1. Call to Order and Agenda Review
   1. Shane Arlington (Co-Chair) called the meeting to order at 6:03PM.
2. Approval of Minutes from 3-1-21
   1. Benjamin Taylor (Political Science) \*in the text chat: Motion to Approve
   2. Grusha Prasad (Cognitive Science) \*in the text chat: Second
   3. **Motion to approve the 03/01 GC meeting minutes.**
      1. Yea: 24 Nay:0 Abstain: 4
      2. Motion Passes
3. E-board Report (Shane Arlington & Conor Bean)
   1. Rachel S. Core Award - timeline
      1. The GRO annually awards the Rachel S. Core award to a member of the JHU community who does outstanding service on behalf of graduate students
      2. Solicitation for nominations will go out soon (mid week)
         1. Due date – April 1nd
         2. Candidates will be voted on in the April 5th GC Meeting
   2. Briana to serve on search committee for Associate Dean of Diversity & Inclusion
   3. Update on GRO lounge for grab-and-go event pickups
      1. We were given the green light to use the GRO lounge (Levering Hall, key-card access for all Homewood grads) as a grab-and-go distribution site
      2. Allows us to avoid competition with undergrad groups for communal sites
      3. Seeking approval to use the site for pre-packaged food distribution
      4. Grusha (Cog Sci): I am assuming you need to get tested to access the lounge right?
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, you need to be in compliance with ProDensity. So this means that you need to not have any systems, have had the flu shot, and be undergoing routine COVID-19 testing.
   4. Update on letter to senior administrators
      1. On Thursday (March 11) the letter discussed at last GC concerning funding extensions and $500 bonuses was sent to President Daniels, Provost Kumar, and Interim VP of Finance Mary Miller
      2. Awaiting response from the recipients, we will update the GC as we hear back
   5. Update on anti-private police legislation
      1. Was discussed in the Baltimore City Delegation on Friday
      2. Co-Chairs emailed HW grads and resubmitted the GRO statement on JHPD to the delegation on Wednesday.
   6. GRO Budget Submission - expected deadline of April 9th, likely necessitating online feedback due to schedule of meetings.
      1. The GRO needs to submit its budget request for 2021-2022 shortly.
      2. According to an email (predominantly aimed at undergrad groups) the submission template should be live March 22nd.
      3. Tentative due date of April 9th
      4. GC and E-Board comments will likely be collected online (in advance of April 5th meeting, if possible)
      5. Additional discussion at the April 5th meeting before finalizing and submitting.
   7. Reminder of Floating Chair position solicitation - vote to start soon.
      1. Two emails have gone to full GC requesting any additional ideas for floating chair positions prior to calling a vote.
      2. Voting will likely commence (in a ranked choice manner) at the end of this week.
      3. If you have a vague idea but would like to help building it out, please contact the GRO Co-Chairs (gro@jhu.edu)
   8. Update from Dean of Student Life coalition from Fall 2020
      1. Subcommittee on Academic Culture and Integration: stay tuned for discussion with faculty diversity champions.
      2. Subcommittee on Diversity/Identity and Inclusion workshops:
         1. Funding has been secured for graduate assistantships in developing the curriculum for workshops.
         2. Pilot program and graduate assistant recruitment/onboarding tot go on from June to August.
         3. Workshops begin in September.
      3. Jo Giardini (English): I’m just curious. For the workshop side, there will be an open-call for applications for assistantships? For the other side of this coalition, there are plans to have graduate student involvement, are there any plans for how this would go forward? Invitation of Dean’s Office or open call for positions?
         1. Conor Bean (Co-Chair): From the initial email, Dean Ruzicka is going to be counting on members of the Subcommittee. But I would be happy for any other member of the GRO to attend these meetings with me. But its unclear, because the people who make these policies have said that the way we wrote the proposal is not the way we make these policies. My hope is for us to get in a room and summarize, we think this is what you want. First meeting to be mainly clarification and later expand to more stakeholders.
   9. Summary of Intercampus DJ Night/Grad Student Mixer
      1. March 5th there was a DJ night/grad mixer coordinated by Tatsat
      2. We received a total 106 registrations for the event.
      3. Graduate students from 7 different sections of the university (KSAS, WSE, BSPH, SOM graduate students, SOM medical students, Carey, Peabody) registered for the event.
      4. Tatsat Banerjee (Intercampus Chair): Planning to do a similar event sometime in April.
      5. Alexander Helms (Social Co-Chair): T shirts are in the final stages of being purchased from the bookstore so hopefully next week we can start handing out the T shirts to the people who purchased them.
      6. Isaiah Chen (Treasurer): Whoever makes the purchase from the Bookstore, please be sure to let me know about it and give me the receipt for this.
