1. Call to Order and Agenda Review [1 min]
	1. Conor (GRO Co-Chair) opened the meeting at 6:02PM
2. Approval of Minutes from 09-21-2020
	1. **Motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. The motion passed. Yea: 21 Abstain: 2 Nay:0**
3. Introduction and Q&A Session with Nancy Kass, Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education [20 min]
	1. Nancy usually comes to a meeting of each of the graduate student groups
	2. The discussion will be held as a Q&A
	3. Stephan Kemper (Admin and Funding Chair): What are the biggest fires you are handling right now? What are the biggest obstacles you are facing currently in doing what you are trying to do?
		1. The current planning and operations for the Spring 2021 semester. We are deciding whether the university can move to Phase 2 next Spring. What things are best handled in person which are best handled online?
		2. The Roadmap for Diversity 2.0: This is being written right now. It is something that is overdue, and we have a moment where there is more attention on this nationwide right now. We are looking around the country for trends.
		3. Mentoring: How many people know that there is a mentoring policy for PhD students and their advisors. More awareness and accountability for this. The biggest issue that I hear about from PhD students overall is mentoring.
		4. PhD Quality: Wellbeing of experience and training. What are our highest quality PhD programs? The more input we have into “What counts?” and “What doesn’t count?”
		5. Note: Julie Nadel has been working on a research project about the GRE, getting historical data on admissions and trying to figure out what is correlated with certain measures of success.
	4. Tom McCoy (Cog Sci GC Rep): Are there other resources that are not as well-known as they should be that we should advertise to our departments?
		1. There are a couple of policies I would love help with. The two that are directly related are: 1) the mentoring policy and 2) the annual discussions policy. The latter is a requirement that the advisor and student have a conversation about progress and professional development goals. There were more programs doing the academic piece than the professional development piece. There are not enough faculty who talk about the range of careers. Really say to a student that it’s okay for us to have this conversation.
		2. We also have a lot of Data about PhD programs. There are websites on the Provost’s website on this (gender, demographics, race and ethnicity, time to degree, attrition, career outcomes). The graduate diversity report was published over the summer. The number of students of different backgrounds in relation to the university. This allows us to do callouts of programs whose diversity numbers are the best and the worst.
		3. Overall JHU childcare policies and http://wellness.jhu site.
	5. Ben Taylor (Political Science GC Rep): We (KSAS graduate students) received an email earlier today from John Toscano about grad student support with respect to budget alterations. This email mentioned additional funding requests with the potential of the Dean’s Teaching Fellowships (DTF’s) as a way to get graduate students funding beyond what is already guaranteed. Furthermore, departments are allowed to provide additional funding. What does the term “negatively impacted” mean in this context and who will be eligible for this level of support? Given that the current DTF’s are not at the level of normal stipend support, is there a plan to increase that funding (as possible given the as possible given the extraordinary circumstances of the current situation.)?
		1. I can confirm that I am not the right person to discuss this with. All of this is entirely a KSAS decision. What I will say, to add some context, is that each of the graduate schools gets its own amount of money and gets to make many decisions internally. KSAS has its own budget and makes its own decisions regarding the finances of the budget. In the context of COVID, there was some additional money that was re-allocated from university central, from the President’s Office to KSAS and to some other schools. This was done to provide some additional influx given the demands raised by COVID. But this was not targeted in anyway because the conceptual philosophy is that it’s up to each school to individually decide how they want to spend that money.
	6. Eugenia (Secretary): I know that you were on the original re-start board for the Summer/Fall 2020 reopening of the libraries. KSAS graduate students have been expressing concern regarding lack of access to the libraries. How are decisions about this being made? What can we do to expand access to the library itself?
		1. Access to the materials in the library is now available and that is what a lot of people in leadership thought was the most parallel to access to the laboratories. What has been the current position so far is that you can’t come on campus simply because it’s easier to work there if you have a private office. That doesn’t count as a sufficient reason to be essential to do your research. When this question has come up in the past, it is very much in the plans for Phase 2 but not Phase 1. But if there are people who believe that logic is flawed, it would be good to articulate that. The logic has been that if the materials cannot travel to your house, then you can get access to campus. But if it is simply easier to work there than your house, that is not a sufficient reason.
	7. Conor (Co-Chair): Did KSAS reach out to central to be helped? What other schools reached out? Do we think that there will be continued money distributed?
