



Cover Memorandum

Early Intervention Program, JHPD Directive #355

Purpose of the Directive

This Directive is to establish the Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD) Early Intervention Program (EIP), a formal system to identify and monitor the performance of JHPD officers.

Summary of Directive Requirements

The EIP is a tool to assist JHPD leadership in monitoring and improving officer performance. The availability of EIP does not alter the responsibility of supervisors to directly monitor the performance and behavior of officers under their command on a daily basis. Along with daily monitoring of officer work activities, supervisors must take proactive measures to address identified deficiencies, and acknowledge achievements, in officer performance or behavior at the earliest practical time.

This Directive requires supervisors to monitor their officers for behavioral indicators related to JHPD's performance competencies. Behavioral indicators can be used by supervisors to assess the competencies of the officers that they supervise and their adherence to JHPD's directives. Competencies are the key abilities necessary to perform the officer's job, which can be evaluated based on an officer's application of those competencies in their interactions with members of the public and co-workers. Negative behavioral indicators demonstrate a lack of competency, while positive behavioral indicators can show that an officer has and is applying the required competency. Some of the competencies that supervisors should be considering, and assessing positive and negative behavioral indicators of, on a daily basis, are: preparedness, legitimacy, courtesy, procedural justice, de-escalation and documentation.

This Directive requires that supervisors review their officers' daily work product for behavioral indicators in order to identify officers' competencies, including their incident reports, body-worn and in car camera footage, citizen contact receipts, attendance records, including required court appearances, and use of force reports. When a supervisor identifies negative behavioral indicators of JHPD competencies, supervisors shall intervene and attempt to course correct with their members. When direct supervisory intervention does not result in the officer's increased competency, the supervisor shall promptly provide all necessary documentation relating to behavioral indicators to the Director for Human Resources for Public Safety for consideration for EIP.

Negative behavioral indicators may also lead to a misconduct investigation or Non-Punitive Corrective Action (NPCA), pursuant to JHPD Directive #350, Complaints Against Police Personnel or Directive #351, Non-Punitive Corrective Action. Nothing in this Directive releases a supervisor from their obligation to refer observed or alleged misconduct violations to the Public Safety Accountability Unit (PSAU) for a formal disciplinary investigation. Because EIP is, by definition, related to performance of JHPD's core competencies, JHPD members may participate in EIP, in addition to discipline and/or NPCA.

The EIP may be instituted at the discretion of the Director for Human Resources for Public Safety or may be mandatory based on the threshold occurrences identified in this Directive, including two or more complaints of misconduct or use of force incidents.

The EIP process includes formal notice, a preliminary meeting to develop a performance improvement plan (PIP) and monthly evaluation of the member's process until successful completion of PIP. In addition to monitoring the PIP may include interventions, such as supervisor ride alongs, peer mentoring, or training.

In addition, the Directive mandates that the Director of Human Resources for Public Safety or supervisors shall ensure that positive behavioral indicators, or the lack of negative behavioral indicators, are acknowledged in the annual performance evaluation process and positive behavioral indicators and with regards to non-competitive and competitive promotions, as well as in award recognition.

Finally, the Director for Human Resources for Public Safety will conduct an annual evaluation of the EIP for submission to the Chief of Police, subject to review and comment from JHPD supervisors to ensure its effectiveness.

Blueprint for the Policy Development Process

The draft JHPD policies (hereinafter referred to as "directives") shared for community feedback are based on examples of 21st century best practices in public safety policy, identified through extensive benchmarking of university and municipal law enforcement agencies across the nation. Taken together, they represent a comprehensively progressive approach to policing that prioritizes equity, transparency, accountability, and community-based public safety strategies.

The JHPD's draft directives embody approaches that community advocates and leading experts have championed locally and in law enforcement reform efforts across the nation. The draft directives have also been developed based on input received through robust community engagement in prior phases of JHPD development, including suggestions received in the legislative process as well as last fall's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) public comment period and feedback opportunities.

In addition, the directives were drafted to exceed the minimum requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Maryland, to align with the Community Safety and Strengthening Act (CSSA) and to fulfill the requirements of the MOU between the Johns Hopkins University and the Baltimore Police Department. The Hopkins community and our neighbors throughout Baltimore can help improve and strengthen these directives further through their feedback and input.