4. E-Board Hours Allocations Requests
   1. Social Co-Chairs
      1. Alex, Social Co-Chair
         1. Original Total Hours: 250 Hours
         2. Prior Allocation Increase: 95.5 hours
         3. Remaining Hours: 125 hours
         4. Requested increase: 87 hours
         5. Requested Spring Hours: 212 hours
         6. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
         7. Matthew Morgado (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Second
         8. **Motion to approve an additional 87 hours for Alex Helms as Social Co-Chair.**
            1. Yea: 27 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
            2. Motion Passes
      2. Ece, Social Co-Chair
         1. Original Total Hours: 250 hours
         2. Prior allocation increase:0
         3. Remaining hours: 110 hours
         4. Requested Increase: 54
         5. Requested Spring Hours: 164 hours
         6. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
         7. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: Second
         8. **Motion to approve an additional 54 hours for Ece Ozdemir as Social Chair.**
            1. Yea: 23 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
            2. Motion Passes
      3. Secretary
         1. Original Total Hours: 100 hours
         2. Prior allocation increase: 25
         3. Remaining hours: 50 hours
         4. Requested Increase: 30
         5. Requested Spring Hours: 80 hours
         6. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: Question for Eugenia: is there a reason you don’t want to request all 95 hours?
            1. Eugenia (Secretary): I’ve given a lot of time to this organization. I know how much to co-chairs work. As precedent, as a co-chair, I did not request additional hours for the time I spent working on the GRO. As such, and with respect to the time that the co-chairs are currently spending, I would not like to request my current full hours.
         7. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve the request
         8. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: Second
         9. Maya Monroe (COVID-19 Chair) \*in the text chat: Question for the treasurer: would the budget allow for the full additional hours to be funded? Beyond what's been requested
            1. Isaiah (Treasurer): Yes. There is enough in flex-funds, can we use this?
            2. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, theoretically that would be the easiest place to dip into. We have other funds we can dip into
            3. Isaiah (Treasurer): Yes, in that case ee should be good.
            4. Wangui (Communications Chair): I just re-read the motion and it is to approve the request for 80 hours as specified. I second that motion, as well as asking Eugenia if she wants to increase to 95. I realize that there are flex-funds available for it.
            5. Eugenia (Secretary): I would like to respectfully decline the offer and will only request 80 hours.
         10. **Motion to approve an additional 30 hours for Eugenia Volkova as Secretary**
             1. Yea: 27 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
             2. Motion passes
      4. Intercampus Chair
         1. Tatsat Banerjee, Intercampus Chair
            1. Original Total Hours: 25
            2. Prior Allocation Increase: 0
            3. Remaining Hours: 0
            4. Requested Increase: 67 hours
            5. Requested Spring Hours: 67 hours
         2. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
         3. Vishal Yadav (Health & Wellness Chair) \*in the text chat: Second
         4. **Motion to approve and additional 67 hours for Tatsat Banerjee as Intercampus Chair**
            1. Yea: 27 Nay: Abstain: 2
            2. Motion passes
      5. Professional Development Chair, Rachel Stein
         1. Original Total Hours: 25
         2. Prior Allocation Increase: 0
         3. Remaining Hours: 12.5 hours
         4. Requested Increase: 12.5 hours
         5. Requested Spring Hours: 25
         6. Moving forward to next year, the Phutures office is very new and we are just figuring out how to work with them.
         7. Grusha (Cog Sci): Motion to approve
         8. Sylvia Cutler (English) \*in the text chat: Second
         9. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Second. Third
         10. **Motion to approve an additional 12.5 hours for Rachel Stein as Professional Development Chair**
             1. Yea: 26 Nay: Abstain: 3
             2. Motion Passes
      6. Treasurer, Isaiah Chen
         1. Conor (Co-Chair): Additionally, Isaiah has a really important role in the bi-weekly meetings with Laura and Erika about budgets and expenses. he has already taken on, through those meetings at least 20 hours of work and I think that is worth approving.
         2. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
         3. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: Seconded
         4. **Motion to approve an additional 20 hours for Isaiah Chen as Treasurer.**
            1. Yea: 27 Nay: Abstain: 2
            2. Motion Passes
      7. Graduate Involvement Chair, Ona Ambrozaite
         1. Original Total Hours: 25 hours
         2. Prior Allocation Increase: 20 hours
         3. Remaining Hours: 0 hours
         4. Requested Increase: 20 hours
         5. Requested Spring Hours: 20 hours
         6. Grusha (Cog Sci): Motion to approve
         7. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Second
         8. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: Second
         9. **Motion to approve an additional 20 hours for Ona Ambrozaite as Graduate Involvement Chair.**
            1. Yea: 27 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
      8. Communications Chair, Wangui Mbuguiro
         1. Original Total Hours: 50
         2. Prior Allocation Increase: 0
         3. Remaining Hours: 20
         4. Requesting Iincrease: 38
         5. Requested Spriing Hours
         6. Assisting other members with their duties or initiatives, Wangui and Maya and Maya did visualization from some of our surveys and was important in getting those posted on the website.
         7. A lot more emails to me as communications chair than previously.
         8. Volunteered to help with analysing the survey results as well
         9. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Those visualizations were very helpful! Thank you.
