

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

### **Accountability Board Members:**

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

### **Johns Hopkins Staff Present:**

1. Calvin L. Smith Jr.
2. Amy Taylor
3. Gus Sentementes (Livestream Technician)

### **Opening**

Ed Kangethe, JH Accountability Board (JHAB) 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 – September Minutes**

**Kangethe moved to approve the September 2024 JHAB meeting minutes. The Board unanimously approved.**

### **Committee Reports – Training Committee**

Kangethe, the Board's Chair, opened the floor for the Training Committee to share any updates. Laura, chair of the training committee reported that she had completed some preliminary actions prior to the holidays. She reached out to Phil Kasten, the senior director of compliance and training for Public Safety, to gain a deeper understanding of the subject and the specific training requirements and offerings for new and established JHPD employees.

Laura also reviewed personnel procedure number 305, which covered training and professional development. Additionally, Laura inquired about the timing and implementation of the Training Advisory Committee referenced in the policy and the role of the Accountability Board as a member of the committee.

Participation in this committee would allow the Accountability Board to review, provide recommendations, and give feedback related to training and training compliance. The work completed so far was very preliminary, but we are moving forward.

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

**Chair Kangethe opened the floor for questions or comments; none were raised at that time.**

### **Committee Reports – Governance Committee**

Kangethe, the Board's Chair, opened the floor for the Governance Committee to share his report. Jerrell, chair of the Governance Committee, discussed in great detail recommendations for the bylaws and voting requirements. One of the topics discussed in previous meetings and since our orientation is the need for systems and processes to handle various procedural tasks for this board and body. These amendment bylaws are just that.

Amendments, are the recommendations from the Governance Committee that we are more apt to be able to vote on at this juncture. There are other recommendations that are more substantial and significant., which would take a greater deal of significance and time for us to weigh, measure, discuss, and process over. We have pulled out and extracted from the recommendations those that we can discuss, come to a consensus on, weigh in, provide feedback, and then be able to vote on tonight.

We have organized the bylaws into seven distinct sections to make them as clear as possible. These recommendations encompass meetings that have been held since June 2024 to now, meetings and orientations, feedback from the community conversations and sessions, and the various formats in which they are held. We have some in person and some virtual formats for a host of reasons, but overall, the feedback we receive in all those ways and capacities from the community, and also hearing the feedback of fellow board members, helps us have clear guidelines, guardrails, or procedures for how we operate. This allows us to operate and communicate, work with, and in tandem with the community in the ways we are set up to do, having clear expectations that both the board and the community can see and understand. This gives us a clearer and more constructive path for proceeding with other meetings, in whatever format or modality they happen.

The first section is about the format and type of meeting, spelled out with some definitions. The clarification needs to be made to the section about quorum, mentioning that our quorum number for the police accountability board is eight, as we are a 15-member board. Special meetings are any instance where we have to call special meetings, and we also spell out the various types of meetings we have. For example, whenever we have a meeting with the community in a different format or setting, it is called out and designated on the agenda the type of meeting it is, whether there will be room for public comment, or discussion conversation, by adding some definitions for that, so that community members who wish to participate know where that falls and what that structure is.

The second section is about officers. Even though it spells out officers here, it does not necessarily refer to board members in the sense that we are approved and selected with the recommendation of the Senate, but more so in terms of our operation within the board, the officers that we establish within this board body.

The third section is about meeting frequency and agendas. In our meetings, we decide upon a host of meetings that engage both our full board meetings and our committee meetings, placing that in the bylaws, and ensuring these bylaws do not run counter to the CSSA or the Open Meetings Act. Based on the feedback, we structure and orient ourselves with meeting procedures.

The fourth section is about debate and discussion, not in the sense of bickering back and forth, but in terms of any agenda topics that call for debate or discussion, and what that means for the board and the community.

The fifth section is about rules and norms, meant to give clear guidance to community members who wish to engage with the board in any of our meetings, with structure and guardrails around respect and civility for other members of the community who wish to add comment or feedback. This ensures that anyone in the community who wants to

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

participate has the liberty and right to do so, without limiting freedom of speech, but allowing us to carry forth our meeting in a constructive manner, handling disruptions if they arise.

The sixth section is about using Robert's Rules of Order as a framework to help facilitate and guide our meeting conversations, without overtaking or overpowering meeting situations, but adding structure to our meetings.

The seventh and final section is about voting, discussing what it means for a chair or committee chair, setting up ad hoc committees, and ensuring everyone understands attendance and agreement.

