

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS PRESENTED BY JHU GARLAND SIT-IN AND OCCUPATION¹

FastForward U
Wednesday, July 24, 2019
9-10 AM

August 20, 2019

From the university: Responsive information is provided in blue following each question and can be found in the comprehensive materials posted on the [Provost's Office website](#). Many of these questions also were answered in the July 24 meeting; we have repeated the answers here for completeness.

Of note, the framing of your statements and questions below mischaracterizes what were good faith, transparent and extensive public consultations and research undertaken over the past 18 months with the university and broader community on the substantive issues at hand, as well as the careful handling of the protest and subsequent forced evacuation and occupation of Garland Hall. The university rejects these mischaracterizations and restates its commitment to free expression and insistence that students and others adhere to the law and to university policy and guidelines. There is a critical difference between the use of expression, ideas, reason and persuasion – including through protest and demonstration – and the resort to coercion, force, risks to health and safety, and disruption of others' scholarship, experiences and educational opportunities.

Student protesters (and their guests and fellow protesters) should be on notice going forward that the university's guidelines for protest and demonstration will apply without exception. As mentioned in the meeting, discussions of the substantive issues raised herein will be scheduled broadly across the university community; no one group will be privileged above others in that context, and all students will be expected to abide by [university policies and guidelines](#) in full, or face consequences under applicable law and the student code of conduct.

1. Proposals regarding the armed private police force:

- a. **Given Johns Hopkins's (JHU)² insufficient efforts at outreach; JHU's failure to properly and sincerely engage with JHU students and community members; JHU's failure to actively employ and analyze alternative forms of intervention; and numerous other shortcomings, we insist that JHU:**
 - i. **Hold monthly public meetings, indefinitely, in neighborhoods surrounding Homewood, Peabody and East Baltimore neighborhoods to establish direct, continuous communication between residents and Johns Hopkins Security;**

Johns Hopkins will continue to engage with the community throughout the planning and implementation process for the Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD), not as a means of revisiting the decision to establish a university police department but to ensure the effectiveness and success of the effort. Meetings will continue to take a variety of shapes and sizes, and groups or individuals can request their preferred format. As the calendar of these events firms up, the events will be noticed to participants and/or the public as appropriate.

¹ This is a summary of our proposals. Members and supporters of the JHU Garland Occupation had additional grievances and proposals not included in this brief account. We are more than happy to send you a more comprehensive list of these proposals at your request.

² Johns Hopkins University (JHU) may also be referred to as the "University" throughout this document.

As communicated in the [June 28 message](#) from Daniel Ennis and Robert Kasdin, the implementation of the JHPD will be a multi-year process. Our immediate focus is on the search for a new Vice President for Security for Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, which also includes community involvement (see below). We do not anticipate hosting monthly JHPD meetings at this stage but will continue to meet regularly with neighbors and community leaders across the city to hear about matters important to them, like public safety, and we are developing a schedule of activities in consultation with local neighborhood associations, coordinated with their regular meetings.

In addition to our engagement with the surrounding community, we continue to provide opportunities for students to share their views on security-related issues. Most immediately, Campus Safety and Security (CSS) and Student Affairs will be hosting a series of meetings with the Student Security Advisory board and student leaders from all nine schools to discuss the search for the new VP for Security. Students will have an opportunity to speak directly with members of the search committee, review the job description for the position, and provide feedback on the qualities and skills needed for this important role. Over the course of the next academic year, there will also be opportunities for our students – as well as our faculty, staff, and neighbors – to remain engaged through the planning and development of the Johns Hopkins Police Department, including through the University Police Accountability Board and memorandum of understanding process.

In this regard, we would note again the hundreds of university and community members who participated with us in more than 125 meetings, 3 discussion panels (approximately 400 attendees plus 300 viewers online), 2 open meetings (over 200 attendees plus 156 viewers online) leading up to the legislation, and public hearings and debate before the Maryland General Assembly. We also continue to receive positive feedback about the comprehensiveness of the research reviewed in those panel discussions and our 50-page [Interim Study report](#), and we will be taking into account new research and best practices along the way. We continue to gather community input through the online comment box on our [Public Safety Initiatives website](#), launched last year, where there is information on the legislation and our current security operations, including crime data for our Baltimore campuses, resources on university public safety, and extensive FAQs.