Material that was considered in the drafting of the Directive and Procedure Manual, include:

a. Publicly available policies from municipal police departments that have undergone substantial reform efforts, including: the New Orleans Police Department; Seattle Police Department; Portland Police Department; Detroit Police Department; Ferguson Police Department; and Baltimore Police Department;

b. National guidance on best practices and model policies from criminal justice reform efforts, social science research centers, and civil rights organizations, including: the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), including the ACLU of Massachusetts's "Racially Just Policing: Model Policies for Colleges and Universities"; the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF); U.S. Department of Justice Office of

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office); The Justice Collaboratory (The JC) at Yale University Law School; and The Center for Innovation in Community Safety (CICS) at Georgetown Law School.

c. National and local higher education institutions that are based in comparable environments and make policies publicly available, including: Carnegie Mellon University; Morgan State University; Towson University; University of Chicago; University of Cincinnati; University of Maryland, Baltimore County; University of Pennsylvania; and Yale University.

To ensure that the proposed directives captured national best practices in community-focused public safety services, the development team collaborated with independent experts from two organizations: National Policing Institute (the Institute), a non-profit dedicated to advancing excellence in policing through research and innovation, and 21CP Solutions, an expert consulting team of former law enforcement personnel, academics, civil rights lawyers, and community leaders dedicated to advancing safe, fair, equitable, and inclusive public safety solutions. Each directive was reviewed by experts selected by both organizations, who provided feedback, suggestions, and edits that were fully incorporated into the current draft.

Finally, individuals and organizations representing the diversity of the Johns Hopkins University community provided feedback to ensure the policies and procedures reflect and respond to the values of our institution and to our community's public safety service needs.

Now they are available for your review. Johns Hopkins is committed to adopting, incorporating, or otherwise reflecting recommended changes and feedback in the final version of policies so long as feedback is aligned with our values and commitments, permissible within legal parameters, and supported by national best practices for community policing and public safety.



POLICE DEPARTMENT

EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE #355

Responsible Executive:
Chief of Police
Responsible Office:
Vice President for Public Safety
Approved by:
Dr. Branville G. Bard, Jr.
Issued: [full date]
Revised: [full date]

Table of Contents

POLICY STATEMENT1

WHO IS GOVERNED BY THIS POLICY?.....1

PURPOSE1

DEFINITIONS.....2

PROCEDURES2

POLICY ENFORCEMENT6

RELATED RESOURCES7

CONTACTS7

Policy Statement

The Johns Hopkins Police Department (JHPD) Early Intervention Program (EIP) is intended to serve as a systematic approach to identify whether officers of the JHPD are meeting the JHPD’s performance expectations.

Who is Governed by this Policy?

All sworn police officers, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201, in service with the JHPD are governed by this Directive.

Purpose

The purpose of this Directive is to establish a formal system to effectively identify and monitor actions taken by officers in order to recognize early indicators of the officer’s performance. The early and continual evaluation of each officer’s performance, and conformance to the JHPD’s Directives, will allow the JHPD to appropriately intervene when officers are failing to meet JHPD’s performance standards, and recognize those that are. As a result, the EIP will increase

JHPD officer accountability and provide all officers the opportunity to develop their skills and abilities.

Definitions

Member:	All members of the JHPD, including employees, officers, and volunteers, unless the term is otherwise qualified (e.g., member of the public, member of the Baltimore Police Department, etc.).
Officer:	All sworn police officers, at any rank, as defined by MD Code, Public Safety, § 3-201, in service with the JHPD.

Procedures

I. General

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director or their designee along with an officer's chain of command shall be responsible for monitoring the performance of all officers of the JHPD.
- B. Officers who demonstrate deficiencies in JHPD competencies will be provided assistance through the EIP in achieving proficiency in any area of deficiency.
- C. Officers that demonstrate proficiency or exceed expectations in JHPD competencies will be regularly acknowledged.
- D. The EIP is a performance improvement process designed to ensure that each officer of the JHPD is able to perform their duties in a manner that is consistent with JHPD directives.