The floor was opened for board members to share feedback on if they need clarification on the breakdown of the seven functions.

**C: Ateeb:** I have a couple of comments. Number one, the summarizing is wonderful. I agree with the bylaws. I just have one disagreement which I will raise later. But first, I want to urge all the board members, whether it's an open or closed meeting, if our constituency involves students and we aim to meet a community that involves students, if the Board does not have a student member present, the Board must not conduct that meeting.

**A: Jerrell:** We have four student members on the board. China, Freud, Kamaria and yourself Ateeb. From a governance perspective, we have that representation on the board. I don't see anywhere in our structure, order, function, or the CSSA where that would be an issue. We haven't had a meeting or situation where no student was present.

It's incumbent upon each of us to make sure we can attend the meetings as best we can, given our lives and priorities. Not proceeding with a meeting when we have a quorum, just because one or two members are absent, wouldn't bode well for the community. This mechanism is set up for the community, and we work with and through the community. Given all the scrutiny we've been under, I don't think it would be wise to cancel meetings for that reason.

**C: Ateeb:** I would like to let you know, with all due respect, that there are four students involved. This involves all four students and the communities they represent. When you don't involve me, if I am busy or unavailable, it is unresponsive. I know the University and the Board have ways to reach out. I deserve to be informed specifically about this closed meeting.

**C: Jerrell:** That was not a closed meeting. All of our meetings are subject to the open meeting rules. As far as I know, we have not had a closed meeting. The only time we had to close a small portion of our meeting was to discuss some security issues related to the incidents in September and November. Fellow board members, we have not had a closed meeting.

**A: Sonja:** Hi Ateeb, this is Sonja Merchant-Jones, I would like to address your comment. I was truly void of understanding why the opposition existed. When we tried to have meetings, we had to divert to having them online. This didn't give us a chance to have the kind of conversation necessary to understand the opposition.

As a board member, I am pro-police department. I thought it was helpful, but I didn't get anything to help me see it from all sides. I was only seeing it from my perspective. We saw a lot of back-and-forth emails from you and another student. I thought to myself, looking at all the things that were said, I'm going to reach out.

I was told we were afraid to meet, that we were cowards. I decided to meet on my own time. The young man agreed to meet and asked if he could bring two people. I said he could bring ten if he wanted. I extended an invite to Jarell and April to join me. Ateeb, I don't mind sharing what was discussed, but it wasn't private. I wanted to understand

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

from the students why we can't sit down and talk like human beings. We did just that, came together and had a conversation.

**C: Ateeb:** And with that, I consider it clarified. That's all I needed. As we evolve as a board, it's important for us to inform each other. I don't absolutely agree with the bylaws, but Jerrell, you can proceed. The only comment I had was about Robert's Rules. I understand this is an official and very formal setting, and for this particular approach, it might be okay for a starter. I'm okay with it and will vote "Yes," but I would also like us to acknowledge that as the board evolves, this might not be the only framework. It's just a preset framework, and we start with it. We don't have to stick to it for the rest of the time period. With that, over to the chair.

**A motion to approve the Governance Committee report was properly moved and unanimously approved.**

### **Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws Section 1**

Kangethe thanked the Governance Committee for their hard work on the bylaw amendments. Section One of the bylaws and member comments were displayed on the screen for board members to review. **The floor was open for questions regarding Section One.**

**C: Elizabeth:** We received feedback from JHU legal counsel (Dan) that switching from in-person to virtual would be an administrative function and wouldn't fall under OMA. For me, it seems easier for us to decide with a quick majority vote offline, rather than publicly. Otherwise, we would need to request IT to set up a public livestream, publish an agenda, etc. This comment was provided in advance by this board member.

**C: Aprille:** The changes to the meeting format and the Open Meetings Act should include a caveat for imminent issues. For example, when we had to switch to a virtual meeting, the vote was taken offline because we had less than 24 hours. There needs to be a caveat for emergencies.

**A: Jerrell:** Regarding potential emergency meetings, it's hard to predict the future. We've had emergency situations before and will likely have more. Sometimes, we can't make decisions in the usual manner due to urgency. This doesn't change our structure; in emergencies, we'll still make decisions quickly without posting an agenda online or following usual steps.

**C: Ateeb:** I agree with everything but suggest defining "emergency" differently. It should be something acute. The term "force majeure" is more appropriate for events beyond our control, like those in the past months. These aren't emergencies but force majeure. An emergency would be like what's happening in other countries now.

**C: Kangethe:** There have been situations requiring right now responses. He suggested amending the bylaws to state that all votes need to be recorded, rather than taken publicly. This would allow public access to voting records, even if votes are conducted via email. He believes this change would address the need for quick decisions, as the current requirement for public meetings isn't feasible in emergencies. Therefore, he proposes updating the bylaws to ensure all votes are recorded, with each board member's vote on record.

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Kangethe asked for clarity on the two-thirds threshold mentioned in the form and the original bylaws. Since June, our quorum number has been 8, so it should remain 8. The two-thirds threshold is specifically for amending the bylaws, not for everything. Later, there's a unanimous threshold for amendments. We need to decide if the threshold for amending the bylaws should be two-thirds or 8. Typically, it's 50% plus one to start or host a meeting. I suggest making it 8 across the board for consistency.

Kangethe recognized Aprille, who explained that 50% plus one is needed for meetings due to other commitments. A higher threshold of two-thirds (10 members) is required for bylaw changes because it's more significant. Our quorum definition is 50% plus one, which needs updating. A simple majority (50% plus one) is needed for regular business, while two-thirds of the board, including at least 3 of 5 community members, is required for bylaw amendments. We can call these 3A and 3B:

3A: Simple majority (50% plus one) for regular business.

3B: Two-thirds quorum for amending the bylaws.

**A motion to vote on the Section One amendments to the bylaws with the following changes: votes will be recorded instead of taken publicly. For Section 3, it will have two parts:**

3A: A simple majority (50% plus one) for regular business meetings.

3B: A quorum for amending bylaws, defined as two-thirds of the board, including at least 3 of 5 community members.

**A motion to approve the Section One amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members:** Aprille W, Ateeb AP, Chyna S, Duke T, Ed K, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Dr. Panagis G, Sam J, Sonja MJ,

### **Old Business – Vote on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 2**

**Kangethe opened the floor for questions about section 2 before voting.**

Jerrell, clarified to the board that when we refer to "officers," we're not talking about the roles as members of the Accountability Board, but rather our specific roles within the Board, such as Committee Chair, Vice Chair, etc. This distinction ensures that when anyone reviews the bylaws document, they understand it pertains to our functional roles within the Board, not our appointed or designated roles as board members.

**C:** Aprille: Regarding point one, if additional officers are added, their appointment must be included in the bylaws and require a quorum.

**A:** Jerrell: Adding officers, like a parliamentarian, requires a two-thirds vote as per section one. This ensures consistency across the board.

Jerrell informed the board there is currently no elections nomination process in place, which is a new development. Previously, there was no formal nomination process when the first votes for chair, vice chair, and committee chair were conducted. Now, the new process stipulates those elections will be held if more than one nomination is received.

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Kangethe, stated Robert's Rules of Order, an election should still be conducted even if there is only one nominee, as individuals can abstain or vote "no." This clarification was made while referring to the nominations and election process outlined in section 4.2, emphasizing the need to hold an election regardless of the number of nominees.

**C:** Aprille: Under membership expectations, members are expected to adhere to the following regulations during their term. Members who fail to meet these expectations may be subject to sanctions, up to and including removal from office. Clarifying that "removal from office" refers to removal from positions such as chair, vice chair, or committee chair, not from the board itself, as we don't have provisions for that.

**A:** Jerrell: That is correct

The body collectively has the authority to make internal appointments for offices that become vacant, with the administration of the Governance Committee, either through an election or in lieu of an election. If there are vacancies in offices, the board will take action to fill them. This does not apply to board member vacancies, only to officer positions such as chair, vice chair, or committee chair. If the Board has the authority to appoint someone to an officer position, such as parliamentarian, by a majority vote, the Governance Committee administers this process. The nominations process is managed by the Governance Committee within the Full Board.

An example was provided for the board's awareness, if there is a vacancy for parliamentarian, the Governance Committee facilitates the process within the same meeting. They do not control it but help administer it to ensure the vacancy is filled. Board members will vote to fill the vacancy. This process is similar to the nominations and motion process. The Governance Committee administers it to add structure and ensure it happens. If someone steps down from a committee chair position, the Governance Committee facilitates the process to fill that position within the same meeting. If the vice chair does not want to assume the chair position, the Governance Committee will facilitate the process to find a replacement. This ensures that all vacancies are filled promptly and in accordance with the bylaws.

