

Security

Student Advisory Committee for Security  
Wednesday February 26, 2020  
5:15 PM  
3001 Remington Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21211

**AGENDA**

5:15 PM – Welcome	
5:30 PM – Active Shooter Video Process	
5:40 PM – First Video Production Vendor	Connor Scott
6:00 PM – Board Structure and Length of Term	Jarron Jackson/Bill White
6:15 PM – Last Meeting Review*	Jarron Jackson/Bill White
6:15 PM – Second Video Production Vendor	Connor Scott/Sarah Cunningham
6:40 PM – Review of Committee	Connor Scott
	Jarron Jackson/Bill White
	Connor Scott

\*this item might move on agenda based on timing of items and Vendor interviews

- **Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020 @ 5:00 p.m.**
- **Please note, May meeting has been added, date pending**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TIME</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
March 24, 2020	5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	TBD
April 23, 2020	8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	TBD
<b>May</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Summer 2020	TBD	Conference Call

**Pre-Meeting Materials:**

- [Ohio State Active Shooter Video](#)
- [Texas State Active Shooter Video](#)
- [Northwestern “Run, Hide, Fight” Video](#)
- Production Company Resumes/Information
- [Student Advisory Committee](#)

**Meeting Notes:**

- Garland Sit-In members joined the meeting

Guests and meeting participants introduced themselves, and the Garland Sit-In group presented the below questions and concerns.

- JHU Garland Sit-In Letter was read (attached); Summary below:
  - Student Advisory Committee meetings should be open to the public.



- Regular open community meetings should be held before this committee meets again and hold March 2020 meeting in East Baltimore
    - OIE needs to be at March meeting to discuss Povey case.
  - Garland Sit-In members noted the advisory committee is not representative of the student body.
  - Meetings should be live-streamed and open.
  - A student member of the committee raised the question, how do we breed effective communication during an open meeting if there are 100+ people and the committee members? Need to think about the format of the open meeting and effective communication during an open meeting.
  - Another student member noted that the committee does not represent the percentage of those against a JH Police Department.
  - Public meetings need to be held because feedback against the PD has not been addressed.
  - The public wants to hear the feedback from the meetings and see how the committee meetings work.
    - A student member proposed to vote as a group (including guests) to hold Open Meeting in March
  - Everyone should be allowed to be at the meetings at the same time. Committee meetings to be rebuilt from scratch (start over).
  - A student member of the committee requested a plan for reducing crime that does not include a private police force (as noted in the Interim Study)
  - The same member stated no one takes the advisory committee seriously and that there is no trust between the Hopkins community and Hopkins Leadership.
  - Garland Sit-In group asked “How will we handle the embarrassment and disrespect that is Johns Hopkins?”
  - Vice President Scott asked for the Garland Sit-In’s opinion on having an at large (to include students, staff, faculty and community members) advisory committee or if there should be several smaller groups.
    - A member of the Garland Sit-In responded that answering that question was the responsibility of school leadership and leadership should utilize the BSPH, which has a department specializing in polling.
  - A community member asked: What would it take for leadership to change their mind about something [when a decision already made]?
    - Response from VP Scott:
      - University leadership is very reasonable, and even in situations where a decision has been made, he has seen them change their mind when convincing evidence is presented. That being said, there are always situations where leadership has broader perspective and may need to make a decision based on a bigger picture than once piece of advice, which happens everywhere, not just at Johns Hopkins.
  - Garland Sit-In leadership noted – The advisory committee meetings are a violation of equal representation.
  - VP Scott committed to responding to the JHU Garland Sit-In request of open meetings by end of next week (March 6, 2020)
  - A Sit-In member stated that people are being murdered by school officers. Another member encouraged leadership to review the UCI racial profiling case as an example.
- Garland Sit-In guests left the meeting
- A student member of the committee stated the meetings notes were discussed in first few meetings of the committee. It was decided by the committee the meeting notes should be broad (although

recently have been very broad) and not specific in nature since the names of the committee are public.

