



Graduate Representative Organization
GC Meeting Minutes
Date/Time: 18:00 PM ET Sept 19th, 2022
Hybrid: Gilman 132, [Zoom](#)

I. Call to Order and Agenda Review

- a. The meeting is called to order at 6:07 PM.

II. EBoard Reports (Vinay & Michael):

- a. Blue Jay Shuttle Update
 - i. *Michael*: There was a lot of constraints with the route that we wanted to make sure they had in place. We finally got some cost estimates. The main important piece of this is we brought this now to our advisors, and we brought this to Dr. Bard. The reason why we brought this to Dr. Bard is because basically, not having these routes in Hamden, can be very easily like a safety concern for those who have to walk home really early in the morning, really late at night in Hamden. So we basically said, hey, you know your office deals with public safety. You've talked about non-police interventions for public safety. This is a great one. You have a huge budget. Could you possibly just fund this in full. So he's basically said like he's gonna look into ways to fund it. So there's a good chance his office will fund it in full. If his office doesn't fund in full, we talked to our advisors, which is the vice deans of KSAS and WSE, and they said, we might be able to split some of that, depending on how much Dr. Bard puts into it. Most likely we'll probably have to do the 4 hr option, which is just basically we'll have like 6:30 to 10:30 in the morning, to just catch everyone who's like going really early in the morning. We just have to make sure that we have the appropriate funding sources for that. But we are tracking that out.
 - ii. *Unknown*: Although it's officially scheduled for us to have a shuttle. The shuttle, unfortunately, did not turn up today, resulting in over 20 students being late to their classes. So I was wondering if there is a point to make sure the consistency of these shuttles, and whether or not this issue about unexpected no shuttles has ever been discussed on the topic of transportation.
 - iii. *Michael*: Consistency and shuttle time is definitely a big deal. That's predominantly handled by the transportation office. We haven't brought this issue explicitly to them in recent years, so that's something we can definitely bring to them.

III. [Proposed Bylaws Changes](#) Vote:

- a. Explanation of main pieces of bylaw changes
 - i. **Group recognition**
 1. *Michael*: There used to be what's known as GRO recognition. Basically, groups would get recognized by the GRO on top of being recognized by the LEED

Office, which made them a registered student organization. The issue is that there's been so many changes to basically like what is under the purview of the LEED office that kind of make the GRO recognition a moot point. So previous GRO recognition allowed you to reserve rooms on Campus, borrow university vans, send out emails from our email list. The first 2 bullet points are completely covered by RSO, or LEED Office registration, we do not have any control of that. So firstly, the bylaws were just incorrect. Secondly, GRO recognition basically offers no extra benefit. To that third point, there seem to be some sort of confusion as to when the GRO was and was not allowed to send emails out on behalf of other groups. If you just look at the bylaws, it seems a lot more restrictive than we had done it in past, which the restrictions basically being, unless we're funding your event, or unless you're GRO recognized, we wouldn't send emails on your behalf. That's kind of the way the bylaws made it sound like, and at least in the year and a half I've been on the GRO, we've never done that, we've always been much less restrictive in the way we've sent out emails. So even that third point kind of becomes a moot point in GRO recognition. And considering the fact that GRO recognition takes a good number of steps, and also takes good amount of your time as a GC, because you have to review each group, and so on and so forth. It just kind of became, in my opinion, like a useless thing to have, because LEED office recognition would grant you everything that you were looking for as a group and GRO recognition. So that's like the main piece of the bylaws changes are just kind of reflecting, like the getting rid of the group recognition portion of it.

2. *Unknown*: I was wondering, in this case, because I know that there is a lot of organizations that are, for example, undergraduates predominantly... are usually undergraduate sometimes exclusive... that without this GRO recognition, whether or not we would be still be able to find what exact clubs or organizations on campus that can distinguish them.. that would be potentially open or receptive towards graduate students participation.
3. *Michael*: This might not exactly answer your question... We really only fund, send emails for, predominantly interact with graduate-student-led groups and like graduate student organizations on campus. For example, we do group funding and we won't fund your group if they're predominantly undergraduate. You also have to be Homewood based, which wasn't fully clarified previously in the bylaws. So we're mainly only looking at Homewood graduate organizations, as far as like knowing if an organization is a graduate organization, I believe most of that's going to be listed like on the LEED website and on various Homewood grad organization websites. I don't know if that exactly answered the question...
4. *Unknown*: This point just came to me... since I think that it's important for us as GRO to potentially provide graduate students with a concentrated list of all the clubs and the activities that, as a graduate student, you're welcome to apply as well as be part of, especially since the LEED office's interface with campus groups can often be very confusing. And there's often a lot of misinformation there, especially, for example, with groups that are previously been active, but now currently inactive, and groups sometimes not necessarily put their latest information on campus groups. So just, I think, potentially providing a spreadsheet, for example, of all the active clubs on campus, that are specifically targeted for graduate students, and then providing that information... Having that information being available on our platform for all the other graduate students to reference. For example, we can have 3 columns. One column about what is this organization, second column showing a certain category, and a third column might be a short description of what they do, and then having that information being provided to some of our students, I think that would be very very helpful.

