

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

Accountability Board Members:

Aprille Weron	Present
Ateeb Ahmad Parray	Absent
Chyna Sinclair	Present
Douglas "Duke" Tremiere	Present
Ed Kangethe	Absent
Elizabeth Hazel	Present
Freud-Williams Maignan	Absent
Jerrell Bratcher	Present
Kamaria Hill	Absent
Kimyatta Ricks	Present
Laura Rossi	Present
Madhu Subramanian	Present
Panagis Galiatsatos, MD	Absent
Sam Johnson	Absent
Sonja Merchant-Jones	Present

Johns Hopkins Staff Present:

1. Dr. Branville Bard
2. Calvin L. Smith Jr.
3. Monique Brown
4. Jennifer Mielke
5. Amy Taylor
6. Kelly Allen (Livestream Technician)

Opening

Elizabeth Hazel, JH Accountability Board (JHAB) Co-Chair, began the meeting at 6:05 p.m. with introductions by the Board members and JH staff. The meeting was broadcast live via toll-free call-in and on the [Accountability Board meetings live-stream webpage](#).

Board Business – January Minutes

Elizabeth made a motion to move the approval of the January 15th Accountability Board meeting minutes to the March 19th full Board meeting. The Board unanimously approved.

Administration Updates from Dr. Bard

Dr. Bard gave an update on the JHPD, specifically where they are and their plans for the year. He asked if the accountability board had questions regarding the community engagement plan he submitted in December 2024. He was particularly interested in how the board planned to deliver feedback and asked if it would be similar to the policy section feedback.

The JHPD currently have 13 employees: one chief (himself), three deputy chiefs, one captain, one lieutenant, one full-fledged police officer, and officer trainees either in the police academy or about to join. Several offers were being made to increase staff to over 15 employees, and an offer would be extended to their first sergeant soon.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

The JHPD are present on all three campuses, mostly in an engagement posture. The aim for the year is to boost hiring significantly, growing into a full-time, full-service police department. The expectation is to hire 25 to 30 officers this year and reach the statutory capacity of 100 employees within the next three years, including 2025.

Regarding technology, there have been significant progress, but a few tasks remain. There is an implementation schedule with expectancy to complete everything by the beginning of the third quarter of the year. They are a fully recognized, functioning department, with the goal of becoming a full-time, full-service police department that year.

For the community engagement plan, Dr. Bard intentionally left the draft watermark to signify that while it was nearly finalized, it is not complete until the accountability board's feedback is incorporated. The goal is not to create robotic engagements but to elevate the principles of Directive 4.25 on community policing and problem-solving, providing condensed guidelines.

The overarching policy talked about tracking engagements and developing metrics, but this was not included in the community engagement plan. The focus was on positive interactions and organic engagements with community partners. However, developing metrics and tracking engagements remained an important part of the process.

The engagement plans emphasized collaborating with campus and adjacent communities, equitable service delivery, and amplifying JHPD's core values of service, professionalism, respect, and humility.

Throughout Dr. Bard's career, he found that meaningful police engagement naturally led to increased community engagement, fostering trust and collaboration. A significant part of the community engagement strategy involved activities from the Police Athletic and Activities League or their center.

Dr. Bard reinforced his interest in the accountability board's feedback on the plan. Feedback could be something as simple as adding criteria under the definition of informal engagement or something more substantial. Whatever the feedback, Dr. Bard would do his best to incorporate it into the entire community engagement plan. Dr. Bard formally introduced their first Deputy Chief of Police for Operations, Monique Brown.

Co-chair Elizabeth opened the floor for questions or comments.

Q: Laura: Do you have a timeframe of when you'd like to have the feedback?

A: Dr. Bard: The statute requires that I submit it every calendar year. I submitted it at the end of the last calendar year. So, it's really up to the board. There's no rush.

Q: Elizabeth: Just to confirm, the Hopkins Police Department officers that have been hired are deployed around the campus and its surrounding areas according to their precinct, correct?

One concern that community members brought up, particularly in the East Baltimore campus, was about the uniforms. They wanted to know what the uniforms would look like so they could identify Hopkins police officers from other security forces at Hopkins and from the Baltimore City police force. Have you planned any community sensitization efforts to introduce the new officers being deployed? Or is that part of the plan?

A: Dr. Bard: There is an infographic that highlights the differences between the uniforms worn by Dr. Bard and the deputy chief compared to those of city police officers and the public safety officers. We were very intentional about choosing an oval-shaped badge because it is unique in the region. This design choice helps ensure that JHPD officers are not confused with sheriffs, Baltimore City police officers, or even our own public safety officers, who traditionally have a badge with an eagle on top.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

C: Calvin: At some point, the infographic will be available on the website introducing a consistent vehicle design across all public safety departments, with a specific design for the JHPD. This will help avoid any confusion.