- A student member asked if the JHPD was part of security.
  - Several members asked the student where to draw the line.
  - When the committee was formed Vice President Hyatt stated the purpose of the group was to discuss ongoing security issues. This group was not going to be about the JHPD, it might come up in discussion but the JHPD was never intended to be main focus of the group.
  - A student stated that this committee was not intended to be about the PD, that responsibility falls to the Accountability Board, this group shares opinion on security as a whole.
  - Another student stated that the Accountability Board is the specific advisory group for the police department and that there should be clear delineation between advisory committee and Accountability Board
- The committee asked to be given agendas and support materials with more advance notice.
- Several committee members asked is this an advisory committee or a decision-making group?
- Two students noted that the community at large should know this committee has no decision making power.
  - This group should be used to provide perspective for leadership
- A student wondered if the community at large should have a say in the production of an Active Shooter training video (for students, faculty and staff)?
  - The group debated whether the committee was voting on which production company they liked best or whether this was a discussion without a formal vote.
- A student asked that committee members influence the agenda and Vice President Scott, Associate Vice Provost Sarah Cunningham agreed this was a great idea and would like to implement this immediately.
  - It was agreed that agenda and materials will be set and sent to committee 10 days prior to next meeting.
- A student said it would be helpful to hold forums at specific campuses to help keep the committee members engaged with Security personnel and communities which they represent.
- A student wondered whether or not the committee members should still be tasked with disseminating information to their peer groups? It is a huge burden and responsibility of being on the committee.
  
- Video Vendor Presentations
  - Vendor #1
    - Look at project not as an action movie, but as a teaching tool for an active shooter scenario. It is important to think through a scenario in order to help prepare ourselves.
    - Important to represent the diversity and international population at Johns Hopkins
    - Shared sample video with the group
      - Filming took place over 2-3 full days (scale)
    - Wants to partner with JH to make video
      - Video should be used as a tool
    - Discuss priorities during pre-production
      - A student felt it was important to film at all the campuses – use the visual to tie all the campuses in – which allows people to visualize what to do on their own campus.
    - A student stated the video should not be used to endorse a police force.
  - Vendor #2
    - Founded in 2012
    - Many local clients (Baltimore and DC)
    - Shared sample video
    - Team member helped to make Towson University’s video while a student at TU
    - Feel it is important to include students in the filming

- Another team member helped with the Baltimore City Health Department Anti Violence Campaign
    - A student did not agree with including warning signs and/or indicators of potential for violence in the video, as many of the alleged signs are not accurate.
  - Committee members felt first vendor would take direction better.
  - Second group has produced more product.
  
- Brainstorming around Structure of the Next Meeting
  - What are the mechanisms for reporting an issue?
  - Draft response sent to committee members prior to being sent to JHU Garland Sit-In
  - Discuss what the board does and responsibilities
    - Role of the committee within organization
  - Need more consistent forums for the community regarding JHPD
  - How to report incidents involving JH Security
  - Next Meeting
    - Open meetings in East Baltimore
      - This idea is based on the idea that this committee is designed to talk about the police, having open forums in current and future patrol areas
      - Security committee is in favor of this but it would be separate from advisory committee
      - Figure out who to talk to about this idea/making it happen
    - **How to make meetings open:**
      - Comment period on agenda – before and after for public
      - Public comment time at meeting:
        - Parliamentary Procedure - 1 minute per person + 3 minutes can be yielded by others
        - Or grant 10-20min at the end, like the meeting will end at a pre-determined time (how do you stop people from commenting at set time?)
      - Live stream
        - With comments? – but then what to do about people watching, if they have comments that should be addressed before meeting ends
      - Video recording + minutes
      - Open + Minutes only
  - Open discussion of outcome of student assault by JHU officer
    - Acknowledge concerns
    - Discuss officer sanctions
      - If personnel matters cannot be discussed:
        - Need the “WHY” those matters cannot be discussed
        - Discuss types of standards of conduct/discipline
        - Publish code of conduct for officers and staff (post to our site or direct to where posted)
        - Show conduct standards are in place (SOP)
        - Discuss who is making decision on action/internal method for accountability
  - Need to discuss role of committee at next meeting
    - Opportunity to talk about
      - Advisory role
      - To what extent are representative
      - Committee role with regard to police force
        - Clarify assumption committee inadvertently legitimizing the process

