1. Call to Order and Agenda Review
   1. The meeting was started by Shane at 6:04PM.
   2. Review of the agenda was conducted
2. Approval of Minutes from 3-15-21
   1. Benjamin Taylor (Political Science) \*in the text chat: **Motion to approve the minutes from the 03/15/2021 meeting**
      1. Jo Giardini (English)\*in the text chat: Second
      2. Yea: 17 Nay: 0 Abstain: 1
      3. Motion Passes
3. E-board Report (Shane & Conor)
   1. Results of Floating-Chair vote (Shane)
      1. Positions that received high enough votes to move on as the floating chair positions for next year:
         1. COVID-19 Concerns Chair - 86
         2. Intercampus Chair - 119
         3. Graduate Involvement Chair - 122
         4. Diversity Chair – 129
      2. Positions that did not receive enough votes to move on as floating chair positions for next year:
         1. Potirofessional Development Chair - 139
         2. Community and Civic Engagement Chair - 150
         3. Graduate Liaison Chair -150
         4. Security Concerns Chair -165
         5. Family Life Chair - 169
         6. Parliamentarian/Legacy Chair – 201
      3. Based on this we solicited nominations for these positions earlier today. If you are interested in running yourself or if you know anyone else who would be interested, please nominate them. We are happy to talk to potential candidates about what the roles might entail.
   2. Response from Nancy Kass regarding long-standing questions (Conor)
      1. Vice Provost Nancy Kass responded to questions regarding offer letter revisions.
      2. After working to pay students working outside the US during the pandemic: “we have undertaken efforts to correct these inconsistencies and to ensure that moving forward, the description and tax treatment of all graduate funding package are consistent with their purpose.”
      3. In response to questions about how this might affect student’s tax classication: “The tax treatment of the monetary component of the funding package, regardless of what it is called, is governed by applicable federal and state laws…How payments are treated for tax purposes does not change their purpose – to provide financial support for students while they further their own educational objectives.”
      4. It is a bit unclear from these general answers what will happen concretely with tax treatment.
      5. Ben (Pol Sci): In my department, during semesters when we TA we receive a W2 that notes that we are getting paid to TA, is that the sort of thing that you’d like to get resolved in the following weeks?
         1. Shane: Yes, how will this change for students for whom this is not currently the case.
   3. Update from President Daniels regarding COVID funding extensions (Conor)
      1. On Friday, President Daniels announced $5 million for two new fellowships for grads affected by COVID:
         1. A travel and research award to help PhD students in time-limited funding packages who experienced COVID-related delays in planned dissertation-related travel, fieldwork, or human research conduct.
         2. A dissertation completion award for students whose time-limited funding packages have expired but who need additional time to complete their dissertations because of the COVID-related interruptions. The awards will generally cover a stipend, tuition, and health insurance for one semester or the equivalent, though support for additional time may be considered in special circumstances.
      2. Questions:
         1. Jo (English): In your framing, it sounds like it is open for 4th and 5th years (you have to be a candidate, which means you have to have passed exams) but based on what I read, it’s open to people who were on 5-year funding plans but had passed the duration of those plans. Have you heard differently? Or are 6th year student eligible?
            1. Maya Monroe (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): This ties into my comment on eligibility. From my interpretation I believe it does apply to individuals in their 4th year and beyond in programs that have limited funding (caps of the funding terms). But I think what’s important to note, the last bullet point says that individuals who are applying for these dissertation completion awards cede their ability to apply for future university funding. You can’t apply beyond this application.
            2. Jo (English): “Student will not be eligible for other university provided funding after award."
            3. Conor Bean (Co-Chair): From university-provided funding, I don’t know if it means “university-provided” or if you could do this and KSAS DTF or departmental funding for a semester.
         2. Jo (English): Just to start with a place where I am most confused by this, what I don’t understand is the final line “Awards that provide stipends will give preference to those not teaching or with other significant university obligations.". What does this mean? Many people are applying for multiple funding sources to guarantee continued funding to finish degrees. Does this mean that people who are accepted for a DTF would be refused this funding extension because they got a DTF? What is the standard for this preference would look like?
