Graduate Representative Organization
GC Meeting Minute
Date/Time: 18:00 February 7th, 2022
Meeting Location: Online, Zoom

I. Call to Order and Agenda Review
   A. Ona called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

II. Approval of minutes from December 6, 2021
   A. Motion to approve the minutes
   B. Motion is seconded
   C. Motion is passed (details were lost during the sudden Zoom interruption at 7 pm)

III. Motion to add discussion about initiating the impeachment of Co-chair Alexander Helms as the first item on the agenda
   A. Motion is seconded
   B. Motion is passed

IV. Discussion regarding initiating the impeachment
   A. Isaiah: According to bylaw Section II.4.3 A, we are considering impeachment against Alex Helms, GRO’s co-chair, who has displayed behaviors and actions that are inconsistent with the policies and rules stated in both the GRO bylaws and the E-board communication policy. There are two specific policies in question that Alex has violated. First, he has violated the E-board communications policy by sending out a time sensitive email from the official GRO email address to Homewood campus students without the approval of anyone else on the E-board. This occurred on January 17, 2022, specifically when he distributed a link to a petition for a group of unnamed students at the School of Public Health, who were opposing the mandate for students to receive COVID-19 booster shots. Alex did not consult with any other E-board members before sending this communication out to Homewood graduate students, which is in violation of the specific clause in the wording of the communications policy regarding time sensitive emails.

   Second, he has violated Section II.4.1 B of the bylaws by creating an environment which other E-board members have found hostile or has impaired their ability to function as a E-board members. Specifically, he has displayed inappropriate actions that have made multiple women, E-board members, and graduate students feel uncomfortable. There is one specific instance in question that is resulted in a complaint to be submitted to the Office of Institutional Equity, which is still pending currently. And this occurred due to a woman on the E-board feeling harassed from Alex's words and actions due to the violation of the two policies in
question. We feel the most appropriate choice is to bypass any official warnings and initiate impeachment according to bylaws Section II.4.2.8.2.

B. Discussion:
Conor: Just to clarify, procedurally, because of the severity of what's involved in impeachment, it's necessarily built in the bylaws as essentially a two-step process. What would occur right now is we're discussing the possibility of initiating impeachment. If passed, it would result in discussion in the next GC meeting with a full impeachment proceeding that has statements allowed on both sides and a two thirds majority vote on removal from position.
Caleb: As a new GC member, I wonder how to make sure that this kind of thing doesn't happen again? Maybe that's a nebulous question. It seems like a big deal. And with just the context that was shared, I don't really have any prior knowledge. This seems to be something that we need to be more proactive about.
Michael: *IN TEXT message lost*
Isaiah: Regarding Michael's concern for more specific context, I can give more details, but I'm hesitant to do so because I have not been the subject of any direct harassment or anything like that. So, it's not necessarily my place to purchase specifics or any specific details. But there has been enough discussion amongst the board members that we feel strongly about Alex's behavior. We think this is essentially trying to get this on the radar for GC and hopefully having it voted on so then it can be discussed in further detail during the actual removal proceedings during the next GC meeting.
Jo: Rather than getting too bogged down in questions about more specifics, given the severity of what's under discussion, I think the appropriate thing to do is move quickly to a vote. Assuming we reach an agreement to vote yes, we can give everyone time to prepare with full details for our next meeting. Therefore, everyone is then able to share the entire context with us rather than collecting things piecemeal. I understand the desire to know before you are maintaining the case, but now, we are not being asked to make any adjudication, but simply being asked to affirm the severity which requires initiating the impeachment procedure. With that said, I think that Caleb's comment regarding thinking about things for the future is pertinent.
*Multiple Zoom chat messages lost*
Veronica: What would be the structure of the impeachment?
Conor: According to bylaw Section II.4.4, all these steps are going to have to go through at next GC regarding. Specific contents of concerns can be read in a statement—either by people affected or by their agents. There's also a full deliberation question and answer. We carry through the impeachment on a written ballot, which is going to be important for anonymity.
C. Motion: initiate the impeachment proceedings against GRO co-chair Alex Helms.
   1. Motion is seconded
   2. Motion is passed