- Some student members noted that the committee was promised not to be used as a promotional tool for the JHPD, however it was specifically referenced in the legislation.
    - How to address misrepresentation about role and decision making ability of this committee (correct for past assumptions)
  - Other topics to talk about at next meeting
    - Clarify the committee does discuss the police force, but because it's a concern of others and members on committee, not because committee is about JHPD
    - Get updates on status of police force at meeting
      - How feedback is monitored on website (which website specifically?)
      - What updates are on the website
      - How to use website

February 26, 2020

Members of the Student Advisory Committee to the VP of Security and Connor Scott, Interim VP of Security:

It is our understanding that this body has met for over a year and has been making decisions without student and community input. We do not consider this committee representative. If you consider this body representative please reconcile with these facts: It has been asserted by security experts solicited by JHU on October 29, 2018 that this police force will be incredibly dangerous if there is not trust from everyone affected by the proposed police department. (Johns Hopkins University, 2018a) Given the many times people have been outspoken about trusting JHU, this process must be halted until proper transparency has been established (Soderberg, 2019). The notes posted of these and other private police related meetings have already had transparency problems with incomplete records, inappropriate addendums, etc. In addition, since you were appointed, there has not been a single public, open meeting with the students you claim to represent. There has not been a single public open meeting about the private police since the amended bill was passed in Annapolis last year. There has not been a single public open meeting about the new VP of Security search. We are here after numerous discussions with interim VP Connor Scott, numerous members of this student committee, Dean of Student Life Smita Ruzika, Director of Community and Government Affairs Jeanne Hitchcock.

We demand regular public open meetings now before this board can meet again, and that all further meetings be public and open. In addition, we demand public open meetings in East Baltimore, if that is where you plan to start the police force. These meetings shall not count towards the state mandated public meetings for the private police but should be continuous in current and future patrol areas to serve as further evaluation of your ability to engage the public, which has failed thus far as the private police department plan is a violation of consent. You may continue this meeting for today under the expressed recognition that this meeting and previous meetings have been a violation of being a representative student body and as a group can begin to fix this issue by making these meetings public and open.

Connor Scott: what is the status of the officer that you saw assault a student on camera? You have seen an officer assault someone and you must take immediate action. As a student I am obligated to raise these issues to you and will need direct action from you. How can you tell us to call the police when that will be a JHPD officer if you have it your way? Through your handling of the Povey attack, it is clear you are not interested in what makes victims feel safe. And we have spoken to the victim and are against going to the police for numerous reasons I'd be curious if you could understand. These concerns need to be addressed at once in our next advisory committee meeting. This is larger than an individual incident.

You, Connor Scott and the advisory committee, must understand that your roles are connected to police violence everywhere. This officer assault happened on your term and nothing has been done about it. You have not been prepared to comment or advise anyone on behalf of student from having these closed meetings. You must understand that by being on this committee and continuing to meet, you are greenlighting an armed occupation of East Baltimore on indigenous land after the forced displacement of indigenous people and 800 families in Middle East Baltimore around Hopkins campus. Connor Scott himself announced they will "test" the private police force on East Baltimore.

We demand regular public open meetings now before this board can meet again, and that all further meetings be public and open. In addition, we demand public open meetings in East Baltimore, if that is where you plan to start the police force. These meetings shall not count towards the state mandated public meetings for the private police but should be continuous in current and future patrol areas to serve as further evaluation of your ability to engage the public, which has failed thus far as the private police department plan is a violation of consent. You may continue this meeting for today under the expressed recognition that this meeting and previous meetings have been a violation of being a representative student body and as a group can begin to fix this issue by making these meetings public and open.

We need spaces to imagine together, no matter how any individual feels about the proposed police. The proposed police department violates the consent of many student polls against its creation (SGA, SAPP, Faculty letter). We need to change the culture about the problems of sexual assault being ignored on campus, about making sure vulnerable people do not feel threatened on campus. Do not limit your imagination to what President Ron Daniels via Connor Scott is telling you is possible. Don't be divided from the people you claim to represent. Demand public open meetings with us. And if you agree with public health experts at the Bloomberg School of Public Health (Johns Hopkins University, 2018b), and the American Public Health Association statement on how we reduce police violence (American Public Health Association, 2018), and JHU's own invited security experts (Johns Hopkins University, 2018a), you will join us in calling for No Private Police, and certainly No Private Police in the way JHU is doing it based on how they run the current security forces.