5. *Michael*: That's definitely something we can list on our website. If it's a registered group through the LEED Office, the LEED office will have that information. The tricky part comes with the not recognized groups, like smaller groups... we can discuss the best method for collecting all of that information. Some of it might be publicly listed, and some might not. We could always just send out an email to everyone saying like if you're a group and you'd like to have your information listed on the GRO website, let us know, and then we could just list their information on the website. That's something we could definitely do and kind of investigate further.
6. *Unknown*: I was going to suggest that that would be a great job for the social chair to take on, but it sounds like the executive board will handle who should do that.

ii. **Group funding**

1. *Michael*: We added that recognition by the LEED office is not required for us to fund your group. The other one is that groups must be Homewood-based to be eligible for funding. I don't believe that we're super strict with this in past, but this is something that our advisors came down and said like unless it's a specific event like the inter-campus event handled by the inter-campus chair, we're really only able to fund groups that are Homewood-based because all the non-Homewood-based groups basically have their own equivalent. For example, med campus have the GSA... stuff like that. One of the duties of the co-chairs, and I think this is just something that was basically grandfathered in from a while ago, was that we need to have a GSA rep for the undergrad. But our mission is shifted in the past 4 years, that we're only tailored to graduate students, so it no longer makes sense to have the SGA Rep. That's not to say that we don't occasionally coordinate with the SGA. For larger events like spring fair or lighting with the quads, we'll still collaborate with them. But to have an entire rep dedicated to serve on the SGA didn't seem to make sense.
2. *Unknown*: What's the last time that we actually went to a SGA meeting and did a cross-collaboration?
3. *Michael*: The last time we did a cross collaboration would be probably spring formal or lighting of the quad, so like we do work with them a little bit when it's like huge university wide events. I don't genuinely know the last time we had an SGA rep, which is why I'm saying I think that was grandfathered in because we definitely didn't have one last year.

iii. **Communication policy**

1. *Michael*: The E-board updated the communications policy and this is just a reflection of that. We wanted to make it clear when we were and were not allowed to send emails on behalf of groups, and we wanted to also have them finalized as quick references. The basic rundown of it is if you're a Homewood-based organization, your events are open to Homewood grads, and you don't spam us with forward request we will forward it on their behalf. The reason why 2.3.4.c.... I'm sure you've noticed there's a certain group that asked us to forward emails on their behalf like every other week, and we don't want to just like spam emails from site groups. So we kind of thought it'd be good to set a limit of like 6 events per semester is enough for us to forward on your behalf.
- b. *Alakarthika*: Motion to approve the bylaw changes
 - i. *Multiple people in the room*: seconded
 - ii. Yea: 30, Nay: 0, Abstain: 0
 - iii. The motion is passed
- c. *Michael*: Now that this has been voted and approved, we plan on sending an email to the entire student body this upcoming week, basically saying here's how you get group recognized through LEED and GRO recognition is no longer a thing.

IV. **Discussion and vote on GRO having an official stance on JHPD**

- a. Introduction:

- i. *Michael*: I wanted to clarify... Previously, I believe it was first ratified 2 years ago, and then reconfirmed last year, but with a new GC, we wanted to give everyone the chance to add on this. There was concerns as to our previous stance, was we were against the formation of JHPD, and there was concerns as to whether or not an organization like our should even have an official stance. Because once you have an official stance, there are certain things you may or may not be willing to do. We have quite a diversity of opinions of different groups here. So there is concerns if we just have kind of one unifying stance on this, then maybe it's not representing everyone. What we've thought the way best to do this is today, we'll discuss basically do we want an official stance? And if we do want an official stance because there's the town halls coming up, we figured we would actually wait to vote on like what the specific nature of that stance would be... is until after the town halls and people can get a really good understanding of what the current JHPD plan is. But there is just kind of the overall general question of given how highly contested the topic this is, we have a lot of different people with a lot of different opinions in this group, whether or not we should have this kind of unified stance. I leave this up to if anyone has any kind of points they'd like to make... feel free to raise your hand; for those who are online, please type questions into the chat or something, so that we can give an order of those who want to ask questions.
 - ii. *Caleb (Security Concerns Chair)*: I'm the current security concerns chair in case anyone has not yet met me. I would say that in my opinion it's good that we have a stance of generalized opposition to the police force here at Hopkins. I think if you look at Bard's record, both his time in PPD as well as his time at Cambridge, there are several examples of students being brutalized at Cambridge and basically him coming out on the side of the officers. We know if you were here during the Garland Hall years, that Hopkins will indeed call police on its own students to usher them out to basically smoke them out. I think the police force represents a greater risk to the student body than the security would provide, especially given the amount of money that the University has sent towards the public safety office to do this, while we are begging for scraps to get an extension on the shuttle route, which I think would be a no-brainer to provide more safety to students. So to me, it's a misplaced sense of priorities with the university, as well as an increased risk to students, especially to those among our international student community and to people of color at this university. I don't think I need to reiterate the points of 2020 and everything we learned there.
- b. Questions and Discussions
- i. *Chloe (History)*: I'd mostly just like to echo Caleb's thoughts and I do agree with everything he said. But since I know that right now, we're actually just studying on whether we should make a statement, I just want to add that, I think it's sort of intellectually lazy and politically dishonest not to make a statement. I think we have an obligation to use what we have here.
 - ii. *Tram (Social Chair)*: I have a little bit of a different stance. I think that we should actually stay neutral just because... taking any kind of stance invites discourse, and if we, as a GRO say one thing, we're basically representing the whole graduate student body saying one opinion, and that might not definitely apply to the whole student body.
 - iii. *Conor (Political Science)*: I wanna be clear... having been involved in the GRO for the last 2 years. It is well within the purview of the GRO to take an advocacy position, specifically advocacy position dealing with relationships between JHU and the greater Baltimore community. That's like right up there upfront in the website, and it's something we've done the entire time we've existed, and I think part of advocacy is you don't wait for a 100% consensus to make an advocacy claim. There is never going to be a 100% consensus on anything, but that doesn't really strip us of the responsibility of doing representative work. Regarding neutrality is a way out of this, or as a way, or not having a position on this, as a way of avoiding flack, I think is substantially misguided, and will invite probably more pushback, than the GRO has ever seen on this matter. We have gotten pushback in a limited extent, mostly just over email in my recollection when I was co-chair, but it wasn't anything like half of the student body getting up in arms, that the GRO did something like this. I think if the GRO moves to a position of neutrality,

especially now with the movement that's happening on it, it's gonna come across we just submitted or just gave up. I'd also note that the KSAS Faculty Senate has voted in the last couple of weeks to approve their own strong disapproval of the private police force, so it's not like this is something that's only something that GRO does. This is very common for any sort of governing student or faculty institution.

- iv. *Ales (Health and Wellness Chair)*: Mainly I just wanted to second what Tram say... But I think a big issue here, as you said.. it's never going to be 100%. But this is a very divisive issue. I feel like this is split quite evenly. I don't think that organizations should be dividing head against one another. I think putting in neutral stance in just welcoming everybody... We'll support you if you apply for a grant or some sort of assistance to have an event, whichever stance... We're welcome to help you with any one of them as long as you're respectful. But this is more accommodating for people in both sides. And I think that's important because there is clearly not any consensus on the issue, and the issue is not black and white.
- v. *Ali Siddiqui (EPS)*: *IN TEXT* An organisation like GRO should have an official stance on JHPD and it should be against it. Hopkins has a long history of using its resources against dissent expressed from any member of the student community and JHPD would only serve to exacerbate that behavior. GRO needs to firmly stand against the go ahead of the JHPD. Rather than use its resources towards community building around its campuses, JHU admin consistently keeps advocating for a private police force which would make it less safe for the wider community.
- vi. *Kathy (Cognitive Science)*: *IN TEXT* I agree with every point Caleb made.
- vii. *Morganne Ottobre (Near Eastern Studies)*: *IN TEXT* Does the GRO have stances on other JHU departments? *SPOKEN* I just didn't know if there was a precedent for the GRO to have an official stance... Has this been a discussion before for other either departments or organizations that the University has created in response to something?
- viii. *Michael*: So other than this specific issue, we've taken stances against specific actions of specific individuals. So like when there was sexual assault allegations by the Harvard professor... As far as other JHU-based organizations... other than the PD, you can maybe make an argument that we took a stance on like JH unionization, which is more just like we would be friendly toward it... I think specifically against like departments at Hopkins. No. I think the GRO should be an organization that is willing to facilitate various conversations and host various conversations. And I felt in the past when there was opportunities to potentially, for example, invite VP Bar to speak. There was a lot of initial pushback against that because of our official stance, and after a conversation to vote, we eventually invited him. But there was a lot more initial push back to facilitating people from JHPD coming... So it's not that I'm against an official stance, I just would wanna make sure that it doesn't strip us of our ability to facilitate conversations and allow people to speak openly and honestly.
- ix. *Ali Siddiqui (EPS)*: I just wanted to address some things which people have already kind of spoken about. As you can already see that has been discussion about this in the GRO before, and we've had a statement put out that there's one on the website right now in 2020. So for those of you who are new here, I just wanted to emphasize the way that Hopkins treats these kind of movements. Hopkins has a very long history of making sure that whenever there's some kind of for dissent towards some of its practices, which it doesn't want people to say anything about, that's the point where they have the strategy to kind of prolong the whole movement, and what they end up doing is they issue a statement in the short term and then try and figure out a way to just dismiss that over a long period of time, and that's exactly what's also happened with the JHPD movement. For those of you who are here for like 3 or 4 years ago, there was a massive moment that happened in 2019 against the JHPD. And I think for some folks who are talking about having a neutral stance, I just wanted to add that having had discussions throughout campus, even via the GRO website, the consensus has been always that Hopkins needs to not have JHPD and so I just wanted to emphasize that this is something which is not new and GRO having an official stance for would be the right thing to do.