- ii. **Detail the selection and approval process of the new Vice President for Security and select a candidate trained in community-driven public health and safety interventions, as well as who is trained to interact with students and community.**

The search for a new VP for Security is underway and was described in a recent [public message](#) and [HUB article](#). The search committee is comprised of community members unaffiliated with Johns Hopkins, as well as students, staff, and faculty. Over the next month, members of the search committee will be meeting with student and neighborhood association leaders to hear their views about what to look for in a new VP for Security. We also have posted the [job description](#) and a [comment box](#) for community input online.

- b. **To align with Best Practices established by the American Public Health Association (APHA), we demand that JHU postpones the implementation of the armed private police force, and require JHU to:**
 - i. **Collaborate with the APHA to revise the current security system to meet its most recent recommendations;**

As mentioned in our meeting, we will not be revisiting the decision to establish a university police department or postponing its implementation, but we welcome the suggestion of direct collaboration with APHA and will pursue that in the planning process. It is important to note that the APHA recommendations are consistent with the best practices reviewed in the Interim Study report and have been incorporated into the JHPD implementation efforts (e.g., review of policies and practices that lead to disproportionate violence against specific populations; including government support for community-based programs that address violence and harm without criminalizing communities; and eliminating acquisition of military equipment). We will also continue to draw on expertise from other fields of study relevant to establishing an effective, constitutional and community-oriented university police department and to addressing violent crime, in fields such as public health, criminology, law, sociology, psychology, and others.

ii. Apply for a Safe Streets program as other private health institutions have done;

Johns Hopkins currently supports the Safe Streets program and will continue to do so as one of a number of initiatives focused on violence prevention and interruption. Johns Hopkins was one of a handful of Baltimore institutions that facilitated bringing the acclaimed youth intervention program Roca to Baltimore, with an early commitment of \$2M over four years. We also have supported the work of faculty expert Daniel Webster and the JHU Violence Collaborative, at the City's request over a number of years, and are long-time supporters of Operation P.U.L.S.E, among other initiatives. In January 2019, we launched the Johns Hopkins Safe Streets Hospital Responder Program – a partnership with Johns Hopkins, the Safe Streets Program and Baltimore City – to work with patients who have been recent victims of violence to prevent retaliation in the community.

As a reminder, information about local violence prevention programs supported by Johns Hopkins, through faculty research, advisory services and funding (e.g., Safe Streets, Roca Baltimore, Operation P.U.L.S.E.) is available in Section I.b of the [Interim Study Report](#).

iii. Establish a survey on stakeholder needs through an independent third-party;

As discussed in our meeting and above, the need for the JHPD to address persistent and serious public safety challenges on and around Johns Hopkins campuses has been well established in the Interim Study and through extensive university and community consultations. In this regard, we look to a number of existing survey instruments, and again welcome the suggestion to consider new survey tools or supplemental questions as we implement and evaluate the JHPD on an ongoing basis. These existing surveys include the Johns Hopkins hospitals' community health needs [assessment](#) (every three years) and periodic employee and student surveys, all of which consistently identify safety/violence as a major concern and community need. We also work actively with City agencies, notably the Health Department, to assess the social determinants of health, including safety/violence.

iv. Detail necessary improvements to JHU security's handling of sexual violence on-campus as related to the private police proposals;

Reports of sexual violence on campus are coordinated across the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE), Student Affairs, Campus Safety and Security (CSS), the counseling centers, and other resources, with clearly delineated roles and required training for each function, and a focus on victim support and fair and balanced investigations. Assistance is provided to victims who opt to

also make a report to the Baltimore Police Department (BPD), but it is important to note that it is generally the victims' decision as to whether they would like to pursue criminal charges against the accused. We anticipate a similar, coordinated approach with a future JHPD, and see the JHPD planning and implementation process as another opportunity to consult with experts, hear from our community, and adopt best practices in this high-priority area. We will hold our security personnel and JHPD officers to the highest standards of accountability and training and have committed to following best practices, such as requiring all newly hired officers to complete training in trauma-informed practices for police-citizen contacts, including contacts with victims of sexual assault.