		1. I know very few details. Lots of JHU schools were in the red after the COVID-19 pandemic hit. What affected the budgets of each of the schools compared to what they were planning pre-COVID was different for each school. When we started discussing how big the hits would be, there were allocations provided to several schools. I’ve had more conversations about SAIS and KSAS grad funding with the Provost, so I know that those specific schools did receive funding. But there are other schools, I don’t know the full list. I don’t want to speculate because that would be unnecessary. Whether there will be more funding, I don’t know and this will depend on a number of things. Sunil (Kumar, Provost) recently said that now things are starting to look better (unclear of what schools this was in reference to). Part of this is because each of the schools had to figure out their own budgets for Fall 2020 and make adjustments. But I am pretty sure that the KSAS budget is now stable. But the next question is “What happens if new additional funding is needed?”. I spent some time at AAU (once a year, virtual meeting) lots of people are talking about graduate education. Some universities have decided that they will not have PhD students in the fall, others are program to program. But that is being left to each of the schools.
	8. Ben Peak (MLL, not a GC rep): Follow-up on Eugenia’s question about the library: “Easier working on campus” as not being one of the things we thought through. Have you carefully considered the socioeconomic impact of students who do not have a place to work or teach? I have a young child at home and very small living quarters. Access to my office in my library is existential to my completion to my degree.
		1. I don’t understand how people are able to do any of this with young kids. I don’t have an answer but I do have a process thought. These are exactly the kinds of things that need to be put together and articulated. I think that the Provost’s Office gets requests for exceptions to other COVID policies. All academic coursework is happening online but faculty can petition why their class has to happen in person. It’s not that there has been a petition process for access to the carrels, but I am happy to bring that idea to the people who make that decision. We are smart people whose training allows us to make analytical decisions. We can have a default decision about the carrels having the default state being closed, but I don’t think it’s crazy for us to think about a petition process that is comparable to the classes that are being taught in-person.
		2. Ben: I know this would be a welcome boon to a lot of people
	9. Shane (Co-Chair): I know we’ve talked about this in different capacities. As it stands, the burden of reporting non-compliance with policies rests on researchers and we have heard, as the GRO, from a number of individuals who have reported non-compliance and who feel that there is no action taken. We know that a lot of students feel uncomfortable making those reports, depending on who the subject of that report will be. What thought has been given to monitoring of policies and how is Prodensity being used to reduce the burden on researchers?
		1. Nancy: Do you have any ideas?
		2. Shane: Idea 1: There is supposed to be some kind of monitoring going on on-campus. I know people are not being asked to show their ProDensity app. I know that I haven’t seen anyone patrolling or checking. Security not wearing masks properly. Some faculty and staff are on campus for various reasons. Personally, I still feel uncomfortable telling contractors in my building to wear masks. What about recruiting faculty and staff and letting them know that they are the people who should be taking a more active role and reduce impact on grad students.
		3. Nancy: In terms of walking the hallway monitoring, there is a lot more in E Baltimore than on Homewood and it has been helpful when there are anonymous complaints to the Speak2US hotline to say “Go to that building to the third floor” so that you could come across it rather than someone having to target a particular lab. I will try to find out more why that isn’t happening on Homewood and what it would take.
		4. Nancy: It’s an interesting idea to ask faculty and staff to step up. It may be that this is something that could be asked of faculty...
		5. Shane: I have frequently seen people who have their masks not fully covering their nose and I don’t feel comfortable saying something but I have discovered that if you make eye contact with the person and pull your own mask up over and over again and gesture toward your nose, they are likely to re-adjust their own masks as well.
		6. Nancy: An interesting psychological point on how we can get people to adhere to these rules better.
	10. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns chair): It’s also really important that these guidelines are enforced and it’s important that the people enforcing these guidelines properly. Sometimes people enforce these policies in incorrectly. Students eating or drinking water outside in the middle of their shifts have been told to stop and leave campus. However, the email from the Provost specifically clarified that eating and drinking on campus (during the middle of shifts, while appropriately distanced and outside) was permitted and supported.
		1. Nancy: We had problem with this but seem to have fixed this with more announcements. Did this happen during the last two weeks?