The current bylaws only spell out the process for the chair and vice chair, not for other positions. This new process aligns with the current structure and ensures all positions are covered.

**The changes to Section 2 include several key updates.** Firstly, a quorum vote is required at the end of the first bullet point. Under the duties of the chair and vice chair, meetings are to be called to order upon a simple majority being present, and in Part C, the phrase "and/or designee" is to be added at the end of the sentence. Regarding the nominations and election process, elections shall be conducted even if only one nomination is received, and members must accept the nomination prior to the election.

Additionally, under membership expectations, the first bullet point will now include the phrase "up to and including removal from office, but not from the board." During the approval process, a motion to approve Section 2 with the stated changes was entertained, and members were asked to vote on the approval. The votes were recorded, and the majority were in favor of the changes.

**A motion to approve the Section 2 amendments to the bylaws was properly moved and unanimously approved by the following members:** Aprille W, Ateeb AP, Chyna S, Duke T, Ed K, Jerrell B, Kimyatta R, Laura R, Dr. Panagis G, Sonja MJ

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

### **Old Business – Discussion on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 3**

Kangethe opened the floor for any members who had edits or suggestions. It was mentioned that all the definitions in the bylaws are homemade, which means they are created internally.

The board incorporated Open Meetings Act (OMA) information for accessibility. This is a new section. "Emergency" was defined to ensure clarity for both the public and internal members. Regarding emergency meetings, the board will decide whether to change the requirement to a majority or keep it as a quorum. The Open Meetings Act should consistently be referred to as "OMA."

In summary, we are adding clarity and consistency to the bylaws by defining terms and ensuring all necessary information is included and accessible.

### **Old Business – Discussion on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 4**

Kangethe opened the floor for any members who had edits or suggestions. Most everyone was generally in consensus with the edits. Elizabeth edits, were to ensure compliance with the relevant guidelines.

There were no additional edits or comments shared for Section 4.

### **Old Business – Discussion on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 5**

Kangethe opened the floor for any members who had edits or suggestions. This decorum piece was discussed in committee and brought up again in the December meeting. Norms for the public on how they should conduct and engage themselves during meetings, both with us and other members of the public, regardless of the meeting format have been established. This new section provides guidelines to prevent disruptions and ensure respectful interactions.

This section is intended for the public, outlining acceptable and unacceptable behaviors during our meetings.

There were no questions or comments from members online.

### **Old Business – Discussion on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 6**

Kangethe opened the floor for any members who had edits or suggestions.

**Q:** Aprille: My only question or concern about number 6 is regarding any amendments to this motion related to Robert's Rules of Order.

This is a new section discussed in committee and other meetings, using Robert's Rules of Order as our framework. Jarrell noted that Section One requires a simple majority for bylaw amendments. Therefore, the last bullet point in Section 6 should be removed, as amendments are already addressed in Section One. This ensures consistency, as 3A and 3B in Section One cover these amendments. We agreed that any amendments would follow the guidelines set in Section One.

There were no questions or comments from the members online.

## Johns Hopkins University Police Accountability Board Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

### **Old Business – Discussion on the Amendment of the ByLaws – Section 7**

Kangethe opened the floor for any members who had edits or suggestions.

The board's voting procedures require a simple majority to conduct a vote. Each member, excluding the chair, has one vote, and the chair votes only to break a tie. A simple majority is needed to pass a motion unless specified otherwise, such as for amending guidelines. The chair may vote on all matters but does not have veto power, as outlined in the bylaws. During the discussion, it was noted that under Robert's Rules of Order, the chair typically votes only to break ties. However, this board allows the chair to vote like any other member, which needs clarification. It was suggested to defer to Robert's Rules for breaking ties. The next steps involve confirming the chair's voting rights.

The committee vote emphasized that decisions must be finalized by a board vote. The updated language for sections was agreed upon, clarifying procedural requirements and voting forums. A quorum consists of two-thirds of the board members, including three out of five community members. A simple majority (50% plus one) is needed for normal business.

**Sections one and two are adopted and in effect, while sections three through seven will be adopted once voted on.**

Chair Kangethe thanked everyone for their contribution to this meeting. **A motion to adjourn the meeting was moved and passed unanimously by the Board.**

### **Upcoming Meeting Updates**

General Board Meeting Wednesday, February 19, 2025 (Special request from full board)

General Board Meeting Wednesday, March 19, 2025

### **Closing**

Kangethe closed the meeting at 8:17 p.m.