- v. Ensure that the University is not the sole entity charged with appointing members of the Accountability Board; ensure that each "community representative who is unaffiliated with the university from" neighborhoods adjacent to JHU Homewood, East Baltimore, and Peabody campuses are neither University-affiliated nor affiliated with any major university stakeholders; ensure that the Accountability Board will not only include individuals from different geographic locations, but different socio-economic (including cultural and ethnic) backgrounds as well, particularly those that have been historically, and are currently, marginalized and underrepresented.

The University Police Accountability Board is one of a number of innovative measures developed in the Community Safety and Strengthening Act and provides greater oversight than other law enforcement entities in the state and among university peers nationally. As set forth in the new law, five seats on the 15-member Board will be set aside for community members from the neighborhoods around Johns Hopkins' Homewood, East Baltimore and Peabody campuses, including one member appointed by the Mayor and another appointed by the City Council president. One seat will be reserved for a member of Johns Hopkins' Black Faculty and Staff Association (BFSA) and the remaining members must include representation from students, faculty and staff. The law requires Maryland Senate confirmation of all JHPD Accountability Board members, except for the two members appointed by the Mayor and City Council President.

2. Proposals regarding justice and accountability for Tyrone West:

- a. Given JHU's failure to call for accountability for the Morgan State University and Baltimore City Police Department (BPD) officers involved in the murder of Tyrone West, and our concern that this institution will not hold itself to a higher standard, we insist that JHU:
 - i. Hire a private investigation firm to undertake a thorough, impartial investigation into the murder of Tyrone West;
 - ii. Issue a written statement actively calling for accountability of the Morgan State and BPD officers, including Officers Chapman and Ruiz, who killed Tyrone West at local, state, and federal levels;
 - iii. Explicitly call for the BPD to cease targeting Tawanda Jones for her involvement with the sit-in and regularly intimidating her for her activism;
 - iv. Continues to actively participate in and pursue community driven alternatives for public safety.

While Mr. West's death was tragic, Johns Hopkins was not involved in any way in the incident or its aftermath, and our non-intervention in the matter is reflective of that lack of direct involvement rather than indifference to either his death or matters of concern to members of the university community, including constitutional policing.

As a university we address matters of public controversy only rarely and then only when there is a direct and compelling link to the institution and our mission. In this way we hold to our fundamental role and obligation to create an environment for the vigorous interrogation of ideas and facts, through academic inquiry and debate, and to avoid any chilling effect on the views of individual members of the university community.

Constitutional policing is critical to the establishment of the JHPD, is embedded in the legislation, and will be addressed in the implementation process.

3. **Proposals regarding Johns Hopkins University's contacts with US immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE):**
 - a. **Given that ICE engages in blatantly inhumane practices and that not one of Hopkins' "peer institutions" holds contracts with ICE, we demand that JHU:**
 - i. **Stops renewing contracts with ICE;**
 - ii. **Lobby against ICE and support the bill proposed by CASA of Maryland to stop deporting individuals when stopped by police;**
 - iii. **Declare Hopkins a "sanctuary campus" in an official statement by:**
 1. **Interdicting the physical presence of ICE from Hopkins Campuses**
 2. **Creating a campus "sanctuary" policy to support immigrant, undocumented, and international students.**
 3. **Taking a stand, now and in the future, against any federal registry of Muslim Americans or other targeted groups, including undocumented students.**

Johns Hopkins' leaders have been unequivocal in expressing our concern about the impact of recent immigration policies on members of the university community and those for whom we provide care (students, faculty, staff and patients).

This is an issue of direct and compelling interest to the university and its mission. We remain steadfast in our commitment to supporting our international and DACA students, offering broad access and support to our students, faculty, staff and patients without regard to immigration status, and providing exceptional care to immigrant and refugee populations in our hospitals and clinics in the United States and around the world.