		2. Maya: I’m not sure exactly when this happened but it’s important that this is take care of.
	11. Elmer (Biophysics GC Rep): One thing I want to add is, my roommate works at SOM and you are not let in through the doors of the building unless you are wearing a mask and have a Prodensity app. People are saying “just tell them” and some people are getting very aggressive about it. That is not acceptable. We have dozens of buildings with multiple doors but I do think you can have guards on multiple entrances outside campus and check Prodensity there. In the past I have reached out to one of your colleagues and have asked what we should do about the people (contractors) not wearing masks properly. The response we (I) received, “Just tell them”, in the past is unacceptable. Faculty, staff, and contractors – I have seen them without masks and I’ve stopped complaining because of this response.
	12. Elmer (Biophysics GC Rep): Also, regarding Maya’s point: The case that I knew, happened over a month or more ago. Two students, who live together, were eating on the beach and were told to put a mask on or leave campus if their forks were not actively in their mouths. I don’t know if this is in your wheelhouse. But the people enforcing these rules need to know what they are enforcing and something needs to be done about this.
		1. Nancy: You’re right, it is not your responsibility to monitor this.
	13. Shane (Co-Chair): As a point of information, the Provost’s Advisory Council (PAC) meets monthly to discuss issues like what we discussed tonight. I am the WSE rep and Daniel McClurkin (form GRO Welcome Chair rep) are the two GRO representatives and will continue to bring your thoughts and concerns to these meetings.
4. Elections for Professional Development Chair [30 min]
	1. Voting link: [http://etc.ch/jHQD](https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fetc.ch%2FjHQD&data=02%7C01%7CGro%40jhu.edu%7Ca428667a09914d25ce3d08d855ba4688%7C9fa4f438b1e6473b803f86f8aedf0dec%7C0%7C0%7C637353605817678767&sdata=q26k5zIDBHBnRBLirPnWVcf943Q3r32RdU691F0MzLg%3D&reserved=0)
	2. Access Tokens from 09/13
	3. There are currently no nominees for the Professional Development Chair. We will read the description and then open the floor for nominations.
	4. The PDC shall: Develop, in conjunction with the Homewood Career Center and PHutures office, programs, and events that will enhance graduate professional development. And will be paid for no more than 25 hours per year.
	5. There were no nominations for this position. As such, we will not be holding elections for thtis position.
	6. Ben Taylor (Pol Sci GC Rep): I would like to suggest that if we do not find a nominee that we hold a runoff vote with the other positions for floating chairs to see if we can fill any of them.
	7. Shane (Co-Chair): I think this is a good and worthwhile idea. I would like us to have a normal nomination cycle and keep this open for one more week, but that is a great idea for next week and the future. We will keep the position open for one more week. If we do not fill it by the next GC meeting then we will hold a runoff vote with the other positions and we will see if we can fill those.
5. Request for GRO to distribute ‘Student Compact’-
	1. Note: Minutes for this portion were recorded by Shane (Co-Chair) as Eugenia (Secretary) was presenting.
	2. Presentation of compact from Ben Peak and Eugenia Volkova
		1. Website of the student advisory committee: <https://covidinfo.jhu.edu/jhu-2020-planning/workgroups/advisory-groups/student-advisory-committee/>
	3. Ben Peak: Reintroduced himself as KSAS representative on SAC, Ph.D. student in French. He was one of the authors of the compact from the SAC, and it was heavily revised by the committee. The language used to request distribution did not actually include names in the signature – this was a big push from the students. The goal is community building and to be from the students and for the students.
	4. Eugenia (Secretary): I will be abstaining from any votes on this. My tenure on the GRO brought me into this committee, and I have done everything to avoid a conflict of interest.
	5. Shane (Co-Chair): I recall discussing with PAC back in June or July that Vanderbilt University was issuing a similar kind of compact, albeit with different structure/format, but that it was required for everyone coming to campus, including students, faculty, staff, contractors, etc. Assuming that this JHU compact was somewhat inspired by Vanderbilt, why does this compact only relate to students, as opposed to all people on campus?
	6. Ben Peak: Good question – we do not really have an answer to it. We’ve brought it up numerous times – we always ask why graduate students are being held to very high standards with no evidence that the other populations on campus are being held to the same standards or similar standards. My personal answer is that, as a student population we can be an example. Too often, we expect everyone to be on the same page at the same time, right now we have the opportunity for students to step forward and be leaders. We pushed for anonymity to protect students from any kind of repercussions related to not signing, but I think that it is a good opportunity for us to be leaders in this space.
	7. Ben Taylor (Poly Sci): There is no explicit call for obligations regarding faculty, who make more money and have more power on campus. I would feel much more comfortable distributing it if there were notes that these other folks are going to be held to similar standards.
	8. Ben Peak: My position here is to be advisory, not necessarily to push the GRO to distribute and push out the document as-is. If the GRO feels strongly on this point, perhaps the GRO should reach out to the faculty stating that we want there to be something similar for the faculty
	9. Stephan (Admin & Funding Chair): If this is for students only and applies to students only – does it seem like the school would use similar kinds of compacts for other areas of student conduct going forward. For instance, would there be a compact regarding sexual violence or racial discrimination?
	10. Ben Peak: Those kinds of compacts could be beneficial for campus, but those are more the purview of the GRO or other bodies than the SAC which is really focusing on COVID-19 related campus issues. I think this is an important question, but that work would be more for other organizations.
	11. Conor (Co-Chair): Thank you for coming and discussing this. Something that was discussed at the E-Board was the way that we were asked to distribute it. The suggested language really suggested this as a grassroots effort from the students up to draft and distribute it. Regarding the formal process by which it was developed: who first suggested it? Were there admin present throughout the development and review? Who governed the final textual revisions of the compact as we see it? Finally, regarding the limitation of “10 people or fewer” at an event – was that led by the students or by the admin.
	12. Ben Peak: Who proposed it: it was brought up by one of the committee members, and I think it may have been from an admin.
	13. Eugenia (Secretary): I am not confident, but I think it was from Alanna Shannahan.
	14. Ben Peak: After this, we went through similar documents from other institutions. Beyond that, a subcommittee was formed to draft and revise the language – this was without administrative oversight. The editing went through several rigorous discussions about what was at stake and what was being put in place. In my opinion, it was with administrative impetus, but entirely crafted by student hands. Regarding the limit of 10 people for gatherings: the situation has been evolving rapidly, and things have changed since the language was initially drafted. Currently in Baltimore, the guidelines limit indoor gatherings to 25% occupancy of the space. I am more than happy to take the concern regarding 10 people to the SAC to request that it be changed to be in accordance with current Baltimore policies. Eugenia and I have been very firm in the SAC to push for these policies to not govern anything outside of our own campuses.
	15. Eugenia (Secretary): There’s something Ben said that I want to clarify from my point of view – there is someone who was originally a student on the committee, but was in the process of being hired as a Presidential Management Fellow in the Vice Provost’s office at some point in the summer (approximately August). She is still on the committee, but her role has perhaps changed somewhat.
	16. Wangui (Communications Chair): Going through the language. For the 5th bullet point “I will wear a face covering at all times when I am in a public setting” – as it came up earlier some people have been reprimanded for not wearing a mask when eating outside. What was the discussion leading to this language, as it seems to discourage eating outside?
	17. Ben Peak: Thank you, this is another bit of language that slipped under my radar. The thought process was that we want to display to the world that JHU is taking the situation very seriously. I can bring it back to the SAC that this language is another sticking point. The goal here is to create awareness and to promote student participation, not that these rules were meant to be hard and fast. We were writing this during a time when face coverings were somewhat of a political question: that is no longer the case, and we now know that masks work scientifically and we can try to revise the language to be better in the current situation.
	18. Matthew Morgado (philosophy): Question in chat: Is there any bargaining power in not signing it?
	19. Ben Peak: Individually, no. Eugenia, what are your thoughts?
	20. Eugenia (Secretary): I think there is bargaining power in the GRO refusing to distribute it without the addenda or corrections, but for individuals not signing there is not much bargaining power. A larger student voice to support what Ben and I have advocated for may be useful to enact actual change.
	21. Christina McNerney (Biology): My question relates to an earlier point about the 10-persons per gathering. Since everything is changing so quickly, where is the flexibility in this compact. Since the guidelines are changing rapidly and presumably will continue to change going forward, is there any flexibility to be offered here.
	22. Ben Peak: There is no flexibility in the current document, and that is perhaps something that should be built into the document. There was a lot of guidance suggested by students from School of Public Health and the School of Medicine which was stricter than the State/City level. Currently, there is no flexibility, but that is something I will firmly support and advocate for at the SAC.
	23. Ashley Kiemen (ChemBE): If edits are made, would the count of how many people have signed on be reset each time it is edited?
