

Questions for Administrators Regarding the Events

The charge of the Homewood Faculty Assembly's Fact Finding Committee (HFAFFC) is to inquire into the facts relating to the events known as the "Garland Hall Sit-In" and report back to the Homewood Faculty Assembly. Although the Homewood Faculty Assembly (or this committee) does not have formal investigative authority, the Homewood Faculty Assembly provides an essential forum for the faculty to discuss and make informed recommendations concerning the purposes and functioning of the University, including in areas of governance. The faculty have historically played a strong role in this university's governance.

These questions were assembled after the HFAFFC's extensive study of all publicly available information and after being provided additional information from the Garland Hall Sit-In protesters. The questions have been additionally informed by interviews with approximately nine (thus far) students and community members who were involved with the Sit-In over approximately 7 hours of total interview time.

Perception of student protest by the administration

1) What did the administration perceive to be the goals of the Sit-In? Did the administration have a clear perspective on what student plans were with regard to the Sit-In? Did the administration understand the goals of the Sit-In to have changed when it became an occupation and/or when the doors to Garland Hall were chained?

The protesters initially demanded that JHU commit to abandon plans to establish a university police department, terminate faculty contracts with U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and issue an apology from the President. On the second day of the protest, the first two demands were reiterated and the third was replaced with a demand for "Justice for Tyrone West." These demands were communicated through various channels (signage, social media, public statements, etc.) throughout the following five-week protest and occupation.

On the first evening the students indicated that they planned to remain in the building at all times of day, including when the building was closed, until their demands were met. The full takeover of Garland Hall on May 1 – forcing the evacuation of staff and students, chaining of themselves to the stairwells, blocking elevator access, chaining the doors of the building closed from inside, and covering security cameras and windows – was conveyed as an escalation of tactics, raising increasingly serious health and safety concerns, but not a change in demands.

Possible meeting with the Sit-In protesters

2) Why did the President and Provost not formally meet with the Sit-In participants during the first 12 or 24-hours of the Sit-In?

The President met in person with students who identified themselves as liaisons for the protest on the first day of the protest and offered to meet for further discussion once the protest ended. In the succeeding weeks, it was reiterated to the protesters that the occupation of Garland Hall was a violation of University policy and the Guidelines for Students in Support of Free Expression through Protests and Demonstrations

“Guidelines”) and that meetings to discuss issues of concern to student protesters could occur upon conclusion of the occupation.

3) Please describe the decision-making to allow the students to remain in Garland Hall. The administration had repeatedly stated its respect for free expression and protest, but also stated its concerns for student health and safety. For instance, administrators noted that the building did not have a sprinkler system. If the administration was worried about these serious safety concerns, why were students allowed to remain in Garland Hall for over one month?

The University made every effort to support the protesters’ ability to express their views and began the protest period with optimism for cooperation from the students to carry out their protest in keeping with University policy, the Guidelines, and health and safety requirements.

The University accommodated the request of protesters to remain in the building after hours and staff worked diligently to ensure the health and safety of the protesters, as well as others working in and visiting the building. Staff also sought expert assessment and monitoring through the [Department of Health, Safety, and Environment \(HSE\)](#), Campus Safety and Security, the Office of Risk & Compliance Management, and the Baltimore City Fire Marshal, and regularly communicated safety concerns, requests and expectations to the protesters verbally and in writing (see written notices posted to the [Provost’s Office website](#)), including with regard to the prohibition on burning materials.

Garland Hall was evaluated as safe for a sit-in by various entities including HSE, subject to health and safety requirements, including the city fire code. If the protesters had continued to violate the prohibition on burning materials or refused to comply with other fire safety requirements, the University would have had to bring in external support to end the occupation sooner (and the University did so after, among other actions, the protesters created fire and other safety risks by chaining the doors and impeding egress).