The university does not disclose any information about the immigration status of members of our community unless required by law. Our safety and security officers do not and will not request information regarding citizenship, nor enforce federal immigration laws without a specific court order; and we will not permit law enforcement or other officials to access private spaces on our campuses to enforce immigration laws absent a valid warrant or court order. In the [Interim Study Report](#) and in other settings, we also committed publicly to extend these well-established policies and practices to the JHPD.

From the Johns Hopkins Center for Law Enforcement Medicine:

Johns Hopkins medical faculty have for many years provided specialized training in emergency medicine to federal law enforcement personnel, including the U.S. Secret Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the U.S. Marshals Service, and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This work is under the auspices of the Johns Hopkins Center for Law Enforcement Medicine and does not involve the development or enforcement of immigration policies pursued by the current administration, or any other administration. The

faculty who lead this program believe the public interest is served by providing high quality emergency medical training that ultimately benefits those who interact with the agency, even when there are serious reservations about the federal government's policies. Discussions regarding the future of this contract are ongoing.

4. Proposal regarding complete and unconditional amnesty:

- a. **Given the ambiguity of the terms and conditions for amnesty on the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Office of the Provost website, we insist that you;**
 - i. **Issue a written statement ensuring the complete and unconditional academic and professional protection of JHU Garland Sit-in and Occupation participants.**

After weeks of attempts to accommodate the protest in Garland Hall, and in the face of escalating dangers and the forced evacuation, occupation and lock down of the building by protesters, the university determined that the protest must be brought to an end. To do so as peaceably and expeditiously as possible, the university took the extraordinary step of extending an offer of amnesty for student conduct violations to any student protester who departed voluntarily, without arrest. The university did not extend any offer of academic amnesty, as that is the purview of the academic divisions, and did not extend amnesty to anyone who engaged in actions that caused bodily harm or substantial property damage or violated the sexual misconduct policy and/or policy against discrimination and harassment.

The offer of amnesty was communicated verbally and in writing (see The University's Extension of Amnesty to Garland Hall Protesters) repeatedly over the course of two days and via multiple channels.

As mentioned in the meeting, most of the students will receive amnesty. Any student who does not receive amnesty will receive a letter laying out the charges, and will have the matter reviewed under the university's usual student conduct procedures, which includes an opportunity to be heard and to provide further explanation of the circumstances of the conduct or other considerations. In addition, student protesters should be on notice going forward that they will be expected to abide by university policies and guidelines in full – without exception or accommodation – or face consequences under applicable law and the student code of conduct.

In order for the university to function as a bastion for intellectual exchange, education and research, its members must be bound by a shared commitment to eschew use of coercive force, violence or threats of violence, risks to health and safety, and disruption of legitimate institutional operations and activities.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS FROM GARLAND SIT-IN AND OCCUPATION

FastForwardU
Wednesday, July 24, 2019
9AM - 10AM

1. **When is the next public, open meeting about the private police force? And, will these meetings serve to merely legitimize the proposed police force or will the Board of Trustees and senior administrators remain open to withdrawing their plans? What are the steps the University will take in the event of a JHU police officer-involved shooting?**

As we have stated previously, we will not be postponing or withdrawing from the implementation of the JHPD, but there will be many opportunities throughout the academic year for the community – students, faculty, staff and neighbors – to weigh in and have their voices heard as the JHPD is developed. These include through campus and community meetings, the VP for Security search, the University Police Accountability Board, and the MOU process.

As communicated in the June 28 message from Daniel Ennis and Robert Kasdin, this will be a multi-year process with numerous opportunities for dialogue and input. Our immediate focus is on the search for a new VP for Security, which also includes community involvement (see above). We meet routinely with students, faculty, staff, neighbors and community leaders across the city on a range of issues, and we are developing a schedule of activities that will include additional opportunities to provide updates and seek input on the JHPD throughout the process.

Specifically with regard to police officer-involved shootings (POIS), any POIS would be investigated thoroughly by Johns Hopkins, by BPD and by independent third parties, and would be required to follow best practices, public reporting requirements, and the procedures included in the U.S. Department of Justice consent decree with Baltimore City.