         3. Jo (English): It is also opaque how the travel and research amounts are judged. What level of research need would justify this award? This has a lot of ramifications for students who need to do research that is planned but also have timeline issues. This seems like a situation that creates problems for students on difficult timelines.
         4. Jo (English): As the research and travel grants are currently structured, they claim that they can be used at any point in the 2021-2022 year, but because they don’t provide enough support I feel that they would only be able to be constructively used during the summer and winter holiday and that raises the question of who would be able to access them given timeline constraints.
         5. Jo (English): What is the university prepared to do in the event that they find there are compelling cases beyond the 200-300 awards they are prepared to provide?
      3. Conor (Co-Chair): Just to clarify, this $5 million was announced at the same time as faculty retirement contributions were resumed (60-70 million according to TRU estimates). We are grateful for $5 million but we do not think this is all that can be provided for graduate students.
   4. GPSA Week Events (Shane)
      1. Charmery - $10 credit for ice cream for 140 students on 04/05
      2. JCard Luncheon - $15 credit
      3. Bottoms Up Bagels - $12 credit (no bulk bagels) on 04/07
      4. Laptop Stand Giveaway
      5. Fitness Band Giveaway
      6. Intercampus Gaming Night/Grad Student Mixer
      7. Alexander Helms (Social Co-Chair): Everything was signed up incredibly quickly, Bottoms Up Bagels was the longest running signup (7AM timeslot). Hopefully people are at the Charmery right now.
      8. Ece Ozdemir (Social Co-Chair): Amazing feedback from my friends. Everything sold out really quickly.
   5. Update on misrepresentation of Swastika (Shane)
      1. Collaborative document being drafted, first draft led by grad Prakhar Kaushik who attended last GC meeting
      2. Executive board will take over the revisions and further drafting to bring statement fully in line with GC vote
      3. Awaiting input from South Asian students at Hopkins and the Inter-Asian Council, who have been contacted by Prakhar
      4. Will be reaching out to a number of other organizations for input
      5. Our advisors recommend that we bring this up/address this to Vice Provost of Diversity and Inclusion Katrina Caldwell.
      6. Guiding whom we should raise the issue with or whom it should go to.
      7. Tatsat Banerjee (Intercampus Chair): What is the aim of the statement? Are we expecting the president to issue a clarification or something like that?
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): It’s not so much to request a clarification from the President’s office but more to provide information and clarification for the student body. Try to raise this as a point with Katrina Caldwell. Specifically something that Christine Kavanagh suggested regarding the fact that central communication in the future is more sensitive to this topic.
         2. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): Has anyone talked to any Jewish group? Because I know a similar case happened at Brandeis University not long ago and a lot of resistance came from the Jewish Group:
         3. Shane (Co-Chair): Prakhar did not reach out to Hillel in his first drafting, but we want ot make sure to reach out to Hillel and the Interfaith Council to make sure they understand what the goals of the statement are, especially that the word and the symbol have been used as hate from the Jewish people.
         4. Shane (Co-Chair)\*in the text chat: (This was the motion as it passed last meeting) 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.
   6. Resumption of VP of Security Search (Conor)
      1. Hub Article from March 26 announced that the VP of Security search is resuming
      2. One graduate student from nursing on the search committee
      3. Input for the search committee is supposed to go through the feedback form on the Public Safety site
      4. Dean of Student Life Smita Ruzicka emailed us separately to share the news and feedback form
      5. Note: the stalled initial search for the VP of Security contributed to the delay of the JHPD rollout.
   7. MyChart Update re: Insurance Billing (Conor)
      1. An Epic software update on 3/26 led to MyChart appointment scheduling including a step for insurance verification.
      2. For JHU-based COVID testing, students will not be billed
      3. Grant Kitchen (Materials Science): I had trouble registering and I emailed people at MyChart and they told me to walk in and say that I have a problem with an app. That has worked for the past week, but I don’t know that this will work forever. This is something we can refer on in the future if anyone has additional comments/concerns.