V. Ryan’s IN TEXT motion is lost, but the motion is seconded and passed.
VI. Alex Helms resigned effective immediately.
VII. E-board Report (Ona)
   A. Next Round of COVID Relief PhD Fellowships
1. [https://covidinfo.jhu.edu/information-for-graduate-students/phd-fellowship-awards-for-covid-relief/](https://covidinfo.jhu.edu/information-for-graduate-students/phd-fellowship-awards-for-covid-relief/)

2. Ona: The next round of COVID Relief Ph.D. fellowships is open, and it's due March 1st. We highly encourage you to apply if you can be graduating before Spring 2023.

B. Parental and Period Care Initiative

1. Ona: The GRO has been part of Parental Care Initiative, where we have dedicated $500 to purchase parental products or female hygiene products that will be available at the GRO lounge. We are still waiting to see the items, but we will keep you updated. We are also adding a request to have first aid kits at the GRO Lounge, which have also been of need recently. For parental needs, we will have diapers and baby food. For hygiene products, period pads and tampons.

C. Cost of Living Calculation Updates

1. Ona: Our advisors suggested that the current Cost of Living is calculated based on the national database on cost of living and loan for individuals live in Baltimore City.

2. Discussion:
   Calvin: We found that our stipend is below average among the top 30 Universities. For the Chemistry department, we are about $1,000 less than the average. There is also an article listing the minimum salary needed to survive in each state. It is around $36,000 for Maryland.
   Michael: TRU teachers, researchers, and students organized a Union and made a statement which encloses a lot of detailed comparisons of Hopkins stipends with its peer institutions. *The link is lost*
   Ryan: The COVID relief fellowship amount is like the Dean’s teaching fellowship. I wonder if the COVID fellowship reflects the adjusted cost of living as the teaching fellowship?
   Ona: We would discuss it with our advisors.
   Caleb: In the Material Science Department, 4th and 5th year Ph.D. students have less stipend than 1st year students because they did not reflect the adjusted amount to students who have already signed the contracts.
   Jo: The COVID completion fellowship is not only below the increased amount but also below the current stipend.

D. Vinay Mahajan to serve as graduate rep for Spring Fair

1. Vinay: We will have the meeting on Thursday. I will update the GC with more details in the next GC meeting.

E. Michael Wilkinson Nominated to Police Accountability Board

1. [https://hub.jhu.edu/2021/12/21/police-accountability-board-new-members/](https://hub.jhu.edu/2021/12/21/police-accountability-board-new-members/)

2. Michael: I just get nominated and must go before the Maryland Senate to approve the nomination, which may happen in February. I was contacted initially by the associate director of State Affairs. They told me that my nomination will be confirmed. They said someone from her team will be reaching out to me to prepare me for the Maryland Senate. The accountability board wasn't nominating from scratch: they already had 11 members and five of them resigned. It's just replacing the five that
resigned, and I was able to watch a little bit of the video from when the original 11 members got their nominations confirmed. My understanding is going up to a podium with the senator standing next to you, and they just say you're welcome to give any comments if you want. Most people don't get comments; then you sit back down.