         10. The last two surveys are coming out soon. We are finishing the analysis now.
         11. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: Motion to approve
         12. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Seconded
         13. **Motion to approve an additional 38 hours for Wangui Mbuguiro as Communications Chair**
             1. Yea: 27 Nay: Abstain: 2
      9. COVID-19 Concerns Chair, Maya Monroe
         1. Shane: Maya has been one of the attendees in meetings with students from the other campuses since March 2020 and she has been instrumental in those meetings. She worked more than 13 hours last semester and I think that is a commensurate increase to the work done this semester.
         2. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: Move to approve
         3. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Second
         4. **Motion to approve and additional 43 hours for Maya Monroe as COVID-19 Concerns Chair**
            1. Yea: 26 Nay: 0 Abstain: 4
   2. Advocacy Co-Chair
      1. Original Total Hours: 100 hours
      2. Prior Allocation Increase: 0 hours
      3. Remaining Hours: 45.5 hours
      4. Requested Increase: 35 hours
      5. Requested Spring Hours: 80 hours
      6. Shane (Co-Chair): For the first time tonight, I will disagree with the requests increase. These hours are not in line with the work we have observed. I think that an increase of 10-15 hours is more in line with that workload completed.
      7. Yuri Chia (Advocacy Co-Chair): Good evening fellow colleagues. This is the voice of the person who has been orchestrating statements. Motion to increase my hour allotment by 35 hours. With the pandemic and all that’s been going on in the world, 2 issues I promised to address are mental health and anti-Asian racism. These issues have been previously swept under the rug. I cannot and will not watch this continue. I dedicate 2 hours every Sundays for my office hours. Vishal, Briana, and I are currently advocating for easier access to the counselling center. I need your help and I need you to reach out to your departments to address these issues. Undergraduate group efforts have resulted in Pres Biden and Gov Hogan speaking against anti-Asian racism. I will be facilitating OMA’s graduate conference this Saturday. If it takes a member of our community to be a victim in order for us to recognize what to do, then it is too late. We need to break the dam and have some sort of victory.
      8. Grusha (Cog Sci): is there a drawback to authorizing the 80 hours and if the additional hours are not used?
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): No drawback, however there is no institutional check at the moment beyond the total number of hours available for a position for the billing cycle. Once the hours are approved, they are paid without any additional oversight. They can be spent out regardless of whether effort or work commensurate with that amount of hours was performed.
      9. Rachel Stein (Professional Development Chair)\*in the text chat: 80 hours for spring is ~ 12-15 hours per month - does that sound appropriate?
         1. Yuri (Advocacy Chair): I will be happy to answer that. The 80 hours is also taking into account the advocacy that is going to come up. An issue came up to me yesterday in my office hours. I think that 80 hours is reasonable and maybe 35 hours is not even enough. There are many issues that are far from being resolved and I will take on the responsibility of continuing the efforts and achieve victory in these initiatives. Feel free to elaborate on your questions.
      10. Ben (Pol Sci)\*in the text chat: First, Shane, what do you mean by output? And I’ll reserve the second for now.
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): A lot of the work that could have fallen to the advocacy chairs or Yuri ended up not being performed there. Due to requests, Ona Maya, and Wangui (COVID advocacy, polls, statements) all contributed to statements that were written outside of this position. For the work which here is being cited as taking 10 hours, the statements brought to the E-Board initially do not appear to be 10 hours worth of effort.
          2. Shane (Co-Chair): One of the keystones of the advocacy position has historically been serving on committees. Of the committees that Yuri has served on, we have not received updates in our E-Board or general meetings that were instrumental in froming the higher organization of the GRO and our efforts.
          3. Shane (Co-Chair): We have only received updates and feedback when specifically requested and when followed through with additional probative questions.
          4. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): I have provided all the information that, to the best of my ability, can be conceived as being useful. Yesterday a very important topic came up and we will discuss that later tonight. A few weeks ago a student came to me and we discussed a question of a potential tuition strike and no one from the E-Board responded to me on that chain. I feel like I’ve done my best to provide all the relevant information I can.
      11. Ben (Pol Sci): Have there been reports or updates from the office hours? Do student contacts arise during office hours, or are the contacts primarily via other channels, such as emails? It is hard to tell whether the office hours have been a fruitful outlet for student contact. Understanding that office hours are a novel program, has it been effective in the sort of way that it’s worth continuing?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): The maximum attendance has been 1, some weeks with no attendance. The GRO email handle received 5-15 emails from students on various topics, some of which are corresponded to other positions. Many of these things are advocacy-related concerns. I had a similar concern about the office hour program. Having it be by-appointment has not been met/implemented.
          2. Yuri (Advocacy Chair): Office hours are not just done by email. When we discuss these topics, we usually discuss at least an hour. I have been having a steady increase in attendance. They email me before attending to confirm that they will come.
      12. Ben (Pol Sci): And when did you suggest that office hours be switched to by appointments?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I first suggested this when we originally envisions office hours. More specifically, in an individually in a meeting with Yuri a week and a half ago. and last week’s e-board meeting.