C: Dr. Bard: The vehicles are clearly branded to indicate their purpose. Currently, there are seven vehicles with seven different brandings under public safety. We are transitioning to a single public safety vehicle design. No matter where you are, when you see a Johns Hopkins public safety vehicle, it will have a consistent branding. The primary purpose of the vehicle will be prominently displayed. For example, one vehicle will say "Public Safety," while another will say "Police." The Johns Hopkins name will be less noticeable, but the main purpose of the vehicle will be clear, preventing any confusion between the two.

Q: Elizabeth: The question was raised of how the accountability board should review the community engagement document and organize the feedback. Her suggestion was to assign a committee to organize the feedback from all board members, document it, collate it, and return it to public safety. Elizabeth mentioned, this task could fall under the purview of the data committee, or someone else could take it on. If no other volunteers, maybe Duke and myself could work together to organize and gather all the feedback.

C: Jerrell: I recommend the entire board be involved in the review process, rather than assigning it to a single committee, as each committee already has a lot on their plate. He was also in agreement that assigning the review of the community engagement document to a committee would allow for the collection and organization of feedback from the entire board. Alternatively, one person from the board could take on this responsibility. Jerrell volunteered to organize the feedback under the data committee and compile it.

C: Duke: The policy committee could work on it. However, there should be someone in charge, likely one of the committee chairs, to pool everything together, collate it, format it, and ensure it is submitted on time.

Elizabeth thanked Dr. Bard for joining the meeting and providing the board with an update. The floor was open for final questions or comments on the community engagement plan document.

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 3

Elizabeth introduced Jerrell, the chair of Governance, to move forward with the old business portion of the meeting. Jerrell gave a brief review of what was discussed at the January 15, 2025, board meeting. The relevant sections discussed included meeting requirements, monthly and quarterly meetings, and special meetings under necessary circumstances. OMA was added for clarity, addressing both internal and external functions.

It was clarified how the board handles notices, agendas, and the open meeting requirement. All meetings have been open, but the board defined closed sessions for future reference. The importance of minutes and recordings was discussed for clarity. Regarding emergency meetings, the board acknowledged the need for flexibility and the impracticality of waiting to schedule a public meeting in urgent situations. Information from such meetings will be made public afterward, similar to regular meeting minutes and agendas.

The board outlined the process for calling emergency meetings and related procedures. The final section summarizes these points, aiming to provide clarity for current and future board members, as well as the community.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

A motion to adopt Section 3 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members for transparency and clarity, given the importance of these changes: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 4

Jerrell stated that Section 4 serves as a refresher for everyone, including the community. There have been various meeting postures, and this section aims to frame how debates and discussions will take place. It's a very short section with a conclusion. When speaking, making a motion, or submitting a report, conduct should be clear. The board specified in the first meeting that a majority vote is 8, and a quorum is 9. These terms are defined as such.

Every motion must be seconded by another member. Only motions moved by Accountability Board members will be entertained. This section supports practices already being followed but clarifies them for the community being served.

Regarding Robert's Rules of Order, members may sponsor motions individually or collectively, and the sponsor has the privilege of opening and closing the debate. No motion can be heard until the member has concluded. The chair can table a topic if the debate goes on too long, which is a privilege of the chair.

A motion to approve Section 4 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 5

Jerrell stated that section 5 was developed based on observations from various meetings between June and December of 2024, particularly the public meetings. It aims to establish decorum, similar to other boards and community-driven boards, to ensure that everyone in the community can engage with the board without their freedom of speech being compromised, whether they support or oppose a position.

Norms and expectations were set for community members engaging with the board, including guidelines on handling disruptions. Our meetings are hybrid, allowing both in-person and virtual participation. We define protective and unproductive speech and outline different types of meetings. For clarity, agendas will specify the type of meeting, whether it's a community conversation, public forum, or open for discussion. The board will set the timeframe for each meeting based on participation and attendance. This ensures flexibility, with shorter times for larger groups and more extended discussions for smaller groups.

The language for section 5, number 2, was edited to read: Public attendees wishing to submit comments must do so in advance or via online registration during the meeting if it is virtual or hybrid. This does not exclude the opportunity for question-and-answer sessions, which are open to all attendees without prior sign-up. For in-person meetings, attendees can also submit comments at the beginning of the meeting. This ensures that everyone has an opportunity to participate, whether they are attending online or in person.

A motion to approve Section 5 with the changes to subsection number 2 was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 6

Jerrell opened the conversation by stating that Robert's Rules of Order will be implemented with the caveat that they will not restrict Accountability Board members from sharing their thoughts, ideas, comments, and expressions. The framework will be simple and flexible, allowing for substantive feedback without being too rigid or stringent.