	24. Eugenia (Secretary): We do not really know. This was drafted to the penultimate state before August when we thought undergraduates would be coming to campus. Then it stalled once undergrads were determined not to be coming back, and finally it was pushed out rapidly without much more revision. What I am hearing is that we need to 1) change the policy as public health situation changes, and 2) change the way we are assessing the success of the compact.
	25. Ashley Kiemen (ChemBE): It may make more sense for the compact to only go live once everyone is actually back in Baltimore or on campus, as someone signing from far away is much less impactful.
	26. Ben Peak: We did discuss that idea, but it was our goal that Hopkins students should be upholding this sense of community and these guidelines regardless of their current location.
	27. Eugenia (Secretary): The goal was that all “Hopkins affiliates” should be held to these standards. There is a large number of undergraduates who are in Baltimore (Shane estimates ~2500) who should be following these policies as well even if they are not strictly “on campus.”
	28. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): I know there’s been discussion about the modifications for the limit of 10-people. Would those modifications include provisions to exempt religious services?
	29. Eugenia (Secretary): I can confirm that it has been discussed at length, and that we can bring it up, but I cannot promise any outcomes.
	30. Ben Peak: What we can do is go back to the SAC and be loud about the concerns and feedback from graduate students.
	31. Eugenia (Secretary): I just want to clarify that I was in favor of the idea of a compact for the entire campus before a return to campus. That is not really what happened, and we are currently dealing with the document in front of us. We can try to revise it, but even if we lobby for revisions it may or may not go through. I do not know when those revisions would be complete if they occur. I support the idea of a compact to bring community together and hopefully get students to adhere to policies better. On a personal level, and on a graduate student level, I have concerns with some of the specific points of this compact as it stands
	32. Ben Taylor (Political Science): motion in the chat: **Move not to vote and suggest that our concerns be sent back to the Advisory Committee**
	33. **Motion was seconded. Vote taken. The motion passes. Yea:27 Abstain:2 Nay: 0**
	34. Ben Peak: As a final note: I am the KSAS representative on the SAC, I would love to share my email and ask that all KSAS people bring concerns related to your departments to me: bpeak1@jh.edu
6. E-board Report (Shane & Conor) [20 min]
	1. GRO authoring letter on GRE as an admissions requirement for Homewood Graduate Board meeting (November 19th).
		1. We were informed by Renee Eastwood that the Homewood Graduate Board will be discussing the future of the GRE as an admissions requirement at JHU
		2. The GRO has advocated against the use of the GRE for several years
		3. We were invited to author a letter/statement for the Homewood Graduate Board to review and consider in their discussions in mid-November
		4. E-Board Involvement: Eugenia, Katiana, Maya, Conor, Shane, Yuri
		5. We welcome GC involvement – please let us know now or via email if you want to participate.
	2. Student concerns relating to COVID case reporting on campus & request for GRO statement
		1. Graduate student in Biology learned of an onsite contractor who had tested positive for COVID
			1. Positive test results due to contractor also working on a site at Townson University, which mandated testing
		2. Researchers who worked near the contractor’s work-site were denied testing
		3. Request be made to the GRO to address/advocate on three points:
			1. Lack of asymptomatic testing available for graduate students. Options for free testing essentially require a car or an insurance co-pay of $50.
			2. Apparent lack of concern regarding graduate student well-being during the relatively sudden re-opening of campus for research.
			3. Inadequacy of testing & tracking rules on campus. Responsibility of reporting policy violations essentially rests on graduate students, and appears to not have much impact. Prodensity is an insufficient system and does not account for asymptomatic individuals in the way that a testing regime such as Towson employees would.
		4. Christina McNerney (Biology GC Rep): This happened in my department and my lab had to deal with this issue. A lot of our frustration came not from the fact that there was a case, but from the response of the department and the Deans. It was basically: “you are probably okay, so come back to work.” It was not safe or responsible. A big thing we were really hoping for is any way that we can advocate for graduate students to get regularly tested. There is a study right now where enrolment is currently open, but a study is not university-wide available testing. And the sooner we can move on this, the better for all campus.
		5. Maya Monroe (COVID Concerns Chair): Obviously this was a horrible situation and there is not a way for graduate students to receive testing if they are asymptomatic. We’re probably going to need to engage in more contact tracing moving forward. I am personally happy about bringing this up moving forward. When we have done contact tracing, we have heard that this is unreasonable. I’ve largely been told that.
		6. Eugenia (Secretary): I brought this up to at the Student Advisory Meeting this morning and think that a more formal statement from the GRO would be more powerful.
		7. Ben Taylor (Political Science): **Move to have the COVID-19 chair (Maya) advocate on these issues (unless we don’t need to vote on this)**
		8. Wangui (BME): I’m concerned about exposed students being encouraged to return to work without getting tested, can we follow up with Christine and Renee to have them talk to whoever in the university said that was ok?
		9. Ben Taylor (Pol Sci): **Accepts clarification on the motion**
		10. Maya (COVID-19 Chair): I would absolutely want the E-board to review the statement.
		11. Conor: An anonymized version of this was brought to administrators (Christine and Renee) and they are already bringing it higher.
		12. Shane’s interpretation of Ben’s motion: **Motion to have the COVID-19 chair (Maya) advocate on these issues, with the explicit endorsement of the General Council on any advocacy statements written by Maya and reviewed by the Executive Board.**
		13. Ashley (ChemBE GC Rep): I would prefer the entire GRO review the statement before approving it, not just the E-board.
		14. Shane (Co-Chair): We have some trouble having out-of meeting votes and we would have to wait two weeks to make this possible
		15. Ben (Pol Sci GC Rep): I am happy with the language but I am happy for GC to review if that is the general sentiment.
		16. Gabriel Ramirez (MSEM GC Rep): **Second Ben’s motion.**
		17. Motion: **Motion to have the COVID-19 chair (Maya) advocate on these issues, with the explicit endorsement of the General Council on any advocacy statements written by Maya and reviewed by the Executive Board.**
		18. Shane: Proposed a quick straw poll through Zoom to figure out how people feel about GC vs. EBoard Review
			1. Would you prefer full GC Review or E-Board Review?
				1. GC – 12 votes
				2. E-Board - 20 votes
				3. Abstention – 4
		19. Gabriel (MSEM): I think we can trust the E-Board review and they can send out a preliminary version 24 hours before it is sent out, and then if there are any comments they can be submitted to the GC.
		20. Ashley (ChemBE): My questions is that if it is only a subset of the student council that is voting on this, will that be mentioned in the email that is sent out?
		21. Shane (Co-Chair): If that is required as a stipulation, that can be required. To give a little bit of historical context, the GC outlines the rough idea of what the concepts they want advocated on. And then we delegate some number of E-Board members, GC reps, or committee to write a statement and send it. Two years ago, we introduced some sort of review for statements to allow for quality control of the statements and only in extreme situations do we bring statements to the GC for review because the process is rather lengthy. That is not typical procedure, no.
		22. Eugenia (Secretary): I think we are choosing whether we want the process to be done quickly (E-Board approval) or thoroughly (GC approval).
		23. Ashley (ChemBE GC Rep): My big thought is that typically it’s all the new people who have joined the student council who would not be involved in the vote. And anyone who is new to the student council is shut out of this in extent. And would not be officially involved in the vote.
		24. Gabriel (MSEM GC Rep): I would favour a quicker resolution
		25. Wangui (Communications Chair): I think I was hoping for the student who was involved on this to shed light on what their preference might be. The statement could benefit more graduate students to show about valuing student lives over productivity.
		26. Shane (Co-Chair): I want to comment, I disagree with Eugenia’s word choice of thoroughness vs. expediency, so it shouldn’t be a concern that this will not be a comprehensive statement. If we end up with 45 additional people reviewing it, it would be likely for us to get a new point. My recommendation is that we could see if Maya is open to having an ad hoc committee that is open to the general council during the review period.
		27. Christina (Biology GC Rep): This happened, at this point, about a month ago. All the members of my lab did go get tested and all of us got tested negative. From that point of view, my lab and the situation is under control. But there is some degree in urgency in that the longer that we wait the more it likely it is that this happens again in another location and those students may not be as lucky. There seems to be more a question of wording and personally, I trust the E-Board to make those word-choices to make those statements. I would be happy to step in and help or offer a clarification if necessary.
		28. Eugenia (Secretary): I support the formation of an ad-hoc committee to address this.
		29. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): I'm certainly open to an ad-hoc committee.
		30. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): If it helps address concerns in the future, a number of E-board members are new to the GC this semester. They have been working over the summer but aren't necessarily long-term GC members.