- x. *Gabriel (PBS)*: First, it was an argument made if GRO takes a stance, that would encourage discourse. But that would be a great thing right? That would be an awesome thing if we get a bigger discourse about JHPD. It's an important thing to have discourse about it. Also the other argument that it's split evenly whether we have JHPD or not... I'm not sure... I get very much the impression that it's not split evenly at all. Basically, even the entire faculty in PBS is against JHPD and also most of the people we've talked to are against JHPD. The third point I wanna make is us making a statement does not mean that we're not inviting for all the ideas. I think that has to be very important that we're not dismissing all the thoughts and other opinions. We can write a statement that we're against it while saying that we still accept all kinds of opinions, while saying that we still support people making events which would go against that statement. We can say that we're against it without discriminating people that have an opinion for it. And I think that's also something we have to do and in that sense, we're not really fighting people, we're just saying we think that's bad, and something needs to be done about it. Another point is if something really bad is going on, you cannot just say nothing... the JHPD is something that's gonna affect fundamentally the entire community... it's gonna have an effect for years for the next 50 years. It's gonna probably make Baltimore police force even worse because problems there won't be fixed because Hopkins, the big influential company in the city, will have their own police force to solve their problems. Just saying nothing about it is not only lazy, it's like not responsible.
- xi. *Caleb (Security Concerns Chair)*: Yeah, I think actually Gabriel said it very well there. The fact that I obviously have an opposition to this has not stopped me from listening to students and talking with students whose opinions are different than my own. In fact, I welcome other people to email me, email the GRO. I do want to encourage people to voice those opinions, and the fact that I feel in direct opposition as I do, and the fact that we have this wording in place actually makes me feel better to go into a meeting with Bard. Because I have been in opposition for this a while, I've been yelling outside of the building about how bad this is. And now I can meet inside the building and say, hey, this is something that we need to resist, and we need to work against it, and I think we have a position to actually move the needle towards justice rather than more of the status quo. We can argue all day long about what that means, but I wanna be realistic in saying that Hopkins is very committed to this idea of a police force. They've invested millions and millions of dollars... so this is not something that they're just gonna drop because we write a statement, but it does allow us to take a moral and principal position to shape what this will look like. We can operate from a position of higher morality, higher justice, from a position of resistance to rather than just acceptance.
- xii. *Conor Bean (Political Science)*: *IN TEXT* Small note regarding previous vote on original statement opposing the JHPD, the results were 22 yea, 1 nay, 5 abstentions
- xiii. *Exchange PhD student*: Did you consider just taking an opinion amongst students?
- xiv. *Michael*: I don't believe we did that before the previous one... That's something we could do in this interim period between the vote on having a statement or not and then the vote on very specifically what that statement is. But before this meeting we didn't have a poll of the general public. Those are also tricky, because the response rate isn't always fantastic. So it's often hard to base what should the entire hero do based on a public poll, because we may or may not get back good data on that.
- xv. *Conor (Classics)*: I just wanted to say I think as Gabriel raised the question, whether this commits us to anything further... I think there's also the question of whether, if we just simply have the statement, and that's all. And it's also not committing us anything further, whether that's desirable because obviously I have the fear that if we just have this stance and call it there, obviously, there's more that we could probably do to fight this as it continues.
- xvi. *Ales (Health and Wellness Chair)*: What does this stance mean? For the GRO to have the stance... this commence people to individuals who are affiliated with the GRO to go speak for a certain position that I'm afraid I'm not going to be able to serve on the GRO anymore....