          2. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): There is also prep work necessary prior to office hours. Also, one week the students came after, so I didn’t get to meet with them. So, I’m open to expand office hours to include an appointment version.
          3. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): There will be more advocacy issues that can come in after this meeting. And this may include more time not detailed in this PowerPoint.
      13. Matthew (Philosophy): Can the office hours be priced in after-the-fact?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes and no. There is institutionally no mechanism for auditing an invoice once it is received. The only mechanism for limiting the number of hours allocated for the position is only through this method.
          2. Conor (Co-Chair): The only reason why this gives me some hesitation, for most of the ones previously passed, the major driver why those increases happened was pandemic-related. Previously had pre-defined time and fit into that pre-defined time. One of the ways that has distributed away from advocacy chairs we created a COVID-19 Concerns Chair, taken on a good amount of advocacy work in terms of the portfolio and a lot of these statements have required substantial input from the E-Board on a pretty regular basis. I do not feel comfortable shifting that much responsibility onto the advocacy chairs. I can understand the request for an increase. After last week’s E-Board meeting, I don’t think that it would rise to the amount of 35. We can amend an extension if we would see fit.
          3. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): As Conor mentioned, having statements reviewed and edited by the E-Board is a common procedure. It would be wrong to not include E-Board input on these statements. They have significant consequence, and this is standard procedure for passing a statement. And I oversee the editing process.
      14. Matthew (Philosophy): How many office hours did each Advocacy Chair need last semester, and the one before that? Maybe this was said but I missed it.
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): For total hours billed, last semester Yuri had 54.5 hours and Katiana had 50 hours. This semester Briana billed 50 hours. There were no office hours last semester, the program was instituted this semester.
          2. Matthew (Philosophy): So there’s no precedent for office hours?
          3. Shane (Co-Chair): Not in recent memory. In the past there was drop-in to the GRO Office. The Co-Chairs routinely meet with people who request to, but this is new.
      15. Rooke Christy (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Perhaps office hours could be 1 hour a week instead of 2, and we can reduce the requested increase? Since it’s a new program
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I think that’s a reasonable suggestion.
      16. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Is there an increase in hours the chairs would consider to be appropriate? And if so, how much of an increase?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I see 10-15 hours as an appropriate increase.
          2. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): We are currently in a pandemic and most people are working remotely. In order to maximize the opportunity to meet more students, with the work being. That is going to take a lot of time because they are very sensitive topics. Work has to be done in a very contentious manner.
      17. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Is it fair to say that office hours are still being piloted?
          1. Briana Whitehead (Advocacy Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: Yes they are
      18. Ben (Mathematics) \*in the text chat: And the total attendance for the office hours has been what, again? E.g. number per week, number of distinct students, any other statistics on that front?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): 3 students, but Yuri can correct me if that is incorrect.
          2. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): That is correct, but the discussions have taken up an hour discussions This is an at-length conversation.
          3. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): Some times the students came after 5PM
      19. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Move to approve 12.5 additional hours
      20. Cyril Cook (Biophysics) \*in the text chat: Second
      21. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: Question: sorry how many hours is the other advocacy chair requesting?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): 50 for the full semester
      22. Wangui Mbuguiro(Communications Chair): I agree that 12.5 is a reasonable number. I might go up slightly higher but I don’t think I would second 35 hours.
      23. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Can we re-debate at another GC session if it turns out Office Hours increases in popularity?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair) From an administrative perspective, it is possible but unlikely. I think that the answer is “probably no, but there is a chance that it can re-discussed at the next GRO GC meeting”.
      24. Yuri (Advocacy Co-Chair): As I was saying with editing the statement is standard procedure. People may not agree with the tone of the statement, work was still done to write the statement.
      25. Ben (Mathematics): I would like to state that we should have, as Matthew suggests, a discussion about whether we have office hours be a thing that advocacy chairs or any other chairs do in the future.
      26. With the current attendance, the motion has been approved
      27. **Motion to approve an additional 12.5 hours for Yuri Chia as Advocacy Co-Chair**
          1. Yea: 16 Nay: 0 Abstain: 7
          2. Motion passes
5. Discussion: possible integration of Engineering for Professionals programs into the GRO
   1. Shane (Co-Chair): We talked about this briefly in last GC meeting. We, being the GRO, frequently receive emails from students in the EP program who have questions about events, advocacy, or the school. Per the current structure of our bylaws and due to the history of how the EP program was structured and funded, EP students are not a part of the GRO. It used to be that EP was wholly separated from WSE. Now they are somewhat indistinguishable from full-time MS students. As such, it seems that it merits discussion whether we should integrate EP into the GRO. There are 4,000-5,000 EP MS students, most are part-time and not near campus. Their participation when we return is likely to be low. However, this would provide them a way of representation and student government that currently does not exist in their program. They have significant overlap for most of their programs with WSE departments, this is not always the case and there are specific concerns and needs of the programs as to how they differ from full-time WSE students. I think that overall, this is a good thing to incorporate EP into the GRO. The structure by which this would occur may require longer debate and the purpose of this discussion is not to decide whether we would incorporate them or how but want to inform our discussions and work going forward.