4) What specific and explicit conditions were set by the administration to meet with student groups involved in the Sit-In? There is a statement in the timeline of discussions with SAPP that “reiterates that the provost and president welcome discussion once occupation is brought back into compliance with protest guidelines and safety requirements.” What protest guidelines are being referred to here? Were students being told they must leave Garland Hall before discussions could occur? Or were these the guidelines outlined by Vice Provost Shollenberger on the night of April 3rd? Were these guidelines provided to the Sit-In inconsistent with the idea that the students should leave Garland Hall before discussion could start?

The protest guidelines being referred to are the [Guidelines for Students in Support of Free Expression through Protests and Demonstrations on the Homewood Campus](#). The Guidelines are well known to most active students on the Homewood campus, are provided to and/or discussed with students during protests and protest planning, and are readily available at all times on the Homewood Student Affairs website ([link](#)). The student protesters were directed to the Guidelines on multiple occasions during the protest and occupation, both verbally and via written communications. (See, for example, [“Notice of University Policies and Expectations”](#) (April 9, 2019); [“Reminder Notice Regarding University Protest Guidelines and Policies”](#) (April 19, 2019).)

The only authorized deviation from the Guidelines during the protest and occupation was the permission granted to protesters to remain in the first floor lobby after the building was closed, subject to other building requirements and protocols (e.g., non-reentry during overnight hours, usual ID checks, closure of external doors, compliance with fire code). The University also made clear throughout the protest that further substantive meetings could occur once the occupation had ended and the protest was fully brought back within the Guidelines.

5) Would the administration have met with the groups of students identified as SAPP and Students against ICE if they had left the building in April? Why or why not?

Yes. As President Daniels told the liaisons for the protest on the first day and as JHU leadership made clear on multiple occasions, the administration welcomed the opportunity to meet with students, even on issues about which they disagree, after the occupation was concluded. To that end, soon after the occupation was brought to an end, the administration initiated scheduling such a meeting with student protesters. The meeting occurred on July 26, 2019. Many attempts also were made to meet directly with SAPP over the course of the preceding year (see meeting outreach summary at this [link](#)). The preceding year also included many meetings with various student groups that included members of SAPP.

6) Does the administration have some estimates regarding the number of students that participated in the sit-in or occupation in some fashion?

There were anywhere from 5 to 125 or more protesters in the building at any given time. These included JHU students and participants unaffiliated with Johns Hopkins. The Fire Marshall limit for the lobby was 73 people, and University administrators shared this limit with protesters (see Fire Marshall letter [here](#)) and worked to ensure occupancy stayed within that limit. After the building was forcibly occupied on May 1, with access denied and cameras and windows covered, the University was unable to accurately assess the number of people inside the building.

7) Why was the May 5th meeting offered on such short notice?

After protesters forcibly occupied Garland Hall on the afternoon of Wednesday, May 1, the administration concluded that the occupation was no longer a peaceful protest, that student health and safety were at risk due to lack of access and visibility into the building, and that the time had come to bring the occupation to an end. The University then undertook a series of extraordinary measures over several days to urge student protesters to leave the building, including direct communication to individual protesters, outreach through emergency contacts, offers to meet, and offers of amnesty.

Early on Friday, May 3, the President and Provost extended an offer to student protesters to meet at any time over the course of the weekend; on Saturday, May 4, a reminder was sent regarding the offer to meet; on Sunday, May 5, an invitation was extended to a meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, May 6, including for a discussion of amnesty; on Tuesday, May 7, amnesty was offered in writing and posted publicly. The notice and flexibility provided for these meetings was more than sufficient given the urgency of the situation and the evident availability of the protesters, who were regularly entering and exiting Garland Hall and hosting events throughout the weekend.

8) Why was the administration so adamant about the strict terms proposed for the May 21st meeting? e.g. no community members, and names of students in advance. Was the administration aware of a threat that the students involved in the Sit-In were not aware of?