II. Supervisory Responsibility

- A. The EIP is simply a tool to assist JHPD leadership in monitoring and improving officer performance. The availability of EIP does not alter the critical role of line supervisors to directly monitor the performance and behavior of officers under their command on a daily basis. Along with daily monitoring of officer work activities, supervisors must take proactive measures to address identified deficiencies, and acknowledging achievements, in officer performance or behavior at the earliest practical time.
- B. Supervisors must remain alert to behavioral indicators that suggest the need for follow up review, intervention or acknowledgment related to officer performance.
- C. The goal of good supervision is to identify whether the officer is regularly following JHPD's directives, particularly related to interacts with JH community members and provide positive re-enforcement to those that are and management intervention to those that are not.

- D.** Supervisors should monitor their officers for behavioral indicators. Behavioral indicators are behaviors that JHPD supervisors can use to assess the competencies of the officers that they supervise and their adherence to JHPD's directives.
- E.** Competencies are the key abilities necessary to perform the officer's job, which can be evaluated based on an officer's application of those competencies in their interactions with members of the public and co-workers.
- F.** There are two main varieties of behavioral competencies: negative and positive. Negative indicators demonstrate a lack of competency, while positive indicators can show that an officer has and is applying the required competency. Some of the competencies that supervisors should be considering, and assessing positive and negative behavioral indicators of, on a daily basis, are:
- Preparedness (i.e., is the officer arriving for work on time, with the appropriate equipment and positive attitude?),
 - Legitimacy (i.e., is the officer following the law and JHPD directives?)
 - Courtesy (i.e., is the officer interacting with their co-workers and officers of the public with the level of courtesy required by JHPD's directives?),
 - Procedural Justice (i.e., is an officer interacting with members of the public and their co-workers in a procedurally just way as required by JHPD Directive #109, Procedural Justice in Interactions, and other directives?),
 - De-escalation (i.e., is the officer de-escalating conflict, as required by JHPD Directive #401 and other directives?), and
 - Documentation (i.e., is the officer activating their body worn camera and in car camera appropriately, completing appropriate reports, and issuing appropriate documentation related to enforcement actions and stops).
- G.** The following shall be reviewed by supervisors on an ongoing basis for behavioral indicators in order to identify officer's competencies:
- Incident reports,
 - Body-worn cameras,
 - Citizen contact receipts,
 - Attendance records, including required court appearances,
 - Use of Force Reports,
 - Complaints of misconduct (including civil complaints),
 - Vehicle accidents,
 - Vehicle pursuits,
 - Transportation Code violations,
 - Disciplinary actions,
 - Criminal or traffic enforcement actions and results thereof,
 - Performance evaluations,
 - Community feedback about the officer, and

- Observations.
- H.** Where a supervisor identifies negative behavioral indicators of JHPD competencies, supervisors shall intervene and attempt to course correct with their officers.
- I.** When direct supervisory intervention does not result in the officer's increased competency, the supervisor shall promptly provide all necessary documentation relating to behavioral indicators to the Public Safety Human Resources Director for consideration for EIP.
- J.** Negative behavioral indicators may also lead to a misconduct investigation or Non-Punitive Corrective Action (NPCA), pursuant to JHPD Directive #350, Complaints Against Police Personnel or Directive #351, Non-Punitive Corrective Action. Nothing in this Directive releases a supervisor from their obligation to refer observed or alleged misconduct violations to the Public Safety Accountability Unit (PSAU) for a formal disciplinary investigation. Because EIP is, by definition, related to performance of JHPD's core competencies, JHPD members may participate in EIP, in addition to discipline and/or NPCA.
- K.** When a supervisor identifies positive behavioral indicators, they shall regularly document and acknowledge them with officers.