   2. Shane (Co-Chair): We received 1 comment from Stephan Kemper (Funding & Admin Chair), who was unable to attend but wanted to comment his support for some kind of integration.
   3. Shane (Co-Chair): There are 16 or more programs in EP, I would not support the creation of that many additional seats. It can be hard to be find reps and would severely slant the organizational structure dramatically and would lead to poor attendance. What I think would be a more appropriate response would be to create 2 voting seats for EP students and those, like a traditional department, would have a rep and an alternate and could have up to 4 members designated as 2 votes. If we do something like this, WSE would foot more of the bill for our budget because more of our funds would go to support events.
   4. **Quoting Stephan: Get this from Conor latter.**
   5. Conor (Co-Chair): The AAP point is true but that is more complicated and that is not on the table tonight or in the near future because they are not undergoing the same reorganizations as EP.
   6. Eugenia (Secretary): I think we should go through and make sure that we are also including all the other departments that we should be. For example, Robotics. I also think that we should consider including Deng.
   7. Shane (Co-Chair): Robotics program – I plan on bringing an amendment to the bylaws to include Robotics based on the precedent that MSM is included and 2 old institutes that are defunct (ISI and Institute for Policy) are still listed and MSEM is not. Robotics we do intend to bring in to be in line with our operating principles.
   8. Shane (Co-Chair): With regards to DEng and shifting the balance between the two schools, I will refrain from comment.
   9. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): How many EP students are there from their general programs?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): I don’t have the exact number somewhere around 4-5,000 students. Comparable to the size of WSE and KSAS in-person students. The difference is that the vast majority (>90%) are not located in Baltimore and are acting in a part-time capacity so it is anticipated that their involvement will be low based on their involvement in other things. Comparable to a large department (BME) more than an additional school. It would be a significant number of students in terms of an event perspective. It would be unfair and difficult to incorporate them into advocacy and events without giving them a voting position, that would be a breach of precedent in our organizational structure.
   10. Shane (Co-Chair): I think this is a discussion that will take longer than this semester. April will be our timeframe for amending the bylaws. Elections will take over all the later meetings. This means that this will carry over to next year’s e-board and GC to handle.
   11. Grusha (Cog Sci) \*in the text chat: : what have the representatives from EP requested from GRO? (e.g. regarding the number of voting seats)
       1. Shane (Co-Chair): EP has not requested this at all. If I were to suggest, we could try to reach out to folks from EP to figure out what their interest level would be. There is no current student gov group in EP at any level that we can discern. For example, if we are looking for a departmental representative from Mat Sci, we ask them to hold elections to send us a GC member. Many departments have representatives or administrative coordinators. EP has full program representatives more than degree representatives. Even within a major/concentration there is not great structure to solicit the nominations. Maybe doing a poll of student interest in participation in the GRO (events and the organization)
   12. Eugenia (Secretary): Where is this initiative coming from and how strong/hard is the push? Do we have a deadline by which we need to complete EP integration into the GRO?
       1. Shane (Co-Chair): This is all entirely voluntary. The admin cannot tell us how to manage our structure in that way, that would cause a significant clash. This was born out of discussions not out of a push from WSE Deans office. They look favourably upon the idea but that’s about it.
       2. Conor (Co-Chair): This is something that has been introduced to us by our advisors, they are not telling us a date and when we must represent them. I share with a lot of what has been said having some representation of EP, worried about it immediately swamping in. Hesitant about polling administrators. If we give thousands of students a poll asking whether they want to be a part of this organization that they don’t really know about, unsure how representative this would be of their eventual participation. We will talk to them to figure out what we have been talking about. I think it is good that we can sort this ourselves.
   13. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): This is a little bit unrelated. But why are we not thinking about AAP students? I find those students as well and they do not receive any event notification from GRO and they are interested in our events.
       1. Shane (Co-Chair): It’s complicated but basically it’s because the Dean’s Office of KSAS does not view AAP as being part of Krieger. They have a different funding and administrative structure. We have received clear feedback from Renee that incorporating AAP is not something that their Dean’s office would support. We’ve requested further clarification and details.
   14. Shane (Co-Chair): I think I would propose the next step that Conor and I work to identify and reach out to administrative staff in EP to figure out whether they have received any questions about student government or programming and to put us in contact with students who haver requested this. Will discuss with the E-Board. Likely not until next year but it sounds like we would benefit from more information from the students in EP themselves.
   15. Wangui (Comm Chair): It’s difficult to determine whether it would be advantageous to include them in the GRO. Support reaching out to admin and students. Maybe include invite 5 random students from EP to 1-2 of our meetings to get feedback and figure out if it is useful. Opening the dialogue would be useful before deciding to include them in the GRO.