2. **In a university-wide communication on June 28, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, Daniel Ennis, and Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, and Chief Operating Officer Robert Kasdin, wrote that the University "will provide a detailed implementation plan, with a phased build-out of the Johns Hopkins Police Department-campus by campus-over the next several years, and then initiate a process for seeking community input and agreement (and City Council approval) for neighborhood patrols." What do you mean by "neighborhood patrols"? Please define how such patrols have been conceptualized and the reach of their mandate. And what are the University next steps in the short term?**

"Neighborhood patrols" references the potential non-campus areas that the JHPD may eventually serve, based on community agreement, in accordance with the Community Safety and Strengthening Act. Many university police departments serve their campus property and surrounding areas. In its initial implementation, the JHPD will begin in our campus areas. Any expansion into non-campus areas will require community agreement.

With the recent departure of our Vice President for Security, Melissa Hyatt, our most urgent priority for our security operation is the recruitment of a new vice president to oversee global security operations for Johns Hopkins University and Johns Hopkins Health System. Once we

have a permanent VP for Security in place, we will develop and share with the community a detailed implementation plan. In the interim, some pre-implementation planning will continue, community meetings and input will be sought as referenced above, and we expect to launch the appointment process for the University Police Accountability Board.

- 3. Did you evaluate any alternatives to policing to improve the safety of campuses and neighboring areas? If yes, what were they? How did you assess their feasibility and cost and determine that forming an armed private police force at an initial expense of \$50 million was justified -- even in the face of the unquestionable harm to vulnerable individuals and communities, not to mention severely compounding JHU's failures at being a good neighbor?**

Alternatives to address the crime situation faced by Johns Hopkins were extensively researched, evaluated and discussed in the Interim Study Report. The Report concludes that improving public safety involves both policing and alternatives to policing, and reiterates that JHU's "primary public safety strategy must continue to be our investments in the health and opportunities of the communities it calls home." These include Johns Hopkins' numerous jobs and educational programs, public health efforts like addiction treatment, economic inclusion initiatives like HopkinsLocal, and neighborhood investments that address the root causes of crime. Johns Hopkins spends over \$100 million each year on jobs, programs, and initiatives to create economic growth opportunity and build a stronger Baltimore. (See Appendix F of the Report for a comprehensive list.)

As a reminder, the university has for many years invested substantial resources in safety and security, including through employment of armed, off-duty Baltimore police officers. The JHPD will be an incremental cost and will eventually replace these off-duty BPD officers with university officers, allowing for more intensive, university-specific training and accountabilities and easing the burden on BPD.

- 4. Given that you are using only a few institutions as examples of private police forces (e.g. Morgan State PD and UChicago PD) how are you addressing the dangers that such a force presents beyond in addition to training and hiring procedures?**

JHU examined the public safety approaches of over 50 colleges and universities nationwide, including 29 private universities. This included all of Johns Hopkins' peers in the Baltimore area and Washington, DC area, both public and private. (See Interim Study Report Part II and Appendix G). Sensitive to concerns expressed about the increased dangers that might come from having a sworn police department, Johns Hopkins also reviewed all publicly reported incidents across all Maryland university police departments over the last decade. For the JHPD we have committed to a comprehensive array of measures – in addition to rigorous training and hiring procedures to prevent and address this important issue, as detailed in Appendixes P2-5 of the Interim Study Report.

- 5. Is it ethical and moral to donate thousands of dollars to bolster political campaigns and spend millions on lobbying efforts while refusing to support victims of police, CBP, and ICE violence? According to an unnamed administrator, international students fear interactions with BPD and face discrimination. How have international students' needs been evaluated in relation to the private police initiative? How have the needs of other students vulnerable to police violence been evaluated as they relate to the private police initiative? How have the needs of others vulnerable to police violence been evaluated as they relate to the private police initiative?**

See above at Question #1 and Section V.c of the *Interim Study Report*, as well as Appendixes P1-5 of the Report, regarding extensive efforts to address the needs and concerns of students and others regarding police interactions.

As previously stated, university employees make campaign contributions in their individual capacity as citizens and voters in accordance with legal limits and public disclosure requirements. University lobbying expenditures are reported annually and made in compliance with all applicable laws and disclosure requirements.