3. Discussion:
Ryan: When you start a meeting, is there a way that we could have a formal way of asking you to report back on this?
Michael: I really try to get as much intercommunication between the board and both members of the student body and the community as possible. I've already met with some representatives that were doing police protesting in East Baltimore. And part of what was the issue with the first board iteration that caused some members to resign is because it was just stagnation in general. They didn't seem to have a very strict formal setup for meetings. I plan to set rigorous meetings and forums where community members meet with members of the student body, such as the GRO. I want to serve as a hub of information as much as I can for this thing. I don't fully know what authority I will have to do that or what ability I will have to do that this moment because it's still up in the air with everything.
Jo: I am speaking, not impugning you or your viewpoints at all, but purely out of concern of how this has gone down institutionally. I'm quite baffled, by the way that this has moved in terms of appointment as opposed to their being consultation with the GRO or other student bodies. Usually, people who sit on analogous boards are recruited from the board and have been elected by the grad students for such positions. It would be useful to agitate for that sort of process. You're as opposed to their being that administrative directed appointment. Now that you're in this position to reflect the needs of the community and the graduate student body, but there's still something about the way this procedure went down that doesn't strike me well.
Michael: I agree with your comment, Jo. I have seen a lack of intercommunication with student organizations like the GRO. I agree that this kind of closed-door process for nominating and electing people and making decisions is not the way they should do things, and I very much will advocate in future for this to be much more open and communicative and cooperative.

F. Changes in the bylaws for GC voting (Michael):
1. Michael: The current method of voting in the General Council meetings other than elections is by public show of hands. I believe that general voting should adopt the same kind of methodology and formulation as elections do. And the reasons are given in the following link: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j0rw6LM8ITXPJjkwDZuHWLhvGxRf8bYY3DIVOhb7ySE/edit?usp=sharing

2. Discussion:
Conor: I'm worried that this would hollows out a level of accountability for GC members. There's a general feeling that the GRO is not actively
reaching enough of the student body in its representation that has been a problem for a long time. The private vote effectively severs one of the few remaining ties between GC reps and their department in the sense that if a contentious issue comes up, and the GC reps aren't having to publicly vote, with their name behind these matters, there's another layer of opacity between the student body and the student government. I see reasons for the possibility of recrimination, but if we're going to be a democratic and accountable organization, it's going to be important that we have our names patched publicly to the votes that we make.

Michael: I hear and understand your concerns. The only way that the student body actually specifically knows what we're voting on is to physically attend the meeting to see what the votes are because we don't publish our votes or everything public. GRO is a cooperative body, and we are already accountable to each other.

3. Motion on approving mentioned changes of GC voting in the bylaws.
   a) Motion is seconded
   b) Motion is not passed. Voting details lost

4. Michael: I would like to motion in the next GC meeting to discuss making voting records publicly. And we could give people two weeks of time to discuss it with their departments.
   a) This motion has been seconded.

VIII. JCash Gift for Fall '21 Efforts (Heramb, Graduate Involvement Chair)
   a) Heramb: As an appreciation from the GRO to all the department representatives, we have handed out $15 JCash per person. I'll be sending out an official email within this week to confirm. If you haven't received it, please get back to me by replying to that same email.

IX. Presentation on JHU’s Second Roadmap on DEI (Ajita, Diversity Chair)
   A. Ajita: Last month, we shared the secondary JHU roadmap on diversity, equity and inclusion endorsed by the University's Board of Trustees. The roadmap ahead builds on the work that has been done for the past five years and guides us through the next phase of the journey. The roadmap has 24 new and measurable goals for the next five years and a continued commitment to transparency, accountability, and open and thoughtful dialogue. This roadmap that was sent out in the last email last month included goals that are for the advanced degree programs and graduate students. The goals include major investments and programs that remove barriers and create pathways to success.