6. Discussion: request for GRO advocacy regarding wording of January email from President Daniels regarding anti-Semitic graffiti
   1. Conor (Co-Chair): Request for advocacy regarding this email sent in January about some anti-Semitic graphitic. The email used the term “swastika” without disambiguating that it was a symbol of the Nazi movement as opposed to the other historical swastikas and that this is consistent with a western approach in discussing Nazi symbology and causes antipathy against people of Asian decent. Request that this terminology not be used or that historical context be provided about the historical swastika.A similar request was made to the JHU Hindu Students’ council and they are working on a statement about this. We could work with them on this (jointly or in tandem).
   2. **Prakhar**: I contacted the Hindu Students’ Council and asked for more details about what would entail the collaboration. This is a serious matter. Kind of read a statement from a few graduate students. Swatstika is used as a specific symbol, It is
   3. **Ask him for the statement**
   4. Vocal ambiguation of this symbol being a Hopkins symbol does not make any try to disambiguate. Empowers fear and hate against people from multiple cultures. This also causes a problem with the current acceptance of the vilification of people of Asian cultures. I can go into detail on this if anyone wants to ask me any questions about this.
   5. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: This criticism makes sense for such an international student body as Hopkins'.
   6. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: What would GRO Advocacy entail?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): It could entail whatever the GC decides that it should entail.
      2. Prakhar: From my discussion with other people, asking for a strongly worded letter back to President Daniels or asking for an apology would be counterproductive. The request is that the term “swastika” not be used and instead the term “Nazi cross” to be used. All the sensitivity training on this. Educative events via the GRO and/or other events that are Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh where we can educate other people about what the difference is and what the swastika actually means.
   7. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: So the two options are these: 1) Email President Daniels, hopefully so that a new email is sent out. 2) Sensitivity Training
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): Personally, I think those two options can be one option. I think we can make a statement that condemns the use of this word, educating the history of the word, request that President Daniels and essential administrations send out their own email apologizing or clarifying.
      2. Prakhar: I spoke with a student here at JHU. He actually recounted his own experience. In SE Asia, E Asia the Swastika is used as a symbol everywhere and he had been putting it outside his door for his whole life. But he was so afraid of discrimination here that he did not do so. So, it is a significant problem that has been brewing under the surface.
      3. Mathew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: That might be helpful to put that personal story in the email, with names censored. Not sure though.
      4. Conor (Co-Chair): A lot of the initial email reaching out made sense in the climate of anti-Asian racism that is being experienced across the country, we maybe should approach the OMA groups together what a collective response to this would look like. I am hesitant to have the GRO be the only organization signing on to this because we have not had a history with this. I would be more willing to approach the administration if we can gather with other groups that have a background in dealing with this so we don’t deal with this on our own. I’m hesitant sending an email on our own mentioning the swastika, even if we provide clear context, I don’t know that students will read the email carefully or at all. I want us to be careful here and one option may be reaching out to groups involved in OMA last Wednesday.
      5. Mathew (Philosophy) \* in the text chat: second Conor’s concern.
      6. Prakhar: The GRO is actually not the only organization taking on this point. Hindu student council is passing it through the Semitic council. The GRO represents many students that are joined in diversity ethnicity and cultures. Sensitivity about the point that the swastika has been taken over - the point that it has been taken over is misunderstood. Historically there is no evidence of the Nazi’s ever using the original swastika or mentioning it. All language of this comes from post-war translation. No sources connect it to the Nazi symbol. That is why the entire thing There is violence happening due to misinformation. The fact that the administration wrote a statement like this is legalizing the misunderstanding of this distribution of misinformation. Like freshman could misunderstand what a swastika is. But coming from the highest office in the university, this is very troublesome. If we do not stand for it, I do not know who will stand for these minorities.
      7. Conor (Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: Would it be possible to join those two organizations in their effort? Oh, ok! That's very interesting and enlightening. Thank you. :)
      8. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Was the English term "swastika" used before the Nazis to describe the Asian symbol? Is it a transliteration?
         1. Prakhar: It is not an English term, it is a proper noun from Sanskrit. This is the transliteration of the Sanskrit.
      9. Shane (Co-Chair): Here's a tentative motion text: "Motion to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement to condemn the usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, to educate the campus regarding the usage of the word 'swastik' or 'swastika,' how it differs from the 'hakenkreuz,' and to call for an apology as well as sensitivity training regarding the differences in meaning, symbology and terminology. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups."
      10. Ben (Pol Sci): I understand the limitations of the language Conor was using earlier saying that certain symbols have been taken over, but I am hesitant when, within a given space that the term as a transliteration connotes a significant portion of the time an active attempt of promoting hatred of a group using specific symbols. The term and the display of the symbol are very intertwined throughout historical trajectory it may seem like we are disregarding the specific impact of hateful forms of abuse that are present in certain segments of US political life. I support the other half of what Shane wrote: outlining, educating the differences in terms and symbology and not actively condemning as your motion currently suggests.
      11. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: In a given context of meaning-making, not universally
      12. Shane (Co-Chair) : Here's a tentative motion text: "Motion to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement to criticize the uncontextualized usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, to educate the campus regarding the usage of the word 'swastik' or 'swastika,' how it differs from the 'hakenkreuz,' and to call for an apology as well as sensitivity training regarding the differences in meaning, symbology and terminology. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups."