Questions from Hopkins Coalition Against ICE, delivered July 22, 2019 to Drs. Nelson Tang, MD, Matthew Le, DO, MSc, Asa Margolis, DO, MPH, Michael Millin, MD, MPH, and other faculty of the Johns Hopkins University Center for Law Enforcement Medicine

The information for questions 6-11 below was provided by the Johns Hopkins Center for Law Enforcement Medicine.

6. Please describe the nature of your relationship with ICE. In particular, does it involve direct care of refugees or migrants; optimization of triage or care protocols; estimates of needed supplies, staff, or care facilities; or epidemiological modeling of morbidity or mortality? How many ICE agents are being and have been trained under this contract? What branch(es) of ICE do they work for?

The Johns Hopkins Center for Law Enforcement Medicine (CLEM) provides emergency medical training to federal law enforcement officers across a range of agencies who are regularly engaged in high-risk, high-stakes situations where individuals may need medical assistance. Regarding the specialized training offered to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), our contract is under the management of Homeland Security Investigations (HSI). HSI is an investigative division of ICE that addresses a broad range of law enforcement issues including, among others, transnational gang activity, human smuggling and sex trafficking, and narcotics and weapons smuggling. We are not involved in the direct care of refugees or migrants, nor are we consulted about or have any input on federal detention or immigration policies.

The core work of this contract is to provide emergency medical sustainment training (e.g. CPR, seizure response, hyper/hypothermia treatment, splints and slings) to a small cohort of law enforcement officers – not agency leadership – so they can provide immediate care to individuals in need, including victims of crime and suspected criminals who may need medical care. Over the course of our contract with ICE, there have been between ~60 and ~120 individuals in the program at any given time. In addition to training, we provide written medical protocols for the medics as well as a direct consultation line with one of our faculty physicians.

7. In a 2013 presentation given to the Institute of Medicine's Committee on Department of Homeland Security Occupational Health and Operational Medicine Infrastructure, Director Nelson Tang, MD, listed "Personnel health and safety" and "Preservation of manpower" among the "programmatic objectives" of the Center's work. Is the health of community members who interact with law enforcement among these programmatic objectives as well? If so, how is their health furthered by the ICE contract?

The focus of that particular IOM committee meeting was the health and safety of the federal agency workforce. The broader law enforcement agency medical programs we lead provide emergency medical training to law enforcement officers across a range of agencies who are

frequently engaged in high-risk, high-stakes situations where individuals may need medical assistance. This includes training for the provision of emergency care to any and all acutely ill or injured persons in the immediate vicinity of a law enforcement operation, including suspects, victims of crime and/or members of the public.

8. In consideration of the widely publicized evidence that ICE has not been providing standard medical care to its charges, how have you attempted to improve the situation?

See responses to questions 6 and 7 above regard the scope of the CLEM contract.

9. Can you provide a copy of the contract's exact text?

Per standard university practice, we are not able to provide a copy of the contract.

10. What recommendations have you provided to ICE? Do they include releasing imprisoned children to their families? Do you think this would improve their health?

See responses to questions 6 and 7 above regard the scope of the CLEM contract.

11. What research or scholarly outputs have arisen from the Center's collaboration with ICE?

In 2005, we published an article* that examined how the training provided to ICE was used in the response to Hurricane Katrina. In particular, the article explores the ways in which such medical sustainment training was used effectively to provide a range of immediate medical care and processes, including field sanitation and pharmaceutical control protocols, to ensure that first responders were able to continue their critically important missions. ([*Journal of Prehospital Emergency Care: Efficacy of a Federal Law Enforcement Tactical Medicine Program Following a Catastrophic Natural Disaster: The Dhs Ice Srt Response To Hurricane Katrina. 2005.](#))

*Questions from directly affected communities**

*Communities that share a border with Johns Hopkins. In the future, Hopkins's private police may conduct operations or patrol part or, in some cases, all of these neighborhoods.

12. Why have "directly affected communities" around the East Baltimore campus not been included in the hiring process for the new Chief of Hopkins private police force?