   8. Cut-Off Date for Purchases through SLI May 4th ­(Shane)
      1. Likely to forestall much GRO activity during May or over the summer. Can we submit invoices for non-material purchases? Can we get a pass for this? If we do need to submit all our purchases by May 4th, this will forestall much GRO activity over the summer.
      2. Alex (Social Co-Chair): I still haven’t heard if we can do restaurants for May 4th. If not, Summer kit: tote bag, book, beach towel, hat. That’s our second option if we can’t do a week of programming past May 4th.
4. Discussion: Finalizing comments and feedback on GRO Budget Submission for 2021-2022 (
   1. Isaiah Chen (Treasurer): Budget overview
      1. We have a deadline to submit the budget for the next academic year by the end of this week. So far, myself and the Co-chairs have gone through the line items and prepared estimates based on perspective/possible things we are expecting
      2. Coffee Hour and Happy Hour are very similar to what has been requested in prior years. Coffee Hours usually goes through Carma’s. For Happy Hours, the costs are usually bartender and alcohol. We allocate based off of the possibility of in-person events next year, we do not know if/when this will change. We just planned for in-person.
      3. Student Programming: Food for other events (not coffee or happy hours) but this year we have had way more events (Speakers) so should we have a similar type of event schedule in the fall,, there are funds for that.
      4. Group Funding: Similar to what was requested prior to the pandemic. This year we barely used anything, but if things are opened up in the future, we will need more
      5. Payroll: This is slightly more than was requested this year. This year’s work hours are much higher than estimated, so just in case there is a need to increase hours due to virtual events, we want to be able to cushion this.
      6. Meetings: Food
      7. Office: A few things that would be useful for the office (printers, furniture). Prepared to allocate for those purchase should be need those.
      8. NAGPS: Covers membership for this society. They extended through the end of 2021, so we did not need to make a payment in 2021 but we will need to pay in 2022.
      9. Summer Sports League: Usually we have $750, but the E-Sports league has had about $2000 in prizes and we have increased this next year
      10. Usually we have Flex Funds that are reserved for unforeseen costs that we do not expect. This year, we are not allowed to put flex funds in. Accordingly, we have considered that in these other costs so that in theory we do not need flex funds.
      11. Other budgets: pretty similar to prior requests
      12. Orientation: BBQ in the beginning. This year, it was taken up mainly by purchase of masks and smaller orientation events
      13. GPSA week: This year was about 10k, this is a little larger to account for in person events that may be a little higher.
      14. Guide: Similar to this year. This year we spent it mainly on wellness bands for GPSA week
      15. Major Change: GSI budget. This year it was significantly less than 31k because the large event (Spring Formal) did not happen. If it were to happen next year, that would take up a significant chunk of this budget.
      16. Conference Travel: Pretty much the same as has been requested in prior years.
      17. This covers what we plan to request, happy to answer any questions.
   2. Shane (Co-Chair): The university does not allow for flex funds anymore (unclear on when this policy started) so we have tried to determine where we used them in the past and then ask for them there. It’s unclear how requests for budget increases will be treated this year. Last year we were told explicitly to not request any increases.
   3. Ashely Kiemen (ChemBE): Is the GRO going to break even on its 2020-2021 budget?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): No
      2. Isaiah (Treasurer): No, this is the estimate that I currently have. Based on all the projected costs, we will spend about 87% of the total budget spent.
      3. Alex (Social Co-Chair)\*in the text chat: Social budgets will be fully spent.
      4. Ashley (ChemBE): Do you have any plans to adapt this? For example, to move more from other budgets into the social budget?
      5. Isaiah (Treasurer): We can only use line items for what they are budgeted for appropriately. We asked if we can use anything from coffee hour/student programming for office purchases, but we were told that we cannot do that. Even within the same account, we are not able to transfer them. So, no, unfortunately this is not possible.
   4. Eugenia (Secretary)\*in the text chat: Do we need to vote to approve the budget?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): No, we do not.
5. By-laws amendments
   1. Shane (Co-Chair): We would like to amend the bylaws. There are a number of amendments. By our rules, these have been sent out to the GC more than 7 days prior to this meeting for your review. Here they are in summary.