III. Assessment for Behavioral Indicators

- A. Discretionary EIP.** The Public Safety Human Resources Director shall monitor complaints against officers, non-punitive action, discipline, attendance, vehicle accidents, pursuit reports, and supervisory reports of behavior indicators and may institute the EIP in their discretion.
- B. Mandatory EIP.** In any given twelve (12) month period, on a rolling basis, the following behavioral indicators requires a mandatory referral for EIP:
- One (1) or more complaints from officers of the public resulting in administrative charges,
 - Three (3) or more complaints from officers of the public, regardless of disposition,
 - Two (2) or more non-punitive corrective actions or expedited resolutions of minor misconduct,
 - Two (2) or more use of force reports,
 - Two (2) or more vehicle accidents in which the employee is at fault,
 - Two (2) or more unexcused attendance related incidents,
 - Two (2) or more vehicle pursuits,
 - Two (2) or more notifications of unsuccessful prosecution of enforcement actions related to officer deficiencies or attendance,

- Two (2) or more notices from supervisor regarding behavior indicators for the officer,
- Four (4) or more unexcused late arrivals for their shift, or
- A combination of three (3) or more instances of any of the events identified above.

IV. EIP Notices and Preliminary Review

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director or their designee will provide a written EIP notice to alert the officer's immediate supervisor and appropriate Command Staff officer whenever an officer will be put in the EIP.
- B. EIP notices are intended to assist supervisors in evaluating and guiding their officers and will not, standing alone, form the basis for disciplinary action. EIP notices will contain the officer's name, employee ID number, and competencies that that will be subject to the EIP. EIP notices shall draw no conclusions nor make any determinations concerning job performance.
- C. EIP notices require that the officer's chain of command (sergeant, lieutenant, and captain) officer meet to conduct a preliminary review of the EIP data, as well as other recent officer performance related information to develop a draft performance improvement plan (PIP).
- D. The PIP will include setting objectives for the officer to achieve proficiency in the deficient competencies, identifying intervention strategies to improve performance, and establishing regular meetings between the supervisor and the officer to review performance.
- E. Interventions that may be included in a PIP include attendance monitoring, additional training and testing, peer mentoring, supervisor ride along, or additional levels of report review.
- F. Officers will be informed they have been placed in the EIP and scheduled to meet with the supervisor to discuss the proposed PIP.
- G. The supervisor will meet with the officer to discuss the PIP. The officer can provide feedback which will be considered for inclusion in the PIP by the supervisor.
- H. The final PIP will be submitted to the Public Safety Human Resources Director for approval.
- I. Once the PIP is finalized, the officer and their chain of command will be provided with a copy of the PIP.

V. Formal EIP Reviews

- A. The Director for Human Resources for Public Safety will institute conduct monthly EIP reviews. EIP reviews will include meeting(s) with the affected officer and relevant supervisors.
- B. The minimum EIP time period is ninety (90) days. The officer will remain on the EIP until they achieve proficiency in the deficient competency for three (3) consecutive EIP reviews within the following twelve (12) month period.
- C. As part of the annual performance evaluation program, EIP reviews will be considered, and the failure of an officer to achieve proficiency in the deficient competencies for (3) consecutive monthly reviews in the twelve (12) month period may be grounds for termination of an officer’s employment.

VI. Acknowledgement of Positive Behavioral Indicators

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director and/or supervisors shall ensure that positive behavioral indicators, or the lack of negative behavioral indicators, are acknowledged in the annual performance evaluation process.
- B. Positive behavioral indicators and successful completion of the EIP shall be considered with regards to non-competitive and competitive promotions, as well as in award recognition.

VII. Annual Evaluation

- A. The Public Safety Human Resources Director will conduct an annual evaluation of the EIP for submission to the Chief of Police. The evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - Statistical data about EIP activity during the past year;
 - Assessment of the overall effectiveness of the EIP; and
 - Any recommendations for changes in EIP Directive.
- B. The EIP annual evaluation will be made available to all supervisors for review and comment.

Policy Enforcement

Enforcement	JHPD managers and supervisors are responsible for enforcing this Directive.
Reporting Violations	Suspected violations of this Directive should be reported to the Public Safety Accountability Unit (PSAU).

Related Resources

University Policies and Documents
Conduct & Responsibility #109, Procedural Justice Administrative Procedure #350, Complaints against Police Personnel Administrative Procedure #351, Non-Punitive Corrective Action Operational Procedure #401, De-escalation
External Documentation
Police Department Forms and Systems

Contacts

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number	E-mail/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation			