1. Call to Order and Agenda Review
	1. Shane Arlington (Co-Chair): Called the meeting to order at 6:03PM
	2. Review of the agenda
2. Approval of Minutes from 12-7-2020
	1. Ben Taylor (Political Science) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
	2. Stephan Kemper (Admin and Funding Chair)\* in the text chat: Seconded
	3. **Motion: Motion to approve the minutes**
		1. Yea: 30 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
		2. Motion passes
3. Approval of New Student Organization
	1. ChemDNA
		1. Shane (Co-Chair): SLI office forgot to notify us that ChemDNA needed a vote by GC to be approved, so we are bringing it to the floor now.
		2. ChemDNA is an organization promoting a well-functioning, respectful, and inclusive learning and work environment. ChemDNA seeks to provide a space where students, faculty, and staff are represented and supported to succeed regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, orientation, and/or other identities. Key programs to create positive change include social events aimed towards initiating and informing conversation, mentorship both vertically and horizontally among career levels, and outreach to the greater community broadening diversity in STEM whilst providing exposure to the Department. Through these efforts to promote diversity we strive to improve the environments in which all members of our community live and work.
		3. ChemDNA was formed in 2016. Our events focus on a variety of topics including professional development, STEM outreach and building connections and mentorship within the department.
		4. Current acting president of Chem DNA: we were originally formed in 2016 but are now moving to be officially recognized. Our events focus on STEM outreach, professional development, and events that the grad students in this field would like to see, but our events are open to all grad students. I am happy to take any questions at this time.
		5. Shane: Please post the question directly, or raise in the chat. I will note that they meet all criteria for GRO recognition but only need a GC vote to proceed with becoming an official group.
		6. Aniruddha Ghosh (Chemistry) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve.
		7. Ben (Political Science) \*in the text chat: Second
		8. **Motion: Motion to have the GRO recognize ChemDNA as an official student organization.**
			1. Vote: 30 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstain
4. Emergency Elections
	1. Advocacy Chair (voting link: <http://etc.ch/ZdK7>)
	2. Access tokens were sent on 01/31/21 - DM Shane if you do not have these tokens and they will be provided before voting commences
	3. Shane (Co-Chair, acting as Election Officer): Explained the election process and solicited questions
	4. Shane (Election Officer):
		1. The Advocacy Chairs are charged to:
			1. Handle student concerns and work to enrich student life in areas that include, but are not limited to housing, security, financial, family life, environmental, diversity, civic, and community concerns.
			2. Sit on university committees regarding the aforementioned concerns.
			3. Liaise with other graduate student advocacy groups, as required.
			4. Work with the Executive Board Members at Large to direct graduate student advocacy programs.
			5. Meet with the deans along with the chairs at least once per semester to discuss graduate student concerns.
			6. Be paid no more than 100 hours each per year (Note: The current allocated hours for Spring 2021 are 50. More hours may be allocated by a vote of the GRO General Council to facilitate further advocacy efforts.)
	5. Nominees
		1. Danielle Bautista (4th year PhD student in Chemistry)
		2. Sara Ord (1st year MS student in ChemBE)
		3. Briana Whitehead (2nd year PhD student in Molecular Biophysics)
	6. Aniruddha (Chemistry): Motion to vote
	7. Ben Taylor (Pol Sci): Second
	8. Voting happened. The results of the election were: **Briana Whitehead was elected as our second advocacy chair for the 2021 Spring semester.**
5. E-Board Report Shane and Conor Bean (Co-Chairs):
	1. Conor (Co-Chair): HFA/AAUP have made the results of their [external audit](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/5lbu9kgzzx9gaue/AABRteLZq8HHgj4YmnnhiSZ5a?dl=0) available publicly
		1. Background
			1. April: JHU announces serious financial problems due to COVID-19 pandemic, $100 million loss (expected spending exceeding revenue). Projected for FY2020 and $375 million loss for 2021. Sweeping layoffs announced and halting JHU contributions to faculty retirement plans and hiring.
			2. June: HFA commissioned an external audit of JHU finances to understand the losses by Dr. Howard Bunsis
			3. October: JHU announces that projected $100 million loss for FY 2020 wound up being a $75 million surplus
			4. November: Auditor report to HFA
		2. Summary of Results
			1. Despite Pres Daniels’ dire warning, JHU has been in fine financial shape throughout the pandemic and rapid cost cutting measures were unnecessary
			2. JHU has $1.9 billion in reserves in the endowment that are not legally bound to any donor requirements
				1. Not specifically allocated by the donor itself. Counter-example: Michael Bloomberg’s money is locked in.
				2. These reserves are typically used during emergency times like right now.
			3. JHU’s financial investments in hedge funds have consistently underperformed the market (auditor projects the lost possible revenue at $900 million over 6 years).
			4. Overall, some mistakes in financial planning from the university that are not the fault of faculty, staff, or graduate students. The investments have been underperforming.
			5. Stephan (Admin and Funding Chair)\*in text chat: "mistakes were made"?
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): The hedge funds used to invest and manage this money underperformed the market in terms of the investment growth. This was concerning because faculty are usually told that they don’t understand enough of the financial matters to understand the university’s financial position.
			6. Stephan (Admin and Funding Chair)\*in text chat: My apologies, that was a joke that didn't carry well over text. But I appreciate the expanded answer here, it was interesting!
		3. Estimated Losses Compared to Unrestricted Reserves
			1. The auditor made about 3 ranked cases in terms of best, worst, most likely cases of how the losses to JHU revenue compared to expenses.
			2. Most likely, the school will be looking at $46 million of losses for the financial year we are currently in.
			3. However, compared to the reserves we have (total and undesignated) and given the scale of the pandemic; this is not that much.
			4. There is good reason to be sceptical about claims of financial necessity (extensions to time to degree, healthcare, faculty pensions)
			5. Give the size of the reserves, and the small size of the potential losses, the reductions in retirement contribution were clearly not necessary
			6. Using reserves for a short-term issue like COVID is exactly what those reserves are for
			7. Even if there is additional borrowing, the current average rate is 3.1%, and any potential increase in the interest rate would lead to an increase in the interest cost of at most $5 million, which is small in the context of a $6.5 billion entity
			8. Ryan Warwick (Classics) \*in the text chat: Out of curiosity, was there a particular investment strategy that would explain this, or a particular fund?
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): I don’t know what the financial strategy is and I don’t know if it is explained in the presentation. This is what can be discerned to my mind.
				2. Ryan (Classics)\*in the text chat: Thanks! Didn’t mean to take away from the overall point here
			9. Jo Giardini (English)\*in the text chat: I mean, the point is that if you just invested in an index fund, you’d outperform Hopkins’ investments, right Connor? Which is to say—you might actually do better on your own.
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): Yes. The point is that they invested in hedge funds that underperformed the market. If they had done something else then they could have expected more money from these investments.
			10. Paige Paulsen (Near Eastern Studies)\*in the text chat: Has the university thus far reversed the austerity measures? If so, have they made restitution for paused contributions and other cuts?
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): I believe the austerity measures were tempered a little bit They gave severance payments. But they have not reimbursement faculty pension contributions and I don’t know anything about an emergency relief package being given.
			11. Shane (Co-Chair): Something unclear from slides it going. There is a chance that a comparison to an SNP500 isn’t fair, because there could be donor restrictions that limit how certain funds are invested. But it is true that the extent that it underperformed is surprising.
			12. Gabriel (MSEM): Is there a chance this is the case for other universities during this year.
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): The auditor compared data to previous years (e.g., 2019, 2018)
				2. Shane (Co-Chair): Princeton’s performed at 5.6% - outperforming SNP500 - and we were about 1.8% lower than SNP500.
			13. Paige (Near Eastern Studies): Do we have plans as the GRO to make a statement?
				1. Conor (Co-Chair): It’s unclear at this point. Making a statement would fall to the GC, depending on how they want to use this information. We could choose to review the slides first then return to make a decision at the next meeting. There has not been an official GC comment on this to the University as of now.
			14. Ryan (Classics)\*in the text chat: 3 % is in the realm of a savings account; wild
	2. Shane (Co-Chair): Note about revising research restart plans: need to be revised and accepted before new persons join, higher density is used, etc
		1. Submitting and implementing plan (FILL IN FROM PPT)
			1. While we are moving to Phase 2, the return to research guidance is still mostly aimed at Phase 1 - we have asked about this several times, and keep being told that more information should be available soon
			2. As such, we cannot answer all questions regarding policy, but want to remind everyone
				1. Every laboratory must have an approved research plan in place to operate
				2. Any changes to the plan must be approved before being implemented
				3. Adding any new people to the plan must be approved before those workers begin
			3. Please remind your colleagues of this and encourage anyone who has concerns or questions to reach out to us
			4. Revised plans must be submitted then approved by Vice Dean before implementing new plan. The people approving plans should be abreast to what acceptable revisions are. This is a request for GC to remind colleagues that plans must be submitted and approved before being implemented.
	3. Conor (Co-Chair): New [“social compact”](https://covidinfo.jhu.edu/health-safety/social-compact/) and the changes incorporated
		1. We have not been asked to distribute as an organization as we were in the fall
		2. JHU Social Media team is hoping the message spreads on personal accounts student-to-student (on the ground account strategy)
		3. The compact is now meant to encompass faculty and staff as well.
			1. Not just limited to students.
		4. Paige (Near Eastern Studies): Would you the GRO like us to put in our department monthly update, or no opinion? Is this something that should go in our department update that the GC members send every month or is that up to us as individuals?
			1. Conor (Co-Chair): I believe it’s fine if you’d like
			2. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, my stance is that the GRO does not have an opinion on it unless the GC votes to have. You can choose to but we are not making a request that you do at this time.
		5. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): I think that the original iterations, some of the problems we had were that it didn’t give any exemptions for gatherings but didn’t give consideration to indoor vs. outdoor and consideration to protests. Also, I don’t understand how they are justifying having students sign this compact and having people in gatherings of more than 10 people. Shouldn’t class sizes also adhere to these restrictions? I don’t understand from a public health standpoint how being indoors for a social gathering of more than 10 people is different from class - both shouldn’t be happening.
		6. Ben (Political Science)\*in the text chat: Second that point. Utter hypocrisy
		7. Conor (Co-Chair): This version of the compact doesn’t have the option to sign, they seem to have gone back to the drawing board due to concern from students about how this was being rolled out and what was being asked forms students.
		8. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): They also tell us in this version to adhere to “local restrictions” but still social gatherings should not have different limitations than classroom education.
	4. Conor (Co-Chair): Survey for GC reps regarding paid/unpaid work for departmental administration (Ona)
		1. Ona Ambrozaite (Graduate Involvement Chair): What does compensation look like for graduate students who take on admin tasks
		2. Co-Chairs were contacted in November with a question about what the average hourly compensation is for grads taking on administrative work in their departments
		3. Examples of work include planning visiting/interview weeks, coordinating happy hours, planning departmental retreats
		4. Ona has developed a survey for GC reps to help us understand the work that grads do for their departments and how they are compensated.

Ona (Graduate Involvement Chair): To see the scope of the work that grads do and get grads compensated for this work. If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer after the meeting today.

* 1. Alexander Helms and Ece Ozdemir (Social Chairs): Updates on event planning for Spring 2021
		1. Ece (Social Chair): Coffee Hours: Resuming and expanding program - changes due to complications with payment method
			1. Already started with Carma’s Cafe. Registration numbers are high and we are waiting for a response from Crystal for Ceremony and Spro coffee to start those.
		2. Ece (Social Chair): Running/Biking Races
			1. Held a t-shirt design (for the race event). So, we are waiting for that. We would like to work with a local place, Baltimore T-Shirt Company.
		3. Ece (Social Chair): Book Club
			1. 46 registrations. March 17th
		4. Ece (Social Chair): Mardi Gras Mask Decorating
			1. We also have 55 registrations and we want them to submit their pictures with their masks or whatever they decorated on February 28th.
			2. Working with Carma’s Cafe for Mardi Grad Kits
		5. Ece (Social Chair): GPSA Week
			1. First week of April, currently planning that week.
	2. Shane (Co-Chair): Upcoming Provost's Student Advisory Committee meeting
		1. President Daniels will be in attendance - no specific published agenda yet
		2. If you have any questions/concerns you want raised, please email Shane directly (arlington@jhu.edu) or the GRO (gro@jhu.edu)
	3. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): Note about survey regarding departmental extension of support during COVID
		1. Aiming to understand which departments have/have not provided funding extensions, what structure those take, and what kinds of communication about them has occurred
		2. Sending an email to GC reps to ask you about information regarding extension of funding in different departments. Please coordinate with your other GC representatives to answer whether there have been general funding extensions, funding extensions for specific cases, and other sources of financial support coming from your department. If you are unclear about the answers to some of the questions and you don’t feel like you can accurately/adequately answer. Contact us and we will create an anonymous survey form to distribute to your department. Important in light of fin audit and many people being impacted by COVID-19 with extension of grad dates and will need to be spending more time at the university than anticipated.
	4. Stephan (Admin/Funding Chair): Motion to move item 9 to right now. Unfortunately, I thought that I had more time, but I have class at 8PM and, as this item discusses my budget, I would like to be here for it. Motion needs to be seconded.
	5. Ben (Political Science): Second
	6. **Motion: Move Item 9 up on the agenda to immediately following this discussion**
		1. Yea: 29 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0
		2. Motion Passes.
1. Stephan (Admin & Funding Chair): Discussion: Should the GRO allow for partial re-allocation of group event funds to expand our own social events programming
	1. We have had extremely few applications for group event funding ~$500/$16,000
	2. The GRO has broader flexibility in the events we can hold, and already has a schedule of events planned and in the works.
	3. Moving some funds would allow for an overall increase in the funds being put towards programming for graduate students
	4. The re-allocation could be contingent on the funds not being requested by other groups
	5. A potential wording: “Funds, up to a potential maximum of X currently designated for funding graduate student organization events be re-allocated to fund GRO Social Events. Should other organizations request those funds, they will have priority over the GRO Social Events to ensure that other organizations are still provided for first.”
	6. Gabriel (MSEM): So, what are the expectations for group event funding now that we are transitioning to Phase 2? Will it ramp up? Do you have projections
		1. Stephan (Admin & Funding Chair): No official projections. The switch to Phase 2 seems to primarily affect undergraduates (more than graduate students). I am personally sceptical that we will see a huge up-tick in grad student events. That said, the 3 events we did get, one was an invited zoom talk and the other two were holiday parties. So, to be honest with you, I was surprised that we didn’t have any more in the fall semester. I don't feel comfortable prognosticating.
		2. Shane (Co-Chair): The policies have been revised but are still extremely restrictive and the school is still unwilling to do what would allow groups to have events in grab and go manner. Technically we can’t have coffee hour or gingerbread baking (we get exceptions for these). No grab and go food and beverage currently allowed. Possible, but I would personally be surprised if we had more than a couple thousand dollars’ worth of requests. Normally people start their requests pretty far from events. Groups usually plan events in advance. We could allocate as much as possible or word the motion as Stephan suggested. We have some flexibility there.
		3. Gabriel (MSEM): Just want to see outlook. I like the idea to have the flexibility to accurately use the funds.
	7. Stephan (Admin & Funding Chair): I move that we, up to a max of $8,000, we designate the group funding for secondary use by GRO social events and in the event that actual student groups need more than 8k…. essentially move half the budget into this category
	8. Ryan (Classics): Second
	9. Ben Taylor (Pol Sci): Second
	10. Wangui Mbuguiro (Communications Chair): Would you say that your motion would be exactly the wording that is here but just changing the dollar sign to $8, 000?
		1. Stephan (Admin): Yes. I was double-checking and it is “Yes”
	11. **Motion: “Funds, up to a potential maximum of $8,000 currently designated for funding graduate student organization events be re-allocated to fund GRO Social Events. Should other organizations request those funds, they will have priority over the GRO Social Events to ensure that other organizations are still provided for first.”**
		1. Yea: 24 Nay:0 Abstain:3
		2. Motion Passes
	12. Alex (Social Chair) \*in the text chat: The Social Chairs are ALWAYS looking for input on what you and your departments want in terms of events!
2. Conor (Co-Chair): Discussion: Request to endorse and distribute [TRU letter-writing campaign](https://actionnetwork.org/letters/tell-jhu-leaders-grads-are-workers-too?source=direct_link&) regarding JHU’s exclusion of graduate students from winter bonuses.
	1. We are still meeting in the GSA/BSPH SA/TRU Coalition meetings. We have received a request from TRU, as part of our partnership through these coalition meetings, to endorse and distribute the TRU letter-writing campaign.
		1. https://actionnetwork.org/letters/tell-jhu-leaders-grads-are-workers-too?source=direct\_link&
		2. Letter concerns $500 bonus payment given to all JHU employees except for grad students for working through the pandemic
		3. Reaffirms demands for funding and healthcare extensions for grads due to pandemic disruption
		4. The link to the letter-writing campaign allows students to write to JHU President Ron Daniels, Provosts Sunil Kumar, and VP of Finance and Administration Mary Miller with suggested text regarding the concerns mentioned above
		5. Jo (English): Many of us are doing work as grad students that if we weren’t titled as students, we would qualify for this $500 bonus. It seems strange that we were not attributed this even though we are doing equivalent labour to those that receive funding.
		6. Ryan (Classics)\*in the text chat: I was slightly swayed by an argument I heard that basically claimed that the 500-dollar bonus argument was a distraction from larger goals but Conor has convinced me with little effort
		7. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): I agree with Jo. In the teaching survey, we learned that many respondents have had to pay for costs related to teaching out of their own pocket. $500 would help defer those costs, as well as other costs associated with changes due to COVID. This would benefit many graduate students, and we certainly have been providing labour throughout duration of pandemic.
		8. Ryan (Classics)\*in the text chat: As is Jo…completely agreed
		9. Grace Walsh (History of Art): Goals for letter writing campaign also include concerns about time extensions for degree completion. This seems like a really specific issue. Where is this covered in the letter or is it separate?
		10. Conor: TRU has directly petitioned 3 people on slide with wider concerns for graduate students. Those larger concerns are included in the petition launched by TRU. The $500 is included in those petitions as well
		11. Grace (History of Art): Is there a plan to form a petition for those other concerns.
		12. Maya: When (TRU) petition was last circulated (last April), the GC voted to circulate it.
		13. Jo (English): <https://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/gro/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2020/05/GRO-Statement-on-the-TRU-COVID-19-Petition.pdf>
		14. Jo (English)\*in the text chat: (full disclosure, I wrote most of the petition text)
		15. Ben (Political Science): Move to endorse and distribute
		16. Ryan (Classics): Second Motion
		17. **Motion: endorse and distribute TRU letter-writing campaign**
			1. Yea: 27 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0
3. Discussion: Student concerns & conflicting information regarding COVID vaccines.
	1. Shane (Co-Chair): We have heard a lot of confusion coming from different people across university. Meeting with SPH Student Assembly and GSA at SOM, we found that students were getting different information regarding vaccination. SOM has many students getting vaccine because they work in clinical settings. We want to run a brief survey to see if anyone has received communication from faculty / department -- something that is not university-wide. We would like to hear what those communications have been.
	2. Conor (Co-Chair): What I’ve heard presented at open forum of KSAS students -- hosted by Renee Eastwood and Mary Favret -- was that graduate students teaching in Spring will be vaccinated in same manner as faculty. Them being graduate students will not make a difference in their vaccination. That is the only dean-level person in university to make claim this clear about when grads teaching will be vaccinated. We are curious what people have heard in Whiting.
	3. Paige (NES) \*in the text chat: I haven't heard that from KSAS but might it's always possible I missed it
	4. Ryan (Classics) \*in the text chat: Radio silence from classics—I’m out of the loop since Roller stepped down
	5. Veronica (Environmental Health and Engineering) \*in the text chat: Nothing has been communicated to students in EHE, though it seems some faculty have been contacted
	6. Briana (Advocacy Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: I haven't heard anything from KSAS but I know at the SOM some grad students who originally got the email were told to disregard it and cancel the appointments they made for the vaccine
	7. Laurence (History) \*in the text chat: Nothing in history
	8. Tom (Cognitive Science) \*in the text chat: I haven’t heard anything to that affect
	9. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): My advisor indicated they had completed the qualification form. I believe it is because they have a secondary appointment in the SOM. They completed the form through mychart. Right now, in mychart, the qualification form says they are for school of medicine affiliates only.
	10. Briana (Advocacy Chair) \*in the text chat: My advisor at Homewood isn't qualified for the vaccine somehow but my SOM advisor has already gotten his
	11. Cyril (Biophysics) \*in the text chat: I'm TAing in person this semester and I haven't heard anything about it.
	12. Veronica (Environmental Health and Engineering): For EHE, I wonder whether discrepancy is because some of us are affiliated with SPH, and others aren’t. I am supposed to be TA’ing this semester and have not heard anything.
	13. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): Concern is understandable. I understand roll-out at SOM was accelerated because more people fit in phase 1. Now, we have more people in WSE and KSAS who fall into phase 1b. I am concerned if there are differences between these division in rolling. Especially since KSAS and WSE are on the same campus. I don’t think there should be a decentralized approach.
	14. Veronica (Environmental Health and Engineering): It seems that, for anyone who is at risk, no matter what department you’re in. You have the risk of working either on campus/exposed. You should be eligible. This approach/lack of communication just feels to be consistent with other items on the agenda to me. Lack of recommendation of what grad students do. Lack of testing in the fall semester or 500 bonuses. It all seems like a lack of protection and support of graduate students who are making the university teaching and research possible at this point. Coming from frustration and nervousness right now, especially with a lot more people being on campus.
	15. Conor (Co-Chair): If there isn’t more to report back on as far as what people have heard, can you please let Shane, me, and Maya any specific questions you would like to raise and what you have heard. We can reach out to R and C to make sure they are both on the same package to make sure that this rollout takes place well. Follow through with us to make sure that we get these questions answered. We don’t have and infinite period of time to get these questions answered. Please reach out to us after the meeting.
	16. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): I am wondering, which phase of the testing should we fall into? For Maryland, that is.
	17. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): That depends on the grad student in question. Let me pull up my phases. I believe that the Maryland People who are teaching higher education. If you are conducting lab services, they changed the phrasing for Phase 1c, they changed it from essential lab personnel to healthcare workers including those manufacturing vaccines and doing healthcare things. Originally, if you were doing research you would be under Phase 1C. But now it is much less clear. Now, if you are not a TA, then graduate students who are conducting research would fall into Phase 3 (people without underlying conditions 15-65). We are all, for the most part, very highly dependent on the university helping us schedule and providing guidance for us. If we aren’t provided that then...Vaccine rollout in Maryland is not ideal and I think they advanced to Phase 1C a little too quickly. So even if you are eligible, you may not be able to schedule a vaccine immediately because they are giving priority to the higher priority phases.
	18. Conor (Co-Chair): A lot of this is also Maryland-specific and what the Maryland government can make happen. It would be good if people could follow up with questions to Shane, Maya, and me via email.
	19. Veronica (Environmental Health and Engineering) \*in the text chat: Thanks for considering our situations and seeking out the information and clarity on the issue!
4. Request for approval to delegate authority to the Executive Board to recruit a wellness coordinator to be paid for no more than 20 hours to assist in planning health & wellness events.
	1. Vishal will be out of the country for a month, and has limited hours to begin with
	2. The GC can either directly appoint a coordinator, or allow the E-Board to do so
	3. Scope (hours, responsibilities) must be set by the GC
	4. Ben (Political Science\*in the text chat): Move to delegate authority to the Executive Board to recruit a wellness coordinator to assist in planning health & wellness events.
	5. Gabriel (MSEM) \*in the text chat: Seconded
	6. Ben (Political Science) \*in the text chat: Accept the friendly amendment
	7. **Please vote on the motion to delegate authority to the Executive Board to recruit a wellness coordinator to assist in planning health & wellness events and be paid for no more than 20 hours.**
		1. Yea: 23 Nay: Abstain:1
5. Discussion: Returning to Dean of Student Life Coalition Diversity Coursework [Proposal](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mAOOSWwYSutzl7TFO3d1BEnsr7MnteT6zKRsyBucqMI/edit?usp=sharing)
	1. Conor (Co-Chair): This was on agenda at last GC meeting of Fall semester. There, we voted on the discussion of the google doc that has been developed by the different groups in coalition. We voted to propose any substantive changes to that doc and then vote on it. That process stalled out towards the end of the year. We said we wouldn’t endorse the proposal at that time, but said we would re-review it and discuss proposals for amending. I would suggest we take the next couple weeks to review this google doc, make notes for proposed changes, then propose these changes to that coalition. Note: this document probably won’t go higher than Dean Ruzicka / the Dean of Student Life.
	Jo (English): I have commented on the document. I struggled because most of my comments were request for clarification. I didn’t feel like I was in a position to propose an amendment because I didn’t follow what the spirit of the document was. I didn’t feel like I could engage with it because of that absent of the other stakeholder involved, such as the undergrads.
	2. Shane (Co-Chair): Jo raised great points. It is going to be challenging. I don’t know when we can have another meeting with those folks. We can reach out to see if some of the other writers of the proposal would be willing to comment on it. We are not in a position to answer all of the questions in the margins of the google doc -- these were all great questions that would be useful to have answered before voting.
	3. Conor (Co-Chair): I can reach out to my half of the coalition that I’ve worked with to see if they can weigh in and provide context. My understanding is that it hasn’t been moved on since December. If anyone has other comments/questions I can bring to that working group, let me know.
	4. Jo (English): 2 Main questions I have:
		1. (1) How are we envisioning the graduate requirement being proposed here? Document says there is precedent at other institutions for undergraduate students to be required to take diversity and inclusion type classes. Does this precedent exist outside of humanities / social sciences programs? I’m interested to hear what diversity requirements might mean in the sciences. I think that it will take further thought. Adding requirements for grad students may mean adding time crunches during students’ time to degree.
		2. (2) How do they envision applying these changes? Would the burden fall to grad students to make these courses? Are we going to need grad students to teach classes that don’t have the most expertise because someone needs to? /// I love the spirit and initiative here. Neither of these questions torpedo this plan. I think there will need to be more work before this can be actual policy.
	5. Ryan (Classics)\*in the text chat: The main thing I like about this is that it would be a step toward making WGS an actual department with actual funding… but Jo you know more about this than I do
	6. Shane (Co-Chair) \*in text chat: I move to table a vote on this until we seek resolution to some of the questions posed by GRO GC members regarding the document.
	7. Ben (Political Science) \*in text chat: Second
	8. **Motion: To table a vote on this document until we seek resolution to some of the questions posed by GRO GC members regarding the document**
		1. Yea: 22 Nay:0 Abstain:0
	9. Conor (Co-Chair): Let me know if anyone has any further comments on this, especially to pass on to the coalition. Seeing no further comments / discussion, we can table this discussion to the next meeting.
6. Open Discussion
	1. Shane (Co-Chair): I found data to compare endowment returns to our peer universities (Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Columbia, MIT, Dartmouth). Results show most of these universities are bad at investing their endowments, with the exception of MIT. We are definitely the worst though. It raises the question of whether we are overpaying our investors.
	2. Jo (English): I appreciate making reports to the graduate student body. Sometimes when we have to send the report, the minutes aren’t available. Could we amend the report due date to ensure the minutes will be available before reports are due?
		1. Shane (Co-Chair): this seems reasonable, I will defer to Ona to amend those due dates.
		2. David Litwin (Environmental Health and Engineering) \*in the text chat: I would endorse the same.
		3. Jo (English)\*in the text chat: I don’t think I’ve seen a template yet, though I’ve made the request a couple times.
		4. Wangui (Communications Chair) \*in the text chat: The template Is here: <https://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/gro/about/general-council-meeting-minutes/>
		5. Jo (English)\*in the text chat: Thanks so much!
7. Adjournment