Given the protesters' extraordinary disregard for University policies and procedures during the course of the protest and occupation, it was important to reestablish that meetings would be expected to follow University norms for student requests of the President and Provost. The administration made clear that no one group of students would be prioritized or privileged above others on matters of significance for the University community, that there have been and will continue to be other opportunities for meetings with community members, and that student protesters are expected to follow the usual protocols for scheduled meetings with the President and Provost, including by identifying participants in advance.

The role of lower-level administration and the relationship between upper and lower administration with respect to decision-making related to the Garland Hall Sit-In

9) What are the policies at JHU for dealing with situations like the Sit-In? Are there guidelines for the administrative staff for how to handle protests on campus with regards to security, health, safety, freedom of expression of protesters? How strictly were these guidelines followed over the course of the Sit-In, i.e., did they prove usable or was a more supple approach adopted?

In addition to the Guidelines for Students in Support of Free Expression through Protests and Demonstrations on the Homewood Campus, there are a number of policies that touch on aspects of the activities that occurred during the protest and occupation. These policies are all listed at the end of the Guidelines in the "Related Policies" section, and the administration reminded the protesters of these policies at multiple points. (See, for example, "[Notice of University Policies and Expectations](#)" (April 9, 2019); "[Reminder Notice Regarding University Protest Guidelines and Policies](#)" (April 19, 2019).)

These Guidelines and policies proved useful during the protest and occupation. Staff are educated about and given guidance for managing protests consistent with these Guidelines and policies – to support free expression while ensuring the health and safety of all involved – and they regularly consult with the Office of Risk & Compliance Management, Campus Safety and Security, the Department of Health, Safety, and Environment, and the Office of General Counsel.

10) How was the response by the administration to the Sit-In coordinated? Why were specific administrators engaging directly with the students instead of others?

The response to the protest and occupation was managed primarily by the Offices of Homewood Student Affairs, Campus Safety and Security, and Facilities and Real Estate, in consultation with the Department of Health, Safety, and Environment, the Office of Risk & Compliance Management, the Office of General Counsel, and University leadership. Homewood Student Affairs is the primary point of contact with students, including protesters, and other personnel participated as needed depending on the specific circumstances or availability over the five weeks.

11) With regard to what issues or range of issues are lower-level administrators -- such as the Dean of Student Life, Director of Student Conduct, Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion -- empowered to make decisions with autonomy? What was their degree of autonomy in decision-making regarding: 1) informal conversations with students; 2) formal interactions with students, such as handling communications between university and Sit-In participants; 3) undertaking surveillance of protesters.

Homewood Student Affairs staff are higher education professionals who interact with students every day on a broad range of issues and needs. In those interactions they use their own good judgment and guidance or direction from supervisors. For serious situations like the protest and occupation, which raised a number of health, safety, and conduct issues, Student Affairs staff also consult and work collaboratively with many other personnel and leaders across the University.

12) What instructions were given to lower level administrators to guide their encounters with Sit-In protesters?

Over the course of the five-week protest and occupation, staff and administrators interacted with protesters on the basis of established university guidelines and policies, their own professional judgment, guidance or direction from supervisors, and consultations and coordination with other University administrators, offices, and leaders (see above Questions 9 through 11).

13) Please describe the decision-making to video-record, photograph, and text such videos and photographs of sleeping students during the Sit-In. Who was involved in this decision-making? Were lower-level administrators empowered to use their own private cell phones as tools for surveillance as they did? Who received the photographs and video recordings of these students? Can the University provide written assurance that all video-recordings and photographs of students taken by administrative staff on their private cell phones have been deleted?

When the protesters occupied Garland Hall, they chose to protest in a public place that is monitored by Campus Safety and Security personnel and by security cameras that are in plain sight. In addition, the University monitored protest activity for the purpose of providing 24-hour support and safety for those present in the building (protesters, staff and visitors), to track occupancy levels for fire code compliance, and to safeguard sensitive and/or federally protected information (such as student financial information). It is also standard practice for University staff to periodically document public protests and demonstrations for purposes of evaluating potential needs and concerns. Security camera footage and other video recordings and photographs of the protest and occupation were used only for official University purposes and never published or posted for public view.

14) In interviews with students, an incident has been reported of an undergraduate student being forcibly grabbed by the wrist by a JHU security officer when she engaged in passive resistance (not showing her ID) when entering Garland Hall in the first days of the Sit-In. The security officer left a mark on the student's wrist from the force exerted. Are Johns Hopkins security officers authorized by the University to physically stop and restrain students? Are there protocols in place that seek to prevent abuses and assaults by security officers on students who engage in peaceful forms of protest?

Campus Safety and Security (CSS) has protocols in place to support student protest and demonstration, while also keeping the broader University community safe. Under any circumstance, officers are authorized to use only the amount of restraint or force that is reasonable and proportional. As much as possible, officers use physical presence, verbal warnings, and de-escalation techniques to diffuse tense situations. Excessive or unwarranted force is never permissible. Any incident involving use of force is reviewed, and corrective action taken if warranted.

During the spring protest, CSS did receive a report of a Campus Police Officer grabbing a student's arm. CSS fully investigated the report and no complaint was filed.

Student code of conduct and amnesty letters

15) Please explain why changes were made to the Student Code of Conduct on May 10th, shortly after the police intervention that ended the Sit-In? Do these changes have any relation to the Sit-In?

No changes were made to the Student Code of Conduct policy or language on May 10 or at any time thereabouts. A social media posting claimed that new language was added on May 10 around immigration status; however, the language in question is a longstanding reference to the fact that student status, including visa and immigration status for international students, can be affected by Student Code of Conduct violations. You can see at this [link](#) from the Internet Archive, for example, that the same language was in the Code in 2018.

16) Please describe the process by which students were identified to receive amnesty letters and subject to disciplinary code of conduct proceedings.

Amnesty was granted to students eligible under the terms of the extension of amnesty issued on May 7. Amnesty letters were sent to student protesters observed to have violated the Student Code of Conduct, University policies, or local law, and not to those who merely were present in the building or participated in protest activities. A small number of student protesters who did not leave the protest voluntarily or whose actions may have rendered them ineligible under the terms of amnesty received conduct letters. Student protesters who received either amnesty or conduct letters were identified based on staff knowledge and observations, security observations and reports, and/or students' own public social media posts about the protest and occupation. Students receiving letters were given an opportunity to be heard through the usual student process.

17) Are amnesty letters formal warning letters? And if they are, then why are they called "amnesty letters"?

Amnesty letters are letters memorializing offers of amnesty, and the terms of that amnesty; they are not formal warning letters.

As stated previously, the University took the extraordinary step of extending an offer of amnesty for student conduct violations to any student protester who departed the occupation voluntarily and did not interfere with University operations or violate University policies through the end of the occupation and related activities. 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.

18) Is the process of sending out amnesty letters and disciplinary letters completed? When were the last letters sent? When the process is completed, will this be publicly announced?

This is FERPA-protected information and will not be released. Any student, faculty, staff, administrator, or concerned party may initiate a complaint under the Student Code of Conduct. While persons are encouraged to bring complaints under the Code as soon after the alleged misconduct as is reasonably possible, should a future complaint be received, it will be appropriately assessed by Student Conduct.

Contacting emergency contacts, advisors, friends

19) The emergency contacts of a number of students protesters were contacted. Please describe the decision-making that led to the “wellness check” phone calls to emergency contacts. Is the administration confident that these contacts were made in a fashion consistent with FERPA regulations? What was the basis for the justification of the disclosure of student information to emergency contacts?

Under FERPA, the University may disclose information about a student to appropriate parties, including parents and emergency contacts, in connection with an emergency if knowledge of the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or other individuals. In this case, the University determined, consistent with FERPA, that it was necessary to contact the students’ emergency contacts to address serious and growing health and safety concerns in the building following the forcible takeover. At no time did the University disclose protected student information; the University’s disclosure was limited and appropriate to the purpose. Each emergency contact person was informed about the unsafe conditions in Garland Hall and urged to contact their student to check on the student’s wellbeing and to request that the student leave or not return to the building because of those conditions.

20) In a letter to Sit-In participants dated May 7th, President Daniels and Provost Kumar write that, “We made an open-ended effort to meet over the three-day weekend, and have been engaging in significant efforts to reach each of you directly and through family, friends, or mentors.” On what grounds were administrators justified in contacting each group: 1) family; 2) friends, 3) mentors? Did President Daniels and Provost Kumar give authorization for student information to be given to “friends”, and on what basis was this information given?

After protesters forcibly occupied Garland Hall on the afternoon of Wednesday, May 1, the administration concluded that the occupation was no longer a peaceful protest, that student health and safety were at risk due to lack of access and visibility into the building, and that the time had come to bring the occupation to an end. The University then undertook a series of extraordinary measures over several days to urge student protesters to leave the building, including direct communication to individual protesters, outreach through emergency contacts and other channels, offers to meet, and offers of amnesty.

As in other cases where there are concerns for the health and safety of students, the University activated its protocol for emergency contacts. Students choose who their emergency contacts are and in some cases those are individuals other than family members.

21) What information was conveyed to emergency contacts?

Each emergency contact person was informed about the unsafe conditions in Garland Hall and urged to contact their student to check on the student's wellbeing and to request that the student leave or not return to the building because of those conditions. As mentioned above, at no time did the University disclose protected student information; the University's disclosure was limited and appropriate to the purpose.

Handling of the Daniel Povey incident

22) After the alleged assault by Toni Millon of a transwoman and another escort accompanying Tawanda Jones on May 1 at 10:15pm on campus, did the administration take into consideration the students' increasing fear and risk of becoming the victims of race and gender related violence in retaliation for the Sit-In?

The University was at all times concerned for the health and safety of the students participating in the protest and occupation. Johns Hopkins security personnel became aware of an off-campus altercation on the evening of May 1 and, per security protocol, contacted the Baltimore Police Department (BPD). BPD responded to the scene. The University has had no further involvement in the matter and has received no additional information about this incident.

23) During the assault by Daniel Povey and others on student protesters, how did University security respond? Were the assailants' identities recorded by Hopkins security?

The incident involving Daniel Povey and others was concerning in many respects and, with respect to its handling by Campus Safety and Security officers, does not reflect the values we strive for in serving our public safety mission. The incident is the subject of ongoing investigation and review, including with respect to complaints filed with the Office of Institutional Equity and the handling of the incident by Campus Safety and Security officers. The University issued the following public statement on the matter in August:

“The safety, security, and protection of our students and others are of paramount importance to the University. While we cannot comment on details of individual personnel matters, we can confirm that a troubling incident in early May prompted an investigation. In response to this incident, based on the undisputed facts of the case, the University took interim and now permanent action to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the community.”

24) Hopkins security were patrolling the perimeter of Garland Hall at the time of the incident. What is the mandate of Hopkins security in terms of ensuring the health and safety of students, faculty, and staff? Were specific instructions given to Hopkins security in relation to how to handle situations arising at the Garland Sit-In?

The mission of CSS is to promote and maintain a safe and secure living, learning, and working environment for our students, faculty, staff and visitors, while also building community relationships that foster trust and mutual respect. This mission includes supporting student protest and demonstration and other acts of free expression while ensuring safety for all involved. Instructions to security personnel are specific to the particular circumstances of any evolving situation, but, generally speaking, during the spring protest officers were instructed to monitor and patrol the areas in and around the building to ensure safety and order, to de-escalate tense situations, and to avoid engaging in response to provocative actions and comments directed at them by protesters.

25) A campus security officer has been recorded on video responding to a student's question, "Why are you here if you are not here to protect us?" The campus security responds, "We're here to protect Johns Hopkins property." Was/is this official administration policy? Under what circumstances are campus security officers told to prioritize safeguarding Johns Hopkins property over student safety?

The mission and mandate of CSS is to promote and maintain a safe and secure living, learning, and working environment for our students, faculty, staff and visitors, while also building community relationships that foster trust and mutual respect. This mission includes supporting student protest and demonstration and other acts of free expression while ensuring safety for all involved. The exchange between the officer and the students is concerning and does not reflect the values we strive for in serving our public safety mission. The incident is the subject of an ongoing investigation and review, including with respect to the handling of the incident by Campus Safety and Security officers. As with any situation, if persons are found to have violated University policy, appropriate discipline and/or corrective measures will be taken.

26) In a video after the Povey incident in which students were assaulted, distressed students are confronting campus security officers. One student says, "Can you guys communicate to anyone who needs to know that there is, because someone needs to know that there are potentially very violent people on this campus right now." Another student says, "Why did you all not do anything is my question." The campus security officer responds in a laconic fashion, "Well, what did you want me to do. You invited them in here." Other security officers reiterate, "We can't do anything about it." The student asks, "Has it been reported?" The officer responds, "Who's making all the complaints?" Another officer suggests, "Go call dispatch and report it to them." Why did officers not responding to an obviously dangerous incident? Why did they say they couldn't do anything about it?

The exchange between the officers and the students is concerning and does not reflect the values we strive for in serving our public safety mission. The incident is the subject of an ongoing investigation and review, including with respect to the handling of the incident by Campus Safety and Security officers. As with any situation, if persons are found to have violated University policy, appropriate discipline and/or corrective measures will be taken.

27) One of the same badged police officers has been recorded on a video as having knocked a student's phone out of their hand while a student was filming him. The officer was relaying to someone on the phone, "I didn't see no assault. I just seen them all here

screaming and yelling at the top of their lungs... [In response to person on phone], There was a whole bunch of them.” When the officer notices the student, the student who is filming interjects, “There was an assault.” Officer continues on phone, “No one was assaulted. They’re mad at us because we didn’t do anything.” Student interjects, “Cause you didn’t do anything.” At this point, the officer slaps away or grabs the cell phone of the student. The student protests, “You are not...” And filming stops. Who is this police officer? Was this officer’s conduct appropriate? What actions have been taken against this officer? Why has this not been addressed in any communications from the administration?

The incident in question is concerning and does not reflect the values we strive for in serving our public safety mission. The incident is the subject of an ongoing investigation and review, including with respect to the handling of the incident by Campus Safety and Security officers. As with any situation, if persons are found to have violated University policy, appropriate discipline and/or corrective measures will be taken.

The police intervention

28) What was the decision-making process to have police intervention carried out on the specific night of May 8th? Who made these decisions?

After protesters forcibly occupied Garland Hall on the afternoon of Wednesday, May 1, the administration concluded that the occupation was no longer a peaceful protest, that student health and safety were at risk due to lack of access and visibility into the building, and that the time had come to bring the occupation to an end. The University then undertook a series of extraordinary measures over several days to urge student protesters to leave the building, including direct communication to individual protesters, outreach through emergency contacts, offers to meet, and offers of amnesty.

During this same period, the remaining student protesters and outside activists conveyed no collective shift in approach or responsiveness and instead repeated prior demands and hosted a series of events in the unsafe and unsecure building, posing risk of harm to themselves and others and causing substantial disruption to university operations, including by disrupting critical student services and accessing areas holding sensitive student information. It was clear that the University’s extensive efforts to bring the occupation to an end would require coordination with local law enforcement, and University leadership requested assistance from the Baltimore City Fire Department (BCFD) and Baltimore City Police Department (BPD). In parallel, the University continued to work to persuade student protesters to leave the building voluntarily.

29) Why was the police intervention carried out when a meeting had been proposed by students (on May 7) for May 9, 10, or 11th, and then a meeting was scheduled by administration (earlier in the day on May 8) for May 21st?

See above responses to questions 7 and 28.