		31. Conor (Co-Chair): the motion currently stands: **Motion to have the COVID-19 chair (Maya) advocate on these issues, with the explicit endorsement of the General Council on any advocacy statements written by Maya and reviewed by the Executive Board.**
		32. **Gabriel seconded the motion. A vote was held. The motion passes. Yea: 24 Abstain: 3 Nay:0**
	3. [Innovation Fund for Community Safety](https://www.jhu.edu/jhu-innovation-fund-for-community-safety/?mc_cid=b7c3f31cda)
		1. Description from President Daniels’ Email 9/30: “The JHU Innovation Fund for Community Safety is a $6 million, four-year fund to fuel projects created and led by community members and community organizations that are designed to improve community safety and reduce violence in the near term and to support research, in partnership with community organizations, to inform and assess the impact of these efforts.”
		2. The fund is tied to the two-year pause on the implementation of the JPD
		3. There will be a call for nominations to the selection committee for the fund’s projects later this fall
		4. Proposals are expected to be publicized at the beginning of December and the selection of projects is expected early next year.
	4. Updates on group registration, space reservations, group funding, and ‘good standing’
		1. SLI is aware of data issues: graduate students missing accounts, graduate students listed as undergraduates
		2. This issue should be fixed by a data-import from SIS. When this will happen is unclear, we have heard several times that it should occur imminently but as of this morning the issues persisted
		3. So far as we understood from discussions with Laura, we should be able to fund non-registered groups for their events, provided the general requirements are met
		4. We need to begin advertising and encouraging students to apply - including ideas on what kinds of things can be done.
			1. More coffee hours where students can pick up coffee.
	5. Diversity Chair received many votes: what does the GRO see as key diversity measures that the E-Board (advocacy chairs and others) can take on?
		1. Diversity Chair received a large number of votes as 4th floating chair
		2. Since advocacy chairs have a lot of overlap with possible diversity-chair initiatives, we want to understand what is seen as pressing/missing that the GRO should be working on regarding diversity.
		3. Ona has put together a survey to get input from the full GC on this question, which will be distributed after tonight’s meeting.
		4. Please respond to upcoming email and survey from Ona.
	6. KSAS Town Hall - recap and salient points
		1. Hosted by Vice Dean Mary Favret, Director of Graduate Affairs Renee Eastwood, and VP Nancy Kass and Jonathan Links
		2. Updates on facilities access/travel, mainly library rooms and travel– so long as we are in phase I, there is no movement on this. We can push the question of exceptions. “Don’t get your hopes up”
		3. Updates on COVID violations, enforcement, and testing
			1. Registered that there are concerns but tried to reassure that the processes are sufficient.
		4. Updates on financial/time to degree accommodation
		5. Requests for GRO reps from KSAS to discuss accommodations with Vice Dean Favret
		6. Call for recruitment of students to design program for financial aid distribution
		7. Please reach out to Conor (gro@jhu.edu) about who is interested and available. We want 2-3 people at this meeting present to propose how we can distribute this money.
	7. Upcoming WSE Ph.D. Town Hall - Oct. 8th – 4PM
		1. Stephan Kemper (Admin and Funding Chair): I just want to mention that I attended the WSE Master’s Hall last week and Dean Schlesinger did not show. Christine Cavanaugh and Sri Sarma lead it. This might happen at the PhD town hall as well.
		2. Eugenia (Secretary): There may be a graduate student university-wide town hall this week, likely on Thursday.
	8. [COVID-19 Graduate](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1UUlc4UpQgGsCCZF0bMSz7JPn2a9RO7neUeFbaUl9wxw/edit) financial need survey from TRU
		1. They have not asked us to distribute it yet, but the results will be shared with us. We will let you know when we find out more about the responses to this.
	9. Using a portion of 2020-2021 flex funds to pay for Rachel S. Core award for recipients from 2018-2019 who never received award.
		1. It was brought to our attention a month ago that the Rachel S. Core Award winners from 2018-2019 never received their prizes (cash value $200)
		2. We attempted to route funds from last year’s budget, but it was not feasible
		3. Will pay out the awards using this year’s budget
	10. Check-in with Eugenia after sending summary statements on GRO action to departments.
		1. Eugenia (Secretary): I have only had 3 departments check-in with me. Please reach out to your departments and please check-in after completing this.
7. Open Discussion & Questions
8. Adjournment