On July 24<sup>th</sup> the Provost claimed the University is following a public health model, but nothing in the interim report speaks to that (JHU Sit-In, 2019). Community driven initiatives are required, not community "oriented" or community placed interventions (Eisinger & Senturia, 2001; Mansuri & Rao, 2004; Paul, Rigrod, Wingate, & Borsuk, 2015). These concerns have been mentioned to Connor Scott and the University President in livestreamed events. The interim study says everyone wants more engagement. Community-driven public health demands community engagement in assessing the needs and assets of everyone impacted by violence and health concerns. The most vulnerable people within and outside this University must drive not only the assessment of whatever problems the private police force is claiming to fix or intervene on, and must continue to drive the process through designing a real intervention for the problem, implementing that intervention, and evaluating the efficacy of that intervention. You have not let community drive this process at all. And to be clear, community is students, faculty, staff, neighborhood residents, guests, and anyone else affected by the private police initiative. Why don't you use a community driven model instead of an outdated community "oriented" model? This department is a violation of consent. Violations of consent are already a major problem here with the amount of sexual assault. Connor Scott himself witnessed a security officer assault a student on camera, has done nothing about it, and has given this officer a raise with the other security officers.

When would you like to have public open meetings with this committee, about the VP of security, the amended bill you are now supposedly designing your police department around? Specifically, when will you have a public open meeting in East Baltimore since you announced in a private meeting with neighborhood leaders, the JHU president's office, university officials, and Senator Antonio Hayes that you will start testing the private police force on East Baltimore. In this closed meeting many people begged for more Public Health expertise and input in the process. Mr. Scott has yet to follow up on this.



We demand regular public open meetings now before this board can meet again. In addition, make your next meeting a public open meeting in East Baltimore, if that is where you plan to start the police force. These meetings shall not count towards the state mandated public meetings for the private police but should be continuous in current and future patrol areas to serve as further evaluation of your ability to engage the public, which has failed thus far as the private police department is a violation of consent.

Sincerely,

The JHU Sit-In  
[Jhusitin2019@gmail.com](mailto:Jhusitin2019@gmail.com)

#### References

- American Public Health Association. (2018). Addressing Law Enforcement Violence as a Public Health Issue. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://www.apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-database/2019/01/29/law-enforcement-violence>
- Eisinger, A., & Senturia, K. (2001). *Doing Community-Driven Research: A Description of Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities*. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* (Vol. 78).
- JHU Sit-In. (2019). JHU Sit-In - July 24, 9am: meeting with Johns Hopkins... Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://www.facebook.com/TheGarlandSitIn/videos/210489719892605/>
- Johns Hopkins University. (2018a). Discussion Series, Session 1 – Public Safety Initiatives. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://publicsafetyinitiatives.jhu.edu/events-livestreams/discussion-series-session-1/>
- Johns Hopkins University. (2018b). Discussion Series, Session 3 – Public Safety Initiatives. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://publicsafetyinitiatives.jhu.edu/events-livestreams/discussion-series-session-3/>
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2004). Community-based and -driven development: A critical review. *World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkh012>
- Paul, M. P., Rigrod, P., Wingate, S., & Borsuk, M. E. (2015). A Community-Driven Intervention in Tufonboro, New Hampshire, Succeeds in Altering Water Testing Behavior. *Journal of Environmental Health*, 78(5), 30–39.
- Soderberg, B. (2019). How to protest campus cops and save lives. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://theoutline.com/post/7431/johns-hopkins-university-campus-occupation-arrests-private-police-ice?zd=1&zi=opjfniup>

**Student Advisory Committee for Security – Johns Hopkins University**  
**Active Shooter Video Process**

**Take care of not doing a video for legitimizing policing.** This is about having a response in case of shootings, not about legitimizing President Daniels and Presidential Candidate Michael Bloomberg's project of a private police force for Hopkins. <These videos must explicitly say they do not endorse or legitimize the private police>

**Community-driven.** Videos argue that what people do matters. Thus, the University should build the capacity for facing shootings with and within the community –students, faculties, staff, neighbors, etc. Moreover, as part of the Hopkins non-security plan for reducing violent crime, we could help in building such capacities with communities affiliated and non-affiliated with Hopkins through, for example, training in gun defense.

This comment is in line with the Interim Study presented to legislators in two senses. First, in engaging with communities. And second, in producing a non-security plan for addressing violent crime in Hopkins campuses and surrounding areas. <It very concerns that we could have a video that is supposed to be a training that suggests people to fight and defend themselves, but you do not provide any physical or realistic trainings or drills for non-security, e.g., gun defense>

**Production of fear.** The three videos use music and production that reminds Hollywood movies. Moreover, they are based on fear. In contrast, I suggest having a more informative approach. For example,

- Before “running, hiding, and fighting”, it is crucial to keep calm. It is a dangerous situation, but we have strategies for not being harmed. Think and remember fastly what to do, evaluate your environment, advance a fast coordination with other people.
- We can talk about safety conditions at Hopkins. For example, saying that windows and doors are bulletproof if it is the case, training on how to use the blue light system in the event of a shooter, making sure there are options for self-defense in every building.

**Threat of police brutality.** Both Hopkins affiliates and non-affiliates could face police brutality. Furthermore, Hopkins attempt to have its own private police force increases the likelihood of this to happen within campuses. As we know, the University has plans for making it more likely not to happen, but it cannot certainly assure it <a police murder>. Consequently, we could also build a plan that builds the capacity for facing the threat of police brutality within and without campuses in relating to BPD officers under challenging conditions.

**Povey’s case.** The NW video calls reporting threats of aggressions as a central part of facing shootings. Before the counterprotesters led by Daniel Povey attacked students and guests on May 8, 2019, he sent emails to his department that he would address the problem by his own hands. Did the department reported to the University? Which was the response of the Office of the VP for Security? This is a real and continued threat, and this context must be included when discussing active shooters and violent attackers on campus.

**Stop the project for a private police force.** The advisory committee suggested having a plan in case of shooting at the beginning of its operations. Previous VP for Security Melissa Hyatt committed to building a plan. Over one year after, we insisted again on a promise that was not fulfilled. In February 2020, we finally are talking about it, but just as a reactive response to students' insistence. **If we were not able to face such a problem, and Hopkins was not aware of this flaw, it means the University is not prepared for having a private police force.**

The majority of voices have strongly suggest stopping with the project of a private police force before it takes actual place because a police in Hopkins's hands could be dangerous. Existing polls, open letters, and the data presented by the Interim Study support this statement.

Alternatively, critical voices suggest following a public health and community-driven approach, an alternative that Provost Kumar agreed in evaluating on the live-streamed meeting of July 24, 2019.

SECURITY advisory committee:

NOTE: EVERY BULLET POINT IS NEW PERSON SPEAKING

1. Conversation on notes
  - a. Wondering how best to take notes
  - b. Not attributing comments to people
  - c. Review minutes at beginning of each meeting
2. When this committee first started it was not about police force and was in strictly advisory capacity
  - a. It's important that this committee stay broader than police force in content
  - b. Re: visitors-- this committee has never voted on anything or decided anything, so it is not the body described by visitors
  - c. Wont police matters be a security issue? Wouldn't a problem with police conduct of a jhupd be considered a security problem?
    - i. Drawing a distinction between security and police can be unhelpful
    - ii. If we are talking about the alleged assault on a person by security directly after daniel povey event--yes that was a seucirty issue and we shoudl talk about it and if its a chronic problem
  - d. The discussion about being advisory versus decision making is a larger conversation about all committees at hopkins. There is no pretensions about these bodies having decision making power but maybe we should talk about problems within that
  - e. "I dont come in here thinking what i say here will have an impact. These are valid frustrations" but we also are not promised authority
  - f. Wasn't this created under melissa hyatt as a model for accountability for private police?
    - i. There's the accountability board separate from this to handle police things. I'm on the nomination committee and we tried to be as accountable as possible. That committee is more meant to discuss police things. Maybe when that gets started itll cover police things--maybe general security things we can all discuss but specific police matters seems more under their jurisdiction
    - ii. I didnt mean this is board for police but in public meetings, that we can gather all feedback regardless
    - iii. I want to clarify that we do not have any power here. There is belief by the greater campus community anf baltimore community that we do have power and i wonder if there was a misrepresentation of this board to others. Those ideas did not come from nothing
    - iv. That was also how this committee was portrayed to the legislature
    - v. I think that and also because there are not other mechanisms so this is the one place people can see, therefore its imbued with power
    - vi. So now we are about to have conversation about videos so that is a decision that will impact others
3. Maybe thats a good point--what is the vision and intent of this committee?