For the community, the guidelines will be updated accordingly, including links from January's agenda that provide a simple overview of Robert's Rules of Order. Section 6 covers how our voting will happen, decorum and debate, and the full Board voting process. The board has specified that a quorum is 8 and a majority is 9. While there are no standing committees yet, we can set up ad hoc committees. These committees do not have any power over the Accountability Board and do not necessarily have to be made up of Accountability Board members.

A motion to approve Section 6 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 7

Jerrell opened the conversation by stating that Section 7 covers the voting and voting procedures. For full board voting, again the quorum number is 8, and a simple majority is 9. Committee voting will follow the same quorum rules, even though committees are much smaller. Majority voting and decorum will be maintained. Standing committees can be set up, which do not necessarily have to be made up of Accountability Board members. These committees can include community members and will report back to the Board. They do not have any power or autonomy over the Board; they are simply a subset or sub-function of the Board. The board will adhere to the Open Meetings Act and ensure compliance with attendance requirements. Additionally, meetings will adhere to the posted and designated times to respect the public and board members' schedules. This section serves as a reminder of the established procedures and ensures consistency throughout the Accountability Board's bylaws.

A motion to approve Section 7 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 8

Jerrell shared that in January, the board discussed and voted on the proposed changes. The chair is responsible for preserving order and decorum, deciding all questions of order, and consulting with all board members. Once a quorum is present, we proceed to business. The chair or vice chair, in the chair's absence, oversees voting motions and calls meetings to order. However, the chair does not have the unilateral power to make structural meeting changes; such decisions require the full board's agreement. The chair and vice chair act as liaisons with internal and external entities, including JHPD leadership staff or designees, and share information with all board members.

The first point of contact for JHPD leadership or other entities and groups should be the Hopkins Police Accountability Board email accountabilityboard@jhu.edu. From there, communications can be forwarded to the chair and vice chair, who will disseminate the information to all Board members within 24 hours.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

Members who are unable to meet the outlined expectations will be removed from holding office, but not necessarily from the board itself. Any member serving in any capacity, such as chair, vice chair, or committee chair, who cannot fulfill the expectations will be removed from their office, but this does not remove them from the board.

Elizabeth asked for clarification on whether a quorum or a majority vote is required for certain matters. It was confirmed that for those matters, a quorum is required. The quorum is defined as two-thirds of the board, including at least three of the five community members. A simple majority, defined as 50% plus one of the boards, is required to hold a regular business meeting and conduct business.

It was clarified that a quorum is nine members, and a simple majority is eight members. This was agreed upon in January's meeting. Decisions are made by a simple majority vote of the board. The updated bylaws will be shared and posted on the website.

A motion to approve the Section 8 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members: Aprille W, Chyna S, Duke T, Elizabeth H, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Madhu S, Sonja MJ.

Other Committee/Other Business Updates

Elizabeth opened the floor for any other committee updates, business or comments.

Q: Duke: Duke informed the board that the Mount Vernon Belvedere Association, which is the Neighborhood Association around the Peabody Campus, had its January meeting on the 17th. Several members, including Duke, April, and Laura, attended the meeting. During the meeting, a group opposed to the formation of the JHPD made a presentation. Duke noted that while some naysayers expressed familiar concerns, a few new issues were raised. One notable concern was from a group of East Campus workers who had previously tried to unionize and felt Johns Hopkins was not a good partner in those discussions. They questioned how Johns Hopkins could be trusted to set up a police force if they couldn't be trusted in union discussions.

Duke highlighted a policy issue that needs clarification: the JHPD's jurisdiction, which is listed as one block around buildings and facilities used for educational purposes.

There was a question about whether this includes buildings used for student housing, as this could significantly expand the patrol areas.

A: Calvin: As I shared during the tour, we are allowed to patrol, operate, and engage with buildings that we own, lease, or control, but not private residences. While we may be seen around residential spaces due to navigating one-way streets and other factors, our law enforcement activities are limited to buildings we control. This includes university-controlled student housing, but not privately rented student housing.

C: Duke: That answers the question regarding the CSSA's definition of "educational purposes." The JHPD interprets this to mean buildings that are owned, leased, or controlled by the university. Calvin, I'll circle back with you on this because I think it's important to add it to our list of frequently asked questions. This way, we can ensure we have a clear and definitive response for both ourselves and the community.

A: Calvin: When the website receives its update, which will be happening soon, new maps will be added to highlight all the buildings that are owned, leased, or controlled within those parameters.

Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 19, 2025

Elizabeth thanked everyone for attending the meeting. **A motion to adjourn the meeting was moved and passed unanimously by the Board.**

Upcoming Meeting Updates

General Board Meeting Wednesday, March 19, 2025

Closing

Elizabeth closed the meeting at 7:30 p.m.