The first goal would be to establishes a university Student Advisory Council (SAC) that may comprise leaders from elected underrepresented undergraduate and graduate student bodies. The second goal is to build out new and improved space for student DEI practitioners for equitable access to the Hopkins’s Students Center. Students, faculty, and administrators have long highlighted the value of on-campus spaces which are designated for identity-based equity seeking student groups and DEI practitioners as well as the need for fair and welcoming access to shared spaces. The third goal is the women scholar’s initiative on STEM Ph.D. diversity, a $150 million effort supported by Bloomberg Philanthropies to create a bold and comprehensive approach to the recruitment, education, and success of
underrepresented students for Ph.D. programs in the STEM discipline. It would be a full funding for up to six years per scholar. The fourth goal is a $5 million Ph.D. pathways innovation plan. This funding will be awarded as a seed grant from the Provost’s Office with the expectation of identifying future divisional and philanthropic funding sources. It’s intended to encourage and support departments that are already demonstrating success in advancing division goals. It will supplement divisional funding of these Ph.D. programs with guaranteed financial support as well. The fifth goal would be to provide ongoing resources dedicated to graduate students; the Chief Diversity Officer and Vice Provost for Graduate education are going to collaborate with the divisions and departments to develop a pilot targeted customized programs for graduate student retention. They’re also going to create a graduate ambassador program which are graduate students who are willing and interested in being really drilled in DEI recruitment and retention. Students can apply to become one of four to five graduate ambassadors in each division, and they’re going to receive a Provost Office stipend of $500 to $2,000 per admission cycle. The last goal would be to develop the DEI toolkit, which will include more historical ideas recommended by the graduate students during DEI related training and professional development opportunities, relocation advances, supplemental awards for the students arriving, cohort and holistic admissions for law-based fields, and mentoring programs. 

https://diversity.jhu.edu/second-jhu-roadmap-on-diversity-equity-and-inclusion/students-goals/

B. Discussion:

Michael: Does the DEI works with the SDS disability services? I think many lab spaces of Hopkins are not handicap accessible.

Ajita: I will follow up this issue with the DEI supervisor.

Jo: I really want to strongly second Michael's point about disability access, and especially mobility access. It's a huge problem with the libraries, and there’s been uneven application following the libraries’ proposed redesign. I raised issues with the accessibility of facilities in the rec center, and the solution for the issues I raised was to remove the accessibility signage on the part of the facility that I had noted was inaccessible as opposed to taking steps to render it properly accessible per ADA guidelines. In addition, if you look at Appendix III of the DEI roadmap, it has assessment of goals from the previous roadmap which was initiated in 2016. Under every single section of that 2016 roadmap, there are many specific goals that zoom in on named projects with direct applicability of individual needs, however, the current roadmap does not have that level of specificity. Also, in the previous mode roadmap, the transgender working group, which they claim to have partial progress on, was never formed. Claiming that they had partial progress on something that never was initiated leads me to distrust the level of certainty that is claimed around many of these other goals.

Jo: *IN TEXT* Would be interesting to see how that breaks down relative to department size. Because non-STEM departments have their own huge diversity problems.

Veronica: *IN TEXT* I mentioned about lab space to Ed Schlesinger and Christine Kavanaugh in the last WSE Ph.D. Student townhall and would like to be
part of further discussion, if any additional student voices can be included.

X. Social Chair Updates (Vinay, Social Chair)

A. Transferring Budget

Vinay: Currently, happy hours and coffee hours are canceled due to the rising COVID cases in graduate students on campus. But we'll be having general programming events that we don't have an adequate budget for. So, we'll have to transfer the budget from happy hours to the general programming. For the general programming, I have thought of three events for now. Charm City headshots that will take around $2,000, according to a similar event last semester. Another $2,000 events, and one more event with a rough estimate of $1,000. The rough estimate of transferred money would be $5,000.

B. Discussion:

Vittorio: ESports had requested $1,500 from the social budget for this semester, and it is one of our initiatives to replace part of in-person programming that requires funding every semester. We should consider the $1,500 for Esports as well.

Isaiah: We also have remaining funds from the orientation fund due to the cancellation of events under COVID restrictions. The remaining funds in the orientation budget need to get approval from someone other than Laura. Once she gets that approval, we could have GC approve transferring the remainder to other programs. Also, people who approve events are hesitant in approving events because some undergrads were unmasked and had food inside Shriver Hall.

C. Vinay: *IN TEXT* Motion to approve the transfer of $6,500 from Happy Hours to student programming

1. Matthew Morgado: *IN TEXT* Second
2. Yea: 17, Nay:1, Abstain: 5
3. The motion passed

XI. Elections

A. Social Chair [1 / 2]

1. Be responsible for the encouragement of interdepartmental community through the coordination of all aspects of the GRO’s social programming. This includes, but is not restricted to, an Orientation BBQ, Coffee Hours, and Happy Hours.
2. Be responsible for and properly manage the GROs budget for these social events.

