if that is an option, I think that would definitely

995 01:35:51.240 --> 01:35:52.899 Elise Favia (she/her): be the best option.

996 01:35:55.310 --> 01:36:03.620 Branville Bard He/Him: I think the crux of the problems before with assigning Non Hopkins employees, Hopkins email what? That was the

997 01:36:03.720 --> 01:36:04.460 Branville Bard He/Him: question

998 01:36:08.290 --> 01:36:14.050 Lorraine Dean: that Well, that was one of the questions, but it actually wasn't the I would even go into it.

999 01:36:15.340 --> 01:36:20.869 Ed Kangethe: So let me just say this: if there is no other comments on this matter


1001 01:36:24.250 --> 01:36:25.429 We

1002 01:36:25.530 --> 01:36:29.700 Ed Kangethe: amenable to accepting the proposal, as Dr. Bart has offered it tonight.

1003 01:36:35.780 --> 01:36:41.080 Michael Wilkinson: I motion to accept the proposal, as Dr. Barn has offered it tonight. Bryan, move to do that.

1004 01:36:48.720 --> 01:36:54.039 Elise Favia (she/her): and you're muted by, I think you just asked there was a second. Yeah, thank you. I was appreciate it

1005 01:36:55.150 --> 01:36:55.980 Ed Kangethe: all right.

1006 01:36:56.520 --> 01:37:02.510 Ed Kangethe: The proposal has been properly moving. Second to all those in agreement signified by saying, I
Sonja Merchant-Jones: bye.

Ed Kangethe: Opposed, may

Lorraine Dean: it's still in they.

Ed Kangethe: The the motion has very properly moved it. Secondly, and

Ed Kangethe: by majority vote

Ed Kangethe: it is past

Ed Kangethe: Dr. Bart.

Branville Bard He/Him: I'm trying to be very quick, so, as we all know, we've signed the Mo. New with bulk. More City police department on December second. I really just want to stress that there's still a lot to be done, and we're as much as

Branville Bard He/Him: conservatively 10 to 12 months away from seeing our first officers on patrol. There are.

Branville Bard He/Him: if I ask, many

Branville Bard He/Him: discreet but unrelated planning efforts and work streams that have to be under way. Many of them will involve you, and and

Branville Bard He/Him: so i'm glad to see you
Branville Bard He/Him: putting bylaws and structures in place to help accommodate this work. As it begins

1020
01:38:10.390 --> 01:38:28.880
Branville Bard He/Him: in December we joined the national teams athletically. I think that many of you know we're required to have a power center as part of having Jhpd. So the next step in that process would be site, selection for Power Center and then development program.

1021
01:38:29.230 --> 01:38:33.470
Branville Bard He/Him: I think the board to play a active role in that, because you know what the community needs are.

1022
01:38:33.570 --> 01:38:37.100
Branville Bard He/Him: We also began the process of

1023
01:38:37.210 --> 01:38:43.609
Branville Bard He/Him: obtaining national accommodation by joining the commission for a presentation for law enforcement agencies.

1024
01:38:43.840 --> 01:38:59.729
Branville Bard He/Him: That's critical for compliance. But it's also important for our policy development, because it outlines the key standards and industry best practices that we have here to that jumps into policy development. I think that one of the most important

1025
01:39:00.010 --> 01:39:07.669
Branville Bard He/Him: how ahead of us is all to development. Obviously you gonna play a critical role in that.

1026
01:39:08.070 --> 01:39:10.759
Branville Bard He/Him: I don't think any more

1027
01:39:11.120 --> 01:39:25.439
Branville Bard He/Him: then what you're gonna play in policy development. So in the next few weeks we will engage the Board to begin discussions on that topic. I think the initial thing that we have to develop jointly a policy that

1028
Branville Bard He/Him: outlines or

1029
01:39:28.350 --> 01:39:45.910
Branville Bard He/Him: how we create policy and review policy. So we need to get a draft ready for you to review for you, to edit, for you to to make comments on, and then figure out how it would start that work. But that's the next substantial thing we should see
Branville Bard He/Him: coming from the Administration to the board, for we can begin networking.

That's really the proximity updates on it.

Ed Kangethe: Thank you, Dr. Bart.

I'll cover agenda. I know the Lord. Did you want to speak a little bit about our speaker for next month.

Lorraine Dean: Yes, so, as I had pre briefly mentioned before, next month we will have Delegate Kalin Young coming to speak to us. Calend was involved and very involved in some of the initial, the 2019 Community Safety and Strengthening Act, which is what and the fiscal note, both of which outline our duties as a board. So we wanted to have Caitlin from delegate young, present, and talk about what our legal responsibilities are kind of better state mandated as board members. So I would encourage you before next meeting, to take a look at the 2,019 community safety and strengthening act is that as it pertains to activities of the Board as well as the attached fiscal note.

to that, because that's what he'll be talking about and want to make sure everyone's prepared.

Lorraine Dean: Thanks.
Ed Kangethe: Logan. I see your hands raised.

Logan Weygandt: Sorry I realized we're running long, just thinking about the fact that we're going to be reviewing policy or proposed policy documents. I think it was exceedingly helpful when we were looking over sort of bylaws and things like that, seeing would have been done at peer institutions, and so I would like to.

Logan Weygandt: You know I I can't make recommendations on behalf of myself, but I I think we as a board, might find some benefit in seeing similar like policy manuals from other police forces that are out there before we get like this huge policy manual like this is our draft. It would be nice to have something that compared to much like Liam did with the bylaws.

Branville Bard He/Him: That makes sense.

Branville Bard He/Him: You just just to clarify on my and Dr. Wy you you're asking for like a benchmark on how other universities create policy?

Ed Kangethe: Okay? I'm looking around. I don't see anybody hand raised.

Ed Kangethe: I appreciate everybody hanging in there a little late in, as usual tonight.
Ed Kangethe: if they have no objection, I asked unanimous consent for the meeting to be adjourned.

1054
01:42:35.670 --> 01:42:37.470
Ed Kangethe: made another jacket

1055
01:42:38.210 --> 01:42:41.710
Ed Kangethe: we're standing at. We're standing adjourned at

1056
01:42:41.790 --> 01:42:44.070
Ed Kangethe: 7, 46.

1057
01:42:45.250 --> 01:42:49.789
Ed Kangethe: Everyone appreciate your time. Thank you all. Have a good evening.

1058
01:42:50.150 --> 01:42:52.869
Terri Massie-Burrell PhD: everybody. Be safe.