We recently announced the launch of a national search to help identify a new Vice President for Security for Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, including the involvement of community members. The search committee is comprised of staff, faculty, students, and community members. There are several individuals on the search committee from the community, including East Baltimore. During this search, the committee is also seeking input from community leaders, neighborhood associations, students, faculty, and staff, and the position description has been posted for public review and input on the Public Safety Initiatives website: <https://publicsafetyinitiatives.jhu.edu/>.

13. Are only former police officers being considered, if so why is that?

No, this is not a requirement of the job (see [job description](#) posted for community input on the Public Safety Initiatives website: <https://publicsafetyinitiatives.jhu.edu/>).

14. When the Chief is hired, will Hopkins commit to a series of community conversations to introduce the new Chief and listen to community concerns with "directly affected communities" surrounding its East Baltimore campus?

Yes. Consistent with past practice, we will expect the new VP for Security to attend and/or hold a series of community conversations, on and off campus, including in East Baltimore.

15. Will Hopkins commit to not hiring police officers that have been disciplined or discharged from any law enforcement agency in Maryland for any offense, particularly police brutality?

We will not hire any officer who was terminated from another police agency, nor one who has been disciplined for any serious misconduct (to include brutality, discrimination, driving while intoxicated, Domestic Violence, Assault, etc.). Prior minor discipline (e.g., tardiness) would not automatically disqualify an officer from employment.

16. Will officer applicants from "directly affected communities" surrounding the East Baltimore campus be given preferred status during the hiring process?

The JHPD legislation requires us to promote the recruiting and hiring of diverse candidates (to civilian and/or officer positions within JHPD) using local hiring and residency initiatives and make specific local hiring commitments, including:

- *Maintaining a 25% local residency requirement for JHPD workforce within five years;*
- *Tracking and public reporting of recruitment and workforce data; and*
- *Hosting or participating in at least four job fairs in across Baltimore City each year to recruit and interview applicants for positions in the JHPD.*

We will meet these requirements and consider a range of criteria when hiring for the JHPD. Some of those criteria are mandated in state law, including state certification of all police officers, and others will be developed by our new VP for Security – guided by best practices and community input. All job postings will be publicly available online. Appendix P.i. of the Interim Report provides additional information on our commitments around recruiting, hiring, and training of JHPD officers.

17. What percentage of civilian positions on the private police force be reserved for members of "directly affected communities" around the East Baltimore campus?

Again, the JHPD legislation requires us to promote the recruiting and hiring of diverse candidates (to civilian and/or officer positions within JHPD) using local hiring and residency initiatives and make specific local hiring commitments, including:

- *Maintaining a 25% local residency requirement for JHPD workforce within five years;*
- *Tracking and public reporting of recruitment and workforce data; and*
- *Hosting or participating in at least four job fairs in across Baltimore City each year to recruit and interview applicants for positions in the JHPD.*

18. Will Hopkins commit to bi-monthly community conversations with "directly affected communities" surrounding the East Baltimore campus? Currently Hopkins only engages with these communities to promote things that will primarily benefit its own interests.

Johns Hopkins will continue to engage with the community throughout the planning and implementation process for the JHPD. As communicated in the June 28 message from Daniel

Ennis and Robert Kasdin, this will be a multi-year process with numerous opportunities for dialogue and input. Our immediate focus is on the search for a new VP for Security, which also includes community involvement (see below). We do not anticipate hosting monthly JHPD meetings at this early stage, although we meet routinely with neighbors and community leaders across the city to hear matters important to them, like public safety, and we are developing a schedule of activities that will include additional opportunities to provide updates and seek input on the JHPD. That schedule is being developed in consultation with local neighborhood associations and other neighborhood groups and coordinated with their regular meeting schedules.

Other questions

19. During the Garland Sit-in and Occupation we saw concern tactics followed by the Hopkins administration that stressed surveillance and counter insurgency tactics. The 24-hour vigilance of security officers, who eve took from us even while sleeping. The manipulation of the heat and the a/c, as well as lights, for disorienting and staying students. Cameras displayed surrounding Garland Hall and cameramen hired to follow our steps whenever we came in and out the building. And calling our families. These tactics do not match with your claims about our safety, and about your willingness to let us participate. Which institutional unit and/or authorities that led and/or authorized these tactics? Or were these decisions taken by the contractors by their own behalf? Do you have any institutional mechanism to evaluate the behavior of the University in this realm? Was there any report on the tactics used against community and student protestors?