B. Nominee:

1. Alakrthika Ulaganathan
2. Satyanshu Kharia
3. Barry Zeng
4. Ashrith Bhupathi

C. Due to the Zoom issue and other issues, only Ashrith presents in the meeting.

Veronica: *IN TEXT* Motion to move the vote to later date

1. Matthew and Ryan: *IN TEXT* second
2. Yea: 12, Nay: 2, Abstain: 7
3. The motion did not pass.

D. The voting does not conclude a new Social Chair. The election will proceed in the
next meeting.

XII. Open Discussion & Questions

A. John Soltis: *IN TEXT* Perhaps we should have a crash course on important rules for new GC members? Like a shorter more approachable pdf? We have all learned a lot about by laws today, but less surprises would be good.

Isaiah: It's difficult to know what the bylaw rules are and what the protocols are. So, I do think that having a streamlined document might be helpful, especially for newer members to the GC who are unfamiliar with any of these rules and policies. I think better communication policies could be helpful, and it's important.

Heramb: I have taken note of the concern with respect to how the procedure goes especially with the newer GC reps. As the Graduate involvement chair, I will be working towards a plan for a better orientation of how the procedure works because even I understand that the bylaw is a very long document, and we need something more streamlined. So, I'd be looking into that.

Veronica Wallace: *IN TEXT* Everything I was referring to that was abrupt, and confusing was about people 1) bringing the case forward, 2) explaining the proceedings.

B. Alaa: Alex has been accused of a harassment problem and then he quits? Will there be no investigation? What implications does this have and if there are no implications?

Isaiah: Since he has resigned, we don't have to go forward with any impeachment proceedings or removal proceedings, because he has effectively left. If we do decide to take any further action, GC could vote upon and discuss it, which is up to the GC. Something like that would probably be unprecedented.

Veronica: It was clear that there were some who were in the know and informed about what was going on, but I can only speak for myself and not the rest. I think I was in the dark about this. I was surprised that I had no information, and as far as protecting details in people's stories: I understand, but to an extent, we need details to be able to make an informed decision, not only for ourselves, but for those we represent. It happened so fast that it was hard to comprehend and understand exactly what was going on. This is a very serious matter, especially to be accused of sexual harassment, but I did not feel in any position to be able to make any kind of judgment because I had no information. It was hard to know what was going on. I think it's disappointing about how the organization is run. We need to be better informed about procedures to make sure that this organization can be successful in carrying out.

Alaa Saad: *IN TEXT* Can I call onto voting to discuss the actions GRO can take and follow up on this next meeting? To clarify, I don’t want any details from the people affected.

Ryan: *IN TEXT* I brought a motion to add this to the agenda for next meeting.

Ryan: *IN TEXT* The OIE investigation will continue, but he has escaped our eyes for the time being. We might vote to formally censure him, but that’s unprecedented. We could also vote to requisition his received pay.

Conor: Per the current bylaws, this was the first venue in which these could be raised collectively. And beyond that, we didn't make it to that stage given Alex's resignation, which is probably an indication of his own estimate of his possible
standing in the organization where there would be official statements read. That's kind of the main forum for raising these in the formal proceedings of impeachment. We could try to be sure that people aren't having to speak on their own behalf in the statement, but can provide it to others to have read. It's also possible to raise these anonymously, but given the way the bylaws are written now, it must be at the impeachment proceeding itself. That doesn't mean though, that we can't do both backward facing what it is that went wrong in this case, and what we need to do to be sure this doesn't happen again. I think based off some of what's been discussed at tonight's meeting, there's still a definite appetite that GRO and GC work through it. In terms of what we can do as an organization to investigate how this was able to occur and how it can be prevented in the future, I think that's what next week's conversation is going to be more about. I wasn't expecting his resignation. But he was resigning to avoid a full accounting of what occurred at an official impeachment proceeding that would take place in the next GC, and it would take place with the protection of anonymity for people affected by his behavior. We don't have the power of subpoena or anything like this to make him answer questions about it. It's more on us to try and figure out how to effectively look at past behavior and find a way to make our best estimate at recounting what happened. We don't have the power to compel him to explain. He is compelled to explain to the institution, but that's an opaque process. I don't think this conversation is over by any stretch of the imagination. I'm just worried about what we can do, to come to a resolution about specifics at specific acts that Alex did, in a way that would involve him going forward.

