Wednesday, March 15, 2023

Accountability Board Members:

Noah Patton	Present
Cynthia Gross	Present
Edward Kangethe	Present
Sonja Merchant-Jones	Present
Doris Minor-Terrell	Present
Lorraine Dean	Present
P. Logan Weygandt	Present
Michael Wilkinson	Absent
Katie O'Conor	Present
Elise Favia	Absent
Terri Massie-Burrell	Present
Thomas Judge	Present

Johns Hopkins Staff present:

- 1. Rodney Hill
- 2. LaTicia Douglas
- 3. Jarron Jackson
- 4. Liam Haviv
- 5. Jennifer Mielke
- 6. Kelly Allen/Gus Sentementes (Livestream Technicians)

Opening

The meeting was called to order by Edward Kangethe, JH Accountability Board (JHAB) member, at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 15, 2023, via Zoom and in person. The meeting was broadcast live via toll-free call-in and on the <u>Accountability Board meetings live-stream webpage</u>. Roll for the Board and Johns Hopkins administration was called.

Theme

The meeting's theme was general Board business.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Minutes from the February 15th meeting were proposed for approval.

Kangethe moved to approve, and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Committee Updates

- Communications/Media
 - Lori Dean updated the Board on the email responses drafted by the Communications Committee and sent via the Accountability Board's JH email address by Public Safety staff. The emails included a disclaimer that the General Counsel previously approved.
- Governance
 - o No committee formed at this time
- Legal/Finance
 - o No committee formed at this time

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

- Outreach/Community Relations
 - O Sonja Merchant-Jones will provide an update on the committee in April, once she and her committee member have had a chance to discuss the vision for the committee.
 - Dean suggested including a video presentation about the Board and onboarding/training for new members.
 Cynthia Gross noted that some of the efforts of this committee may be taken on in conjunction with the new administrative support person.
- Open Meetings Act (OMA) Compliance
 - o No committee formed at this time

Board Business: Meeting Format

Gross expressed interest in reviewing the minutes and recording from the Board meeting at which the hybrid format was proposed by the Board.

Note: This information was shared with the Board via email on March 16, 2023. It was the November 16, 2022 meeting where the hybrid meeting format was discussed. Currently, the format of the meetings allows the public to join in via a toll-free call-in and livestream. However, Gross and Kangethe felt that the meetings were to be in person to include members of public; this sentiment was later echoed by Thomas Judge.

Dean added that in-person meetings were to contribute to Board cohesion and allow for full participation of members (not everyone has a chance to respond to email). Doris Minor-Terrell echoed the importance of meeting in person to better express thoughts and opinions in a group setting.

Kangethe asked if hybrid meetings were proposed to include members of the public?

P. Logan Weygandt stated that there may not be a need to review prior meeting discussion if the Board's current desire is to allow the public to participate in person. Dean and Judge expressed concern over the changes that were made regarding Board decisions, such as the plan to have past Board meetings in a hybrid format and then, moved to virtual only. Kangethe reiterated the need for the Board to make a clear decision and convey that decision to Administration.

LaTicia Douglas, Special Assistant, confirmed that any decision by the Board to include the public at the Board meetings in an inperson capacity would be reviewed by Administration and discussed internally. A vote on this specific topic by the Board would be considered a recommendation to Administration.

Gross moved to open up hybrid meetings to the general public; the motion was seconded by Judge. The motion was passed by the Board with 9 affirmative votes and one abstention.

Board Business: By Laws

Kangethe brought up the By Laws which are under review by the Board. Gross mentioned that Delegate Young, who presented at the February 15, 2023 meeting, offered to share sample By Laws and asked if administration had received those examples. Douglas confirmed they had not been received. Starting with the Removal and Discipline section, the Board proceeded to review the By Laws. Dean expressed the need to be concrete with the language around dismissal from the Board; Kangethe suggested that after three (3) consecutive meetings, a member would be put on voluntary probation. Judge expressed his concern that the By Laws would be developed by the Board, but not taken as anything but recommendations by the administration; this sentiment was shared by Minor-Terrell and Noah Patton. Weygandt commented that, in his opinion, it is worth creating By Laws regardless of how the By Laws are viewed by administration (as a recommendation or something more definitive). The structure provided by the By Laws will allow the Board to move forward. Noah Patton echoed the importance of having structure, even if only at the level of recommendations, because it still demonstrates the work the Board has done. Dean

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

disagreed and stated that she felt it was disrespectful of Board members' time if recommendations are "just lip service." She listed four examples where she perceived recommendations made by the Board were overturned:

Note: Please refer to the transcript, beginning at 38:35.

- Communications/email with the Board
- Hybrid meeting changes
- Board administrative staff person hiring
- Board meeting agendas

Dean did specify that her complaints were not directed at Public Safety staff, who she commended, but rather at the structure of the relationship between the Board and Johns Hopkins. Kangethe recognized the strong feelings members of the Board have but encouraged everyone to stick with the agenda and focus on the By Laws. Gross reiterated that the By Laws are for the Board and not for the Administration. She also reminded Board members that two members are appointed by the City Council President and Mayor; not all Board members go through the application process.

Judge moved to table the discussion about the By Laws until the Board has an opportunity to review the By Laws of the Baltimore City Police Accountability Board. The motion was seconded by Gross and approved unanimously by the Board.

Douglas clarified that her comment about recommendations was solely in relation to the public attending Board meetings in person. Terri Massie-Burrell encouraged the Board to be proactive in asking for the City's Police Accountability Board's By Laws and suggested that the Board may want to work alongside the City Board to create By Laws. Judge recommended that a Board member reach out to get the City's By Laws and Dean volunteered for this task. Weygandt shared information on the City's Website which may be helpful for the Board.

Board Business: Committee Structure & Duties

Judge raised the question of having the Governance committee research By Laws and Board structure to provide clarity on this topic. He asked to work with Jennifer Mielke, Director of City Relations in Government and Community Affairs, along with other Board Members and Public Safety staff, to research this topic more.

Kangethe asked the Board if any additional committees should be established in addition to the five (5) the Board is seeking to create. Dean suggested a committee for data/crime statistics or policy review, per the recommendation of Delegate Young; this could be two committees or one. Gross clarified that the legislation provides the Board with its duties and crime data is a

After the Board expressed a desire to be able to reply to community members' e-mails directly through the JHU e-mail account and with a disclaimer, the Board was told they could not use the JHU e-mail account and instead spent time designing another system for responding; however, the decision was later changed such that the Board could use the JHU e-mail account with the disclaimer. The initial denial of the Board's request and changes around these decisions resulted in an up to 1 year delay in the Board's ability to respond to e-mails. After the Board voted to hold hybrid meetings to allow for both virtual and in-person interactions, JHPS cancelled the in-person option for two meetings. Although this was cited as being due to Board member's low response to e-mails to specify their virtual or in-person attendance preference, this denied the opportunity for Board members who responded to attend in-person and allow those who may not have responded to the e-mail to still attend in-person. Immediately after the Board used its formal voting process to recommend that a Board administrator be hired as an independent consultant, Dr. Bard re-affirmed that JHPS would move forward with hiring the Board administrator as a part-time staff person, regardless of the Board's vote. After the agenda committee set up items for discussion at meetings, JHPS removed items from the agenda several times.

¹ The following edits were submitted by Lorraine Dean as amendments to the minutes on April 12, 2023. The transcript for this meeting can be found here and this discussion begins at 38:35.

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

component of the legislation. Judge asked if Johns Hopkins had additional requirements and/or tasks for the Board, in addition to the minimum requirements as imposed by the legislation.

Dean moved to create a Data Overview committee which was seconded by O'Conor. The motion was passed with nine (9) affirmative votes and one abstention.

Weygandt explained his abstention by stating that, as he was unsure what data the Board would receive, it could be critical for the full Board to receive the information (such as in the case of misconduct) and not just a subset of the Board.

Gross clarified that data around crime statistics and police misconduct is not the responsibility of the Johns Hopkins Police Accountability Board, but that of the Baltimore Police Accountability Board. Rodney Hill, Senior Advisor, confirmed that this is correct- JHPD officer misconduct will be reviewed by the Baltimore Police Accountability Board per terms of the legislation. He explained that all University police departments in the city fall under the Baltimore Police Accountability Board for misconduct review, not just the Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD). Judge suggested working with the Baltimore Police Accountability Board on the committee structure and formation as well.

O'Conor moved to table further discussion on the committee structure for future meetings. This was seconded by Judge and carried unanimously by the Board.

Board: Vision for the Board

The idea to establish a vision for the future of the Board came out of the December 2022 Board retreat. Judge encouraged the Board not to limit itself in creating its vision. He expressed interest in reviewing broader crime statistics to help the Board create future recommendations. Dean mentioned the need to be the voice of community members and part of the Board's vision needs to represent the community.

Updates from Administration

Douglas noted that there are no updates from administration. When asked about the Board administrative support person, she noted that the position is currently posted internally before it can be publicly posted.

Hill commented on the two policy positions that have been posted in response to Dean's question about them. Hill noted these positions are to help with the policy process, in addition to the consultants currently being used. These positions will work with the JHPD and the Public Safety enterprise. Dean asked how the Board would interact with those individuals and Hill noted that that would be up to the Board.

Open Discussion

Gross expressed thanks and appreciation for the staff at Peabody and Public Safety who helped facilitate the in-person portion of the Board meeting.

Merchant-Jones expressed her concerns regarding an email the Board received in January 2023 about the December 2022 public listening session regarding the magnitude of opposition to the creation of the JHPD. Her concern was that it was difficult for those in favor of the creation of the JHPD to show their support. Merchant-Jones continued with her concern if all voices will not be heard meaningful dialogue cannot be had. She reiterated her personal support for the JHPD. Like Gross, Merchant-Jones shared her appreciation for Public Safety staff. She encouraged the Board to look and move forward to creating a police department that everyone can be proud of. Merchant-Jones reiterated a comment from Michael Wilkinson at a prior Board meeting that meetings may need to be longer than ninety (90) minutes. Any Board members willing to have a discussion about support for or against the JHPD should feel free to reach out to Merchant-Jones directly.

Patton noted for the record that he does not agree with the necessity of the JHPD. Judge expressed interest in having a Board meeting with President Daniels to which Douglas commented that would involve internal discussion and requested an email be sent to her with a formal request for this meeting.

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

Upcoming Meeting Updates

The next Board meeting is Wednesday, April 19, 2023.

Next Steps/Action Items

- By Laws
 - o Request sample By Laws from the Baltimore City Police Accountability Board
 - Lori Dean will reach out for the By Laws and ask Mariel W. Shutinya if she can attend the April 2023 meeting
 - o Research sample By Laws
- Establish a new subcommittee
 - o Data Overview committee
- Hiring of a part-time administrative staff person for the Board
- Board meeting with President Daniels
 - o Board member(s) to email LaTicia Douglas with a formal request

Closing

Kangethe asked for unanimous consent to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 p.m.; the Board gave consent unanimously.

Kangethe thanked everyone for their time.