30) Who made the decisions regarding how the students would be dealt with during the intervention? e.g. Who determined or how was it determined what were the conditions for arrest? How many police would be there? The rules for engagement? How much force would be used?

Law enforcement and life safety operations are determined by the relevant public safety agencies, in this case the Baltimore City Fire Department (BCFD) and Baltimore City Police Department (BPD).

31) If the intervention was taken in part due to concerns for students' health and well-being, what precautions were taken to ensure the safety and emotional health of students and protesters during and after the intervention?

See above responses to questions 7 and 28. In addition to the University's extensive outreach and support efforts in advance of the intervention by BCFD and BPD, during the intervention itself the remaining protesters were given three sets of warnings outside the building and three sets of warnings inside the building and were informed repeatedly of offers of amnesty for voluntarily exiting the building. Student Affairs professionals were on hand before, during, and after the intervention, including in some cases being in direct communication with individual student protesters and their emergency contacts, and student protesters were offered counseling support and resources as needed.

32) Why was the police intervention carried out in the wee hours of the night/morning and not during the day?

Law enforcement and life safety operations are determined by the relevant public safety agencies, in this case the Baltimore City Fire Department (BCFD) and Baltimore City Police Department (BPD).

Other Questions

33) In their interviews, numerous students shared their operating assumption that the University was an exceptional kind of institution, where it was possible through argument and discussion to affect decision making, even at the highest level of the administration. In this image of the University, although there is a hierarchy, it is still possible for even the voices of those who inhabit its "lowest rung" to be heard and legitimated. This vision seems to be inconsistent with the administration's response to the students over the last few years concerning the original issues that these students brought forth (private policing and ICE contracts). What is the administration's vision of the University in terms of a space of shared decision-making?

The University is indeed an exceptional kind of institution, a place that highly values reasoned discussion and debate among students, faculty, and administrators alike, and a place where disagreement is still welcomed and respected. That the University administration or academic leaders reach a different conclusion from students, faculty, or other members of the University community does not mean that their voices are not heard. In fact, the University has engaged and been guided and influenced by hundreds of meetings, conversations, forums, lectures, consultations, and online commentary over the past several years on these and other issues of critical importance to our community.

On the police department issue alone, the University has thus far held more than 125 stakeholder meetings, in which University administrators sought feedback from faculty, staff, students, and neighbors about options for combatting violent crime on and around our campuses, heard the arguments raised on all sides, and took heed of the deep concerns and importance of issues such as accountability, transparency, and constitutional and community-oriented policing. Student views and voices, including

those of student protesters, had a substantial impact on the contours of the police legislation, which went from 5 to 27 pages, with clarifications, limitations, commitments, and programs responsive to the concerns they raised, putting it among the most progressive police authorizing bills anywhere in the United States. Students also are participating in the Student Advisory Committee on Security, are welcome to apply for the University Police Accountability Board, and will have opportunities to engage in the public process for the MOU needed for the JHPD to operate.

Student views and voices also have been heard with respect to faculty contracts with ICE, and student protesters were given an opportunity to meet directly with the Dean of the School of Medicine and the Chair of the Department of Medicine on this topic.

34) Did anyone in the administration suggest to the President and/or the Provost that they should meet with protesters? What were the arguments for and against? If no one made such a suggestion, is there any concern that the President and/or the Provost are not getting adequate input from their staff to make well-informed and properly considered decisions?

As noted above, decisions regarding the handling of the protest and occupation reflected the considered judgment and input of a broad range of professionals within the University, as well as consultations with academic leaders, peer universities, and outside experts. The administration also heard from faculty, students, community members, and parents, reflecting widely varying views of the protest and the University's approach.

See also the responses to questions 2 and 7 above. Again, the President met in person with liaisons for the protest on the first day to hear their demands and issues of concern, and offered to meet for further discussion once the protest ended. Throughout the protest and occupation it was reiterated to the protesters that the occupation of Garland Hall was a violation of University policy and the Guidelines and that meetings to discuss issues of concern to student protesters could occur upon conclusion of the occupation.