**Ryan:** The abruptness of the proceedings was not on the GRO or the people running this meeting. It was on Alex deciding to resign. Perhaps he decided to resign for some other reason than an admission of guilt. I do agree. But he has the right to do that. I do want to continue to discuss what happened and put measures in place so that abuse is more practically combated in the organization. There are more resources like having these massive meetings and teaching people. None of us have really been in this situation before. And what Alex did was take away our opportunity to give a full accounting of his actions one way or the other.

**Calvin:** I don't like that we had to impeach, to vote to continue impeachment to even find out what was happening. 50% of us are in the dark of what's happening and still don't know what's happening. I don't think that Alex did resign and guess he did allegedly do these things that we don't know about. But maybe he doesn't want to be dragged through the mud and go through this public process. That's up to him. I think there should be consequences to actions and a more streamlined way to do this. I voted to continue with impeaching because I was led to believe that he did something without any proof. And I don't think that's how justice should work.

**Jo:** I want to speak in defense of the current procedure. Why the current system would delay things to the later time would be precisely to give someone who was going to be subjected to impeachment time to prepare his statement and to know that there was going to be something happening later. Opening the procedure is giving prior notice. And I don't really understand quite what the alternative would have been beyond saying that we shouldn't ever make accusations about someone.
I also just want to say that these accusations from what was said earlier in the meeting come from multiple people involved in the E-board. I see no reason to distrust any of them.

**Alex Yeh:** This process did feel quite abrupt, and the bylaws are difficult to parse unless you're deeply ingrained in the system. It feels like we have been left without a satisfying resolution in that it feels like half the story was presented. And perhaps Alex could have spoken up during the discussion of this impeachment motion. He chose not to and then resigned. And we don't know why, and we can't ascribe reasons to that with much basis. But I think that we should discuss what to do specifically for previous issues like sexual assault in our next meeting. We can try to either think through the procedures that are being used then to raise impeachment, and then to have a trial proceeding in the following weeks, or perhaps educating new members about how these more arcane policies in the GC operate.

**Amoh:** We should know what was happening to take actions. But now Alex has resigned. He is not in office to be impeached from the president. I don't think it is necessary for us to go ahead and subject him to an impeachment process. I think we should focus on the good work, and then even spell out costs and access so that soon is going to guide us rather than going back trying to impeach anyone.

**Conor:** To clarify, Alex wasn't found guilty or not guilty of anything. At this meeting, the majority vote to initiate impeachment was to begin the investigation formally at the GC level into what may or may not have happened with his behavior and when that passed, he immediately resigned. I added it to the agenda because formerly there are barriers to raising complaints about co-chairs in the structure of how these GC meetings happen. And because of that, it did not seem wise to essentially give Alex control over how these would happen without telling him in advance essentially that he was going to face an impeachment initiation.

The idea behind opening it that way was so there would still be a full accounting before the GC of what happens in the actual impeachment proceedings, but the standard for initiating impeachment itself is much lower and it raises concern to reach a level of seriousness such that it is worth opening a full investigation by the GC into it, that would then happen at the next GC. And it also happened by asking people who have been affected by this behavior to, if not present themselves, provide statements to see any E-board members regarding what happened. Alex didn't want to face that step, for whatever reason. And because of that, I think we've been left with this unsatisfying conclusion to open an investigation that can't be finished. I think we can still do the best that we can as an organization internally to find out what occurred. But in terms of having a sustained conversation with statements provided by the people affected and Alex's response to that as of his resignation is out the window. I don't know what to do with that. I'm hoping that we have it on the agenda for the next GC meeting to try and sift through this. I think it's a much more serious discussion that is going to warrant multiple occasions. Collectively, we're capable of making some decisions about how we want to strengthen our internal rules so that this doesn't happen again, but also so there's more satisfying conclusions to these accusations. Right now, I don't see any other possible option besides us initiating those impeachment
proceedings, and they would have been carried out, but he left. It's an elective body and we don't have the power to compel him to explain more. That's not to say that it's satisfying in the least.

Veronica: *IN TEXT* I would bet that even Alex didn't even know what was going and could have resigned having no idea what was going on. The point is that other than those who spoke about ousting Alex had no idea what was going on.

Ryan: *IN TEXT* Right—and the process is designed to give people space to discuss further. It’s not ethical to air evidence and determine guilt without any prior notice. I’m sorry that anyone felt pressured to vote a certain way, but we should be clear that it was a vote to OPEN proceedings, not determine guilt.

Veronica: *IN TEXT* And none of us are informed about the processes, and therefore need to better understand the organization and ourselves —to be better reps— by becoming more informed about all procedures and processes. I say none of us meaning it felt like a general confusion, other than those who were able to mention specific lines from the bylaws

Ryan: *IN TEXT* The next meeting is a chance to put more transparent measures into place as well. Amoh makes a good point that the discussion next meeting should not litigate anything Alex did or did not do; we should focus on developing strategies to make the process clearer.

Matthew: *IN TEXT* Is one of the issues here whether the GRO should have a mechanism to broach harassment issues before motioning to initiate impeachment? Like maybe a mechanism to inform the GC of harassment issues with de-identified data, even the accused being deidentified?

Isaiah: It's a very difficult situation to navigate because there's the issues of who is/is not affected feeling comfortable sharing this right with them. It's very specific and difficult to ask. That's why the impeachment process exists. As voted on by the GC, we would have the opportunity for everyone both on the E-board and the GC to hear the cases. There are some things regarding harassment specifically, for example, protocols for having an internal executive order review and impeachment requested by the GC. The only bylaw that does that in question is the one that I mentioned in my statement, which is 2.4.1 B, regarding creating an environment in which other E-board members feel hostile or they're unable to function if they feel uncomfortable. There is remedial language in the bylaws to address that. I've been aware of this whole situation since late December, so it's been basically over a month of that in the background. We've had to figure out how to deal with this or what is the best way to go about doing this. It's been difficult, and I think that the bylaws there should be some extra language written regarding other mechanisms for how to handle this kind of matter outside of bringing up things that GC meetings have gleaned because the E-board does work during months when the GC does not meet. It was severe enough that I did not feel comfortable talking with Alex individually or just continuing to work alongside him like it was. That's my personal discomfort with the situation which has warranted our rise to consider impeachment over just giving out warnings or anything like that. Ideally, we would have had the impeachment process to have a chance to display everything so that everyone is more aware of the exact context
which has happened and that's it's unfortunate that we don't have the opportunity to go through that entire process.

Alaa: I think there are various ways to deal with something like that whether there's power in the institution to do something about it. Impeachment is not doing anything about the situation. Unfortunately, I'm not entirely sure that the office is responsible for sexual harassment is a dependable office either. I'm just thinking there are different ways in which we can collaboratively think what to do with similar situations. I'm very uncomfortable by the idea that even impeachment to me is not by any means something let alone quick. It's just about if this happens again, which I'm sure it will, there needs to be some guidelines to what we can do realistically.

Alaa: *IN TEXT* I would ask if we can please put this as a priority for discussion next meeting as this is urgent, and I have a few ideas on gendering our policies with regards to upcoming incidents whether GRO/GC has power or not.

XIII. Adjournment
   A. The meeting adjourned at 8:46 pm