      13. Prakhar: General comment on point Ben brought up: the term has been entwined with the Nazi cross symbol, but the thing is that it has not been entwined for over a billion people. The people who entwined it did it out of ignorance or were basically racist to it because it was fine for colonists to do it. If we keep perpetuating the same terminology as they did, we are no better than them. Usage of term or a symbol that not the same: alk about the burning cross of the KKK has been taken from the Christin Cross and used to terrify African Americans. If the administration starts to refer to the Christian cross as the KKK cross and JHU not allowed to have the cross. **Islamic shahada, the boko haram al qauda**. It is also on the flag of Saudi Arabia. The Shahad is the same, but we do not make that kind of mistake, the administration does not make that kind of mistake. We chose to not do that, but here the choice was made for other people who are ignorant.The Jewish community is harmed because they do not have any negative history with the swatstika. The people who revere the swatstika also are not helped.
      14. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Maybe say something like "reclaiming the words 'swastik' and 'swastka' to better reflect the transliteral origins and to be fairer, more sensitive, etc."?
          1. Prakhar: It doesn’t need reclaiming for over a billion people, it just needs that people are miscalling or misusing it.
          2. Shane (Co-Chair): The majority of the word doesn’t view that word that way, but the US has viewed it in this specific context. The meaning of words changes depending on the societal context, and in the US society reclaiming is appropriate. the symbol historically did not mean what the swatstika meant, this is what historians inappropriately did. So, we are still dealing with the historical connotations of what those historians have done.
          3. Prakhar I understand that we might do that. But if we go through that avenue for our discussion, it is like putting forward the idea of swatstik as being very colonial-centred.
          4. Shane: Reclaiming the word as has been experienced can be a positive thing. And the act of reclaiming does not put the negative connotation in the forefront.
          5. Prakhar: Many people here at JHU do not feel the urgency regarding this problem and even I was like that because you live in a very protected circumstance and we don’t understand what other people are going through. With the recent increase in anti-Asian violence, if you look there has been an increase in xenophobic laws and violence. NY assembly has tried to ban swastikas in all their form twice, with the last time being in 2020. The condition that nothing related to Hinduism, like “namaste” not be said in the class. Cascading effect that needs to be countered by education.
      15. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: also, "communism" being reclaimed/de-associated from dictators like Stalin
      16. Wangui (Comm Chair) \*in the text chat: I don’t think we need or should use “reclaiming”. From what Prakhar has said, it seems more precise to say we are criticizing the uncontextualized usage of the word swastika. I would be in favour of taking any/all edits from Prakhar and student leaders from Asian groups on any statements/e-mails we issue on this topic.
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): We can take the lead from student organizations and other student leaders as well as Prakhar if he wants to work with us.
          2. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Yes, I agree! I think Prakhar's points make the most sense.
          3. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Char): I do think we also need to work with Jewish student organizations on this as well as with the groups Wangui suggested
          4. Shane: I agree, I consider them to be within the groups affected by this issue.
      17. Shane (Co-Chair)\*in the text chat: Motion A: Motion to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement to criticize the uncontextualized usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, to educate the campus regarding the usage of the word 'swastik' or 'swastika,' how it differs from the 'hakenkreuz,' and to call for an apology as well as sensitivity training regarding the differences in meaning, symbology and terminology. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups.
      18. Eugenia (Secretary)\*in the text chat: Second
      19. Ben (Pol Sci)\*in the text chat: Motion: Move to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement about the usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, contextualizing that, while the symbol under its transliterated name “swastika” has been deployed as a weapon of hate against Jewish people, that it is still a symbol of deep religious importance to millions of people around the world who are consequently fearful of using it because of the way the term has, in a given time and context, been distorted. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups.
      20. Ben (Pol Sci): I guess my main thing is that if our main concern that Ron Daniels’ email was one-sided in that it only recognized certain forms of hatred and oppression that are better-known in a better milieu of analysis then perhaps acknowledging that there is an irresolvable bridge dividing the positive use of the term and the very hateful use of it as an anti-Semitic symbol that has become associated with a transliteration of the Sanskrit term. Avoid accidentally seeming like we are in support of a hateful use of the symbol.
      21. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Has Radhakrishnan written on this word "swastika" being used in a misrepresentative fashion by Western writers?
      22. Shane (Co-Chair): To me, those changes go beyond the scope of a friendly amendment. We will treat Ben’s motion as a full-on amendment.
      23. Shane (Co-Chair)\*in the text chat: Second the proposed amendment.
      24. Shane (Co-Chair): To clarify for everyone: We are now discussing whether we should discuss the motion A or B. If the amendment is passed, we will vote on it as proposed by Ben, otherwise Shane. Another amendment could be made if Shane’s motion does not succeed.