- a. The intent should be broader like what X was saying--this board covers florida and DC, so we need to raise all concerns across campuses
  - b. Wants this group to be useful to all participants
  - c. So this was created to be broader than jhupd, but that's the elephant in the room and its in an in-between space because jhupd is in process
  - d. I would want to see more open forums on private police force. And we've had conversations but we want to know what others are thinking
  - e. I think student ability to influence the agenda would help
  - f. Maybe week before meeting (wed before?)--we build agenda to make it a two way street
  - g. Im coming from a different campus, maybe we should have forum system for individual campuses. I know a lot for someone on my campus. We should have open meetings but we still might need private meeting to make some decisions or have some conversations
  - h. All committees around the country have open meetings, public, with agendas and public commentary periods. You can make deicisions with public input and
  - i. I dont know if we make decisions
  - j. Yes by univeristy policy we will not make decisions
  - k. Maybe recording these meetings woudl help and for institutional memory. Also agenda sent two weeks before would help a lot
    - i. Could we do something like a week to ten days because news is rolling
  - l. Maybe we should stop using the word 'representative' because that is a big weight to carry and hard to fulfill--its a big burden
  - m. How would you change the charge of the committee?
  - n. To claim that we are not representative. We advise
  - o. I read through our definition and it makes sense to those in administration--that we are giving one perspective, so its a matter of bveing misunderstood by the public
  - p. I assume melissa made this just for that, to get perspective
4. So how do we answer the demands of the JHU sit-in? How do we respond?
    - a. Are there enough members here to do a vote that would be considered the majority?
    - b. What's quorum to this body?
    - c. If we can make a comment on a vendor but not opening the next meeting then that's inconsistent. We should make a rule on quorum and that is the consistent number
    - d. Quorum is important here because this IS decision making, to open meeting
    - e. And having dissenters who aren't here wouldnt have the oppurtunity
    - f. Well those who are not here did not know this vote would happen
    - g. Can we do a survey so all members can give a deicison and we give a bunch of options for how the next meeting shoudl go
  5. Vendor presentation--solicited for active shooter video
    - a. Human being productions
      - i. [there is handout]

- ii. Will it be all campuses?
    - 1. Discussion: we might do homework and decide this is for everywhere or not
  - iii. There is a hospital video on clinical setting, is that being replaced?
    - 1. Maybe, but academic setting is different
  - iv. That's a pre-production conversation
  - v. Some tactics are universal and some things are specific
  - vi. When security talks about campuses, they talk all campuses, not specific area
  - vii. We want video general enough to be representative of everyone
  - viii. Production team will have conversation about setting--will we do lab setting? Study setting? Class setting? We might want it to feel like anywhere
  - ix. Is the video the whole plan? Is there stuff after this video?
  - x. People are talking about how to do these videos and do follow up--people are being traumatized by these videos so how to do it in the best way
  - xi. I worry about legitimizing the police or security officers in making the videos. In two of the examples, the protagonists are the police or security. It seems police should be external to these videos and for some when police show up they might confuse
- b. Rock shore
- i. Are you saying you want a portion of the video dedicated to warnings of active shooter situations?
    - 1. A: yeah possibly at the end but that could be gone over
    - 2. I have concerns about the data behind 'warning signs'
    - 3.