      1. Amendment 1: Section I.1.2: Including 2 more departments to be consistent with the representation we currently should have on the GRO
      2. Amendment 2: Section V.2.1 and Section VI.1.1: Make conference grants conference grants instead of travel grants to be more in line with how we view these grants (and to allow them to be used to fund conferences but not travel in the face of a pandemic)
      3. Amendment(s) 3 onward: Article II.1 and Section III.4.3.(a).(iii). Second set of changes is purely grammatical or spelling mistakes.
   2. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): Why are we including Robotics (the Robotics Department) specially?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): They are a degree grandting program that is not in a home department. They are considered independent by the administration so the way that we recognize departments also applies to their program. An alternative example is that ISI used to be recognized but now they are part of the Comp Sci department so they no longer have that individual status. This was a comment from Christine Kavanagh that the Dean’s office is pushing back on these kinds of programs (MS programs that are separate from a home department) but in theory they should be incorportated.
   3. Jo (English): This is something of an aside, but based on what you have said, there are current plans to allow PhD students could transfer to an Alexander Grass Institute? Is that something that we are attending to or planning to?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): No, I would need to look into that. We were not aware of this and we will ask Renee Eastwood if it fits the same structure. We trust them on an organizational standpoint because we don’t know how its viewed from the university side and we can make a proposal to include them in the future if it fits within those requirements.
      2. Jo (English) \*in the text chat: <https://krieger.jhu.edu/humanities-institute/phd-program/> (seems like a disaster in the making, tbh)
   4. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair): I know there is 1 program, Environmental Health and Engineering, which is shared in Whiting and Public Health?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, they are and they have representation in the GRO. Yes, they’ve been here for all the meetings this semester before this one. This is similar to how BME is also represented in the GRO.
   5. Shane (Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: **Motion to approve the proposed by-laws amendments.**
      1. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: Second
      2. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: Second
      3. Yea: 32 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0
      4. Motion passes.
6. Discussion & vote: Rachel S. Core Award Winner
   1. This award is given each year by the GRO to an individual who has demonstrated extreme service on behalf of graduate students. It does not have to go to a graduate student or to an employee of Hopkins.
   2. We received many nominations this year. Outstanding work as teaching assistants, decades dedicated to students through departmental administration.
   3. Matthew Morgado (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Question: How does the GC usually vote on this award? e.g. what kinds of considerations do they weigh?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): This is the largest slate of candidates we have ever had by a factor of 3 or 4. Typically the consideration given is breadth of impact as opposed to specific impact on an individual. So someone who has been an exemplary mentor to a younger student in their lab, the GC would not consider that as strongly as someone who has done work on behalf of their department or the school. But with that in mind, there is no precedent in terms of weight towards any specific activity.
   4. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Do nominations traditionally have between strong to decisive weight?
      1. Shane (Co-Chair): Are you saying that the decision normally rely on how strongly-worded the nominations are?
      2. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Oh, good question! I mean number of nominations.
      3. Shane (Co-Chair): I can’t say because we haven’t historically polled people on why they voted how they voted. Typically the number of nominations is useful to figure out why people feel the same way. Sometimes a concerted effort to nominate a person as a group. The value of having multiple nominations is to check between them what students say is the common thread of how an indidivual has affected the lives of grad students.
         1. For example: Ezgi formed a virtual zoom work environments to help students get through the COVID pandemic. Many people found the work valuable because of commentary on that effort.
         2. Kathy: a beloved administrator who passed away recently
      4. Jo (English) \*in the text chat: If i may, the Ezgi Ince nomination was about her home department in CTL, not MLL, I believe. Not to detract from her! She is a dear person, formidable scholar, and worthwhile nominee.
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, I can confirm that. My mistake, that was my error.
      5. Stephanie Cooper (Near Eastern Studies): I was looking back at previous winners and I noticed that there were two winners before, how does that come about, is it a tie?
         1. Eugenia (Secretary): Usually that occurs when there is a single effort that is awarded that already naturally has two leaders. For example, JHToo received the award and the monetary prize was given to the two graduate students at the front of the movement.