      25. Prakhar: Like we mentioned earlier, the problem is not anti-Semitic use of the Nazi symbol, the problem is the misuse of the swastika symbol. If you focus on the Nazi use of the symbol then we get off track from the point of the statement. The information that Ben provided is good additional information, but Shane’s is preferred.
      26. Rooke (Philosophy): would it make more sense to craft the wording with the other organizations writing the letters?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I very much hope that the specific wording, distribution, and content is determined during the writing, and by the collaborative writing of this with other student organizations that represent all the groups that have a vested interest in this. There are some differences that are important in terms of how the topic is approached. But this vote does give a fair amount of flexibility to the E-Board to change wording and content. The difference is whether it is required we must have some mention of the Nazi symbology.
      27. Rachel (Prof Dev Chair): I’m also leaning toward the more general one. It’s still a symbol of hate to some people. I don’t want for the Jewish people, who might feel attacked by the symbol, I don’t want to minimize their feeling of hurt by the other action. The more general statement is the one I’m leaning toward.
          1. Prakhar: The thing is, the problem is that this kind of conversation devolves into whether this is anti-Semitic. If you don’t want to be anti-Semitic you shouldn’t push other communities under the bus. You are misunderstanding the symbol if you think it is a symbol of hate.
      28. Ben (Pol Sci): Misunderstanding is not the way to phrase it. The word has been linked to a movement that sought to exterminate the Jewish people in Poland and Germany and elsewhere. We can’t discuss it without having that conversation at the same time. We’re encountering a place because of how meaning sediments over time we are at a loggerhead between some people for whom this symbol means different things.
      29. Conor (Co-Chair): Because the immediate context of the email as it was sent by Ron Daniels is being contextualized as an anti-Semitic event, we cannot avoid the way this symbol is an act. There continue to be attacks on Jewish cemeteries where this symbol is used, however misguided that may be. Not to say that they have legitimate claim to this symbol. Where we are right now, it is used for the habitual hatred of Jews. and in JHU it is being investigated as a hate crime against Jewish people, I do think that we must specify at least a little, that there has been the wrongful, attempted, and not successful appropriation of this term. Trying to take something like a swastika and convert it for fascist purposes. I think we should pursue calling on Pres Daniels to call that he is not correct in what a Swastika is or is used because that is what provoked this to begin with.
      30. Prakhar: Conor – the thing is, historically, the swastika was never converted. The problem is that it is not putting two communities/cultures against one another, because none of them of them did anything wrong with one another. Misnaming. Yes, we should go into the Semitic/anti-Semitic part of it but that should not be the crux of this. We must understand this one crucial thing that while it is understandable that many people in the Jewish community may attribute this symbol as a symbol of hate unknowingly, if we still try to perpetuate this misinformation with good intentions then we are perpetuating the same kind of racist ideology that our predecessors perpetuated in the first place. If we continue to perpetuate the same kind of ideology and misinformation, then we are as culpable as them. This is hurting people in the real world, in the physical sense. People are making the argument that one community may get hurt if we change the motion. Hesitant to have it worded like that. We are just trying to educate people and remove the misinformation. yes, we should go into the antisemitism problem but that should not be the crux of it.
      31. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: Motion to end discussion and move to a vote (at this point in the order/list)
      32. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: I’ve been told before we can’t call the question per our current bylaws
      33. Ben (Pol Sci)\*in the text chat: Second Eugenia’s motion
      34. **Motion to end discussion on the motion on the table.**
          1. Yea: 11 Nay: Abstain: 3
          2. Motion Passes
      35. **Motion to amend the wording of the motion on the table to "Move to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement about the usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, contextualizing that, while the symbol under its transliterated name “swastika” has been deployed as a weapon of hate against Jewish people, that it is still a symbol of deep religious importance to millions of people around the world who are consequently fearful of using it because of the way the term has, in a given time and context, been distorted. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups."**
          1. Yea: 8 Nay: 2 Abstain: 8
          2. Motion Passes
      36. **Motion to have the GRO Executive Board, on behalf of the General Council, write and distribute a statement about the usage of the word 'swastika' in the January email, contextualizing that, while the symbol under its transliterated name “swastika” has been deployed as a weapon of hate against Jewish people, that it is still a symbol of deep religious importance to millions of people around the world who are consequently fearful of using it because of the way the term has, in a given time and context, been distorted. This statement, if possible, will be written in collaboration with other student organizations, particularly those representing groups impacted by this issue. Based on other group advocacy, this may lead to the Executive Board contributing to and signing onto a similar statement drafted by those other groups.**
          1. Yea: 10 Nay: Abstain: 5
7. Open Discussion
   1. Request for graduate student submission of videos regarding experiences over the last year
      1. We wanted to ask the GRO GC for your comments on the matter
      2. Eugenia (Secretary): After everything that has happened this year I think that the idea of the admin using us as promotion material, and this request in general, are incredibly insulting.
      3. Conor (Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: Hard agree
      4. Shane (Co-Chair): I agree with this as well.
      5. Jacob Bruggeman (History) \*in the text chat: Agreed.
   2. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: My new business is to move to end the meeting
8. Adjournment