The circumstances of the protest and occupation are well-documented on the Provost's Office website, including university actions to support the protest, to seek cooperation from protesters, and to address serious and increasing health and safety risks (to protesters and others) and the disruption of university services, particularly affecting other students.

As stated previously, at no point was the air conditioning or heating system manipulated or turned off; in fact, the HVAC system was programmed to a cooler temperature than is typical for the building when it is closed and well within regulatory requirements.

In addition, please note that in this instance, the university went to extraordinary lengths and expended substantial resources to attempt to accommodate the protest. However, in order to prevent such risks and disruption in the future, the university will require students and others to adhere fully to the protest and demonstration guidelines. As necessary, the university will take action under the student code of conduct to address violations of the guidelines or other policies and will seek assistance from local law enforcement in the event of trespass or other illegal activity.

20. Is there any ongoing investigations related to the JHU Garland Sit-in and Occupation? We are aware of three such investigations: i. The first includes the April 24, 2019 incident of transphobic attacks from a contractor, hired by JH, which resulted in the termination of his employment. ii. The second case, involving racist interactions at the President's Alumni breakfast on April 6th, 2019, is nearing completion. iii. Lastly, late in the evening on May 7, 2019, Dr. Daniel Povey (Assistant Research Professor, Center for Language and Speech Processing) and his paid accomplices attacked the Garland Sit-in and Occupation (including students and community members). This case, as we understand it, is still under investigation.

Anti-LGBTQ Messages in Bathrooms: This investigation has concluded. The contractor was identified and removed from all JHU projects. Work on this project was suspended until the conclusion of the occupation. We also offered support services for impacted students.

Alumni Breakfast Incident: This matter is pending with OIE.

Povey Investigation: Both interim and permanent disciplinary actions have been taken to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the community. The OIE investigation is ongoing.

- 21. Dr. Rothman attended the meeting at Homewood without so much as a request from us; yet, he has refused to meet with his own employees. As members of the Coalition for a Humane Hopkins, we call upon Dr. Rothman to meet with nurses at the bargaining table, to end the obstruction to their efforts to unionize, and to stop suing patients for medical debt.**

Dean Rothman and his leadership team meet frequently with employees, including nurses. For example, Johns Hopkins Medicine (JHM) holds five town hall meetings each year on the East Baltimore campus, led by Dean Rothman and open to all faculty, staff, and students. There are also regular town hall meetings for The Johns Hopkins Hospital (JHH) faculty, staff, and students, as well as quarterly nursing town halls that are open to all JHH nurses. Hospital leadership also regularly meet with the JHH Patient and Family Advisory Council, which provides feedback and insight from the patient, family, and caregiver perspective, and JHM leadership hosts “Community Conversation” events open to the public in East Baltimore.

As stated previously:

- Johns Hopkins supports the rights of our nurses to organize, and to unionize if that is the choice of the majority. In fact, Johns Hopkins has collective bargaining agreements in place for other workers in the health system and university. If the NNU were to advance the process by filing an election petition with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), we would encourage our nurses to participate. Although NNU has brought a number of allegations to the NLRB during the past year, each has been withdrawn or, in one instance, settled. In all, the NLRB made no determination that JHH violated the law or in any way acted improperly nor that Johns Hopkins engaged in “anti-union” activities.*
- Maryland hospitals are required by law to attempt to collect payment from patients who have the ability to pay all or part of their medical bills. By doing so, we can ensure that those who need free care are able to receive it. If a patient at any point demonstrates financial hardship, we make every effort to ensure that they have access to resources that may help reduce, and in many cases eliminate, the costs of care. Lawsuits are rare and only an absolute last resort after several months of trying to contact the individual, offer financial counseling and try to come up with a payment plan. On average, we provide \$32 million in free medical care to low-income patients every year.*