      6. Shane (Co-Chair): If there is anyone present who knows any of the individuals and wants to speak on their behalf, that has historically happened at these meetings.
      7. Matthew: Question: Do we have other metrics (other than number of nominations) for figuring out breadth of impact?
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): No, we do not do any investigation beyond receiving any nominations. However, the impact of the nominations varies greatly.
      8. Josh Popp (BME): So, would an honorary award be something that could be considered in that circumstance?
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): Do you mean creating a second award for someoneone?
         2. Josh (BME): I mean mainly awarding one award and then an honorary award without a prize, like a runner up. However, the idea of creating another award may also be worthwhile.
         3. Shane (Co-Chair) : We would have a restriction if we wanted to create an award. We were allowed to keep giving $200 for this award because it was written into our bylaws before any other limits were imposed. But our limit for other awards is $100. We could vote to give a 1-year honorary award to someone for $100. If we were to give the award posthumously, we could spend those funds to pass the financial component on to next of kin or do something in honor of?
         4. Josh (BME): Can we include information outside of the nomination forms?
         5. Shane (Co-Chair): If anyone knows anything about the nominees, you can share that information.
         6. Josh (BME): I’d like to comment that the BME application assistance program that Sarah Neshat founded, through their ranks, the application rate of URM, acceptances of URM, and number of students who have accepted offers from JHU. The numbers were very impressive and have been the talking points at several departmental events I have attended. I would like to endorse that nomination. It was a great idea to start the program, but they already have very impressive statistics.
      9. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Most of these nominees have had important, wide impact. I think we have sufficient reason to award multiple indiviudals here. But we can pick only one.
         1. Shane (Co-Chair): the precedent would be to award 1. We could engage in a multiple tiered vote to pare down the list to make it easier on people as voting on a slate of 15 candidates can be challenging.
      10. Eugenia (Secretary): Are you suggesting that we conduct a straw poll now or that we do a ranked choice vote electronically?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): We could engage in a ranked choice electronically
      11. Wangui Mbuguiro(Communications Chair): We have several excellent nominees for this. So one thing that came to mind is that given that this year was an exceptionally challenging year for everyone, I was leaning towards preferencing graduate students because even though the Rachel S. Core Award is open to everyone and given that Grad students haven’t gotten a lot of financial support from the university, it would be helpful to narrow down our candidates to graduate students.
          1. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: That’s a fantastic point, Wangui!
      12. Shane (Co-Chair): Can you tell me what the uncommited Flex Funds are currently?
          1. Isaiah (Treasurer): It’s under $200, about $180.
          2. Shane (Co-Chair): One method we could go about this is that we perform a ranked choice vote and have the winner receive the Rachel S Core award in the whole and designate some GRO-specific awards that we
          3. Isaiah (Treasurer): Technically, if the award is awarded for this semester, it’s always possible that the recipients take longer to receive this award. If multiple winners are picked, we could use next year’s budget. Obviously, the award would have to be made during the next financial year.
      13. Matthew (Philosophy)\*in the text chat: Question: What about diversity considerations? Have traditional winners been racially, ethnically, gender-ly homogenous?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): Several of the people awarded in the past have gotten the award due to their efforts in diversity but we haven’t know their backgrounds.
      14. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: I think there were honorable mentions in previous years
      15. Josh (BME): Idea of prioritizing a graduate student and possibly an honorary mention to Kathy (an honorary award without funding attached)
      16. Maya Monroe (COVID-19 Concerns Chair) \*in the text chat: Motion to create three $50 "GRO appreciation awards" for runner-ups
      17. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: Motion to give 1 RSC award ($200) and 3 Honorable mentions in the amount of $100 based on an electronic ranked choice vote.
          1. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Second
      18. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair)\*in the text chat: I withdraw my motion in favor of Eugenia's
      19. Conor (Co-Chair): I’m in favour of Eugenia’s motion, one thing I would say in the name of Kathy Loehmer is that I don’t know how appropriate it would be to reach out to her family just for an honourable mention. If it doesn’t carry financial weight, do we want to contact them about this?
          1. Tatsat (Intercampus Chair) \*in the text chat: I agree with Conor
      20. Shane (Co-Chair): Isaiah, how feasible is it for us to find that $300 additional funds?
          1. Isaiah (Treasurer): Do you have any idea where there RSC comes out of?
          2. Isaiah (Treasurer): It depends when they receive their awards, if they don’t see them for a few months,, then they would be taken out of the next budget.
      21. Matthew (Philosophy) \*in the text chat: Might Kathy Loehmer's department be part of who receives the award/honorary award?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, it could be up to the GC to determine whether the money goes to a plaque or something else in the department.
      22. Jo (English): I just want to express some hesitation to the plan that was raised a couple comments ago about voting on the award and then delaying the nomination. Members of the winners’ department are likely in this room. It would be strange to not notify the winner until we get things sorted. Also, our minutes are posted publicly, so they would know.
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I recommend that we notify the winners that the GRO has recognized their contribution and be up front with the fact that we may not be able fund them immediately.
          2. Isaiah (Treasurer) \*in the text chat: that is a very good point
          3. Jo (English) \*in the text chat: No shade intended, Isaiah! I know you’re just trying to make sure all possibilities are addressed.
      23. Ben (Pol Sci): aren’t questions regarding specific winners no longer germane given the motion on the table? \*specific Candidates
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, Ben you are correct.
      24. Alex (Social Chair): can we give the awardees a $100 credit at the bookstore? from the social budget. we can afford 200-300 to give
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): The way the award has been handled in the past is that we inform the recipient that they can spend up to $200 for the award and they pick something on Amazon or the Bookstore. I leave it up to Isaiah to figure out whether we can route this through the social budget.
          2. Isaiah (Treasurer): If Alex plans to use the entire social budget, then that isnt’ possible. But that is Alex’s call
      25. Tom McCoy (Cog Sci): I agree that a posthumous award may be a good idea but in a different way. We could consider making a new award (in Kathy’s honor) for non-graduate students who have shown exemplary service to grad students.
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): It’s a great idea and it’s possible, but I think what we need to do is speak to our advisor to SLI. We have a small, endowed fund that pays about 900/year and there is a chance that we could create another similar award, and actually it could be a similar thing for Kathy. But yeah, I appreciate that suggestion, but I think it’s beyond the scope of the current motion.
      26. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): In response to Alex’s suggestion of a credit at the bookstore, I’m more in favor of providing funds as general funds for the winners rather than limiting them on spending that at the bookstore.
      27. Eugenia (Secretary): Even if we give them funds to go to the bookstore, could they technically buy Visa giftcards at the Bookstore itself?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I don’t think we can buy Visa giftcards for them.
      28. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: doesn’t the motion as presently worded allow significant leeway on these questions (i.e., how the moneys are disbursed) moving forward, should it pass?
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): Yes, the wording gives a lot of leeway on these questions.
          2. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Then move to call the question
          3. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: Second Ben’s motion
      29. **Motion to give 1 RSC award ($200) and 3 "GRO Appreciation Awards" in the amount of $100 based on an electronic ranked choice vote, pending securing sufficient funding to provide those awards.** 
          1. Note: this motion was amended via friendly amendment by Shane (Co-Chair) twice. Eugenia (Secretary) accepted these amendments. However, because Eugenia could not actually consider the amendments and transcribe them in real time, these amendments are not reflected in the text of the minutes but are reflected in the final motion. Eugenia apologizes for the inconsistency.
          2. Yea: 24 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
          3. Motion passes.
      30. Ashley (ChemBE) \*in the text chat: can we have a top 5 rank choice vote? To avoid us having to pick 1st choice, 2nd choice, … 15th choice, 16th choice candidate via full ranked choice voting
          1. Shane (Co-Chair): I think this sounds reasonable. If no one objects within the next 30 seconds, it shall be done thusly.
7. Request: Creation of Welcome & Guide Coordinator for Fall 2021
   1. My recommendation is that the GC approve a 25-hour paid coordinator position and to facilitate orientation and welcome events, and give the incoming executive board the power to solicit nominations and fill the position should it be deemed necessary.
      1. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: **move to approve the creation of the position as requested**
      2. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: second
      3. Yea: 20 Nay: 0 Abstain 3
      4. Motion passes
8. Request for GRO to endorse East Asian Studies, RIC and WGS joint-statement
   1. Jo (English): I don’t have a whole lot to contribute, I’d prefer that the statement speaks for itself. I was not involved in writing but it came through the boards and they held a town hall with a round table with a number of students to discuss how to combat anti-Asian acts/sentiment/racism. They held a discussion of a number of strategies for anti-racism. Moving to make several programs and initiatives for student involvement in the fall. In the meantime, this statement condemning anti-Asian racism and violence and have been seaking other organizational endorsements. Requesting that an endorsement consist of the organization emailing them and circulating on their social media.
   2. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: Move to endorse the statement
      1. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: SEcond
   3. Conor (Co-Chair): In terms of mailing. Yuri and Briana have been working on a statement and I’m wondering if a statement by the advocacy chairs pending E-Board approval could accompany this. I would be more in favor of us endorsing and then distributing with our own statement.
   4. Jo (English): That sounds great to me. That sounds like it meets the terms of the request and fills a supplementary action.
   5. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: “endorse” in my motion means “endorse” in the sense Jo has just outlined, which I don’t take to mean we couldn’t supplement with a specific comment/statement
   6. Shane (Co-Chair) \*in the text chat: Motion to amend Ben's statement to "motion to endorse the statement and distribute it as the GRO distributes its own statement currently being developed"
   7. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: sure, but I think it’s superfluous i’ll accept it
   8. **Motion to endorse the EAS/RIC/WGS statement and distribute it as the GRO distributes its own statement currently being developed.** 
      1. Yea: 25 Nay: 0 Abstain: 1
   9. Jo (English) \*in the text chat: The statement had been posted to RIC, EAS, and WGS websites, but apparently a Hopkins wide wordpress problem deleted the last month of departmental updates
9. Open Discussion
   1. Request for GC vote on distributing vaccination informational guide
      1. Maya has been working on this guide and we have tried to coordinate with academic advisors to make sure what we are saying is in line with university’s viewpoint and that we make sure that what we say cannot be interpreted as medical advice (decreased risk of litigation). This request is because we discussed this at a prior GC meeting but there was never a formal endorsement from the GC to distribute it. More that they endorse the distribution of the intent of the document.
      2. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): If anyone has questions, comments, or concerns, I just want to make sure that we have a mandate to distribute before we send out something of this scope. Christine and Renee have discussed this and have declined to be involved in distributing information about vaccination at this time but are willing to check over some points for accuracy at this time.
      3. Ben (Pol Sci)\*in the text chat: as of tomorrow, as I understand it, everyone over 16 is eligible to register for vaccines at state-run mass vaccination sites. Does that make specific rules regarding who’s eligible no longer relevant?
         1. Maya (COVID-19 Concerns Chair): It does not make your eligibility irrelevant because demand is still expected to outpace supply and the different centres are still supposed to be prioritizing people who are eligible at earlier phases. And we cannot guarantee that is being done but knowing why you are eligible Is important because it helps prioritization
         2. Conor (Co-Chair): I second Maya there. It is important that people know that eligibility rankings do not go away. We were worried that people would use the guide for jumping the line. Now that many people want to register fo the vaccine and JHU has a frighteningly small supply of the vaccine and if people’s first reaction is to look internally to JHU, it is helpful to point them elsewhere and this is our attempt to address that.
   2. Ben (Pol Sci) \*in the text chat: noted. Then move to send it
      1. Eugenia (Secretary) \*in the text chat: Second
   3. **Motion to distribute the COVID vaccination guide**
      1. Yea: 22 Nay: 0 Abstain: 2
   4. Wangui (Communications Chair): I want to thank Maya for putting together the vaccination guide. It required an extensive amount of research and the number of updates necessary as guidelines continued to change.
10. Adjournment