- xvii. *Michael*: There's 2 points I want to mirror here: The first one is, I'm very appreciate that people said this: regardless of what stance we take, like if we take a stance against... I want to make sure that we are opening up the conversation. I think like with many of these things, there's silent majority or silent minorities right... we haven't done university-wide polls, so I don't think it's ever fair to make an assumption about the entire graduate student body based on what we know locally.
- xviii. *Gabriel (PBS)*: *IN TEXT* But also regardless of a statement or not there will be pushback meeting organizers of JHPD, I do not think the statement matters. At the same time pushback against meeting people organizing JHPD is wrong IMO.
- xix. *Michael*:
- xx. *Unknown*: I just want to add that... if you want to have a survey, whenever you have GRO events like the coffee hour today, whenever students are scanning, you can just add something like what's your stance on this. People are always coming in for food and you can get some data if you really want it.
- xxi. *Michael*: So we have maybe 150 people show up to these coffee hour although we have more than 5000 grad students... getting a representative sample is very difficult. I think that it's always tricky because like you want to make sure you have enough data that you're actually being representative and when you're less than 30% that kind of gets into a gray area... if you're actually being representative, or if you're representing people who feel extremely strongly about it.
- xxii. *Chloe (History)*: There were a couple of things that have come up that I think it's worth sharing another perspective on. One is the idea that it's a very meaningful distinction to distinguish between voting for neutrality and not taking a stance, because I think by not taking a stance, we are essentially trying to maintain neutrality for ourselves. We're trying to stay out of trouble, we're trying to make sure nobody can blame us. I think the other thing is I know our American democracy is not super highly functioning right now, or maybe ever. But we sort of have some basic understanding of the fact that if you're in the minority, we don't get to discriminate against you just based purely on the fact that you are in the minority. So I think that though... I respect the fact that we're concerned about shutting down conversation up and opening it up, I think that we can sort of take for granted or that if we are at least are somewhat careful about it, we can assume it will work out in the end... like the fact that people who disagree with us we'll kind of assert themselves as much as they need to to get what they need from the GRO. I don't think we have to worry that grad students are going to stop asking us for funding.
- xxiii. *Michael*: When e-board members raise the idea of staying basically not having an opinion, I don't think it is fair say that we want to stay out of trouble. We take a lot of advocacy on a lot of different positions. But the reality is, there is concerns of like are we shutting down the minority, which is a very different thing than we want to stay out of trouble. I know that's how some people may view it, but I just wanna be intellectually honest to why this conversation was brought up. It wasn't so like that if we have a stance, people are going to crack down on us, because there's other things we have stances on in like we do a lot of advocacy, I'm not afraid to have people crackdown on us and other e-board members.
- c. *Michael*: Motion to have a stance on the issue of JHPD
- i. *Alakarthika and multiple people in the room*: Seconded
 - ii. Yea: 27, Nay: 1, Abstain: 3
 - iii. The motion is passed
- d. *Michael*: So the idea is that the town halls are happening... I believe the last one is September 30th, so I think our next GC meeting will happen after that date. We can basically vote on... Thank you Connor for posting that original document on our website.. what all our statements are. I highly recommend in the meantime, basically look over what our previous statement was going into the townhall in mind and then in the next meeting, we will decide what specifically we want to do as far as like a stance, or we want to do an email campaign anything like that. I figured we should give people, especially newer GC reps, time to actually learn more about the topic.

V. Open Discussion & Questions

- a. Time of townhall:
 - i. *Alakarthika*: Just wanna say that the townhall for the JHPD are on the 22nd, 29th, and the 30th.
 - ii. *Caleb*: The first one is at Homewood on the 22nd. I know I will be there and there will be other people there both asking the hard questions in that townhall. There will be people in protest with signage. So come as you are. And we will make sure to resist this to the best of our ability, and in whatever ways you feel comfortable doing. I will have the GRO send out a reminder of this if they haven't been sent out.
 - iii. *Michael*: The one on the 22nd is on Homewood campus. The one on the 29th is at School of Medicine, and the one on 30th is virtually. It's not gonna be a zoom link... it's gonna be basically a hyperlink to their website.
- b. Addressing club funding issue
 - i. *Conor (Classics)*: I remember this club called the Philological Society... former secretary, now member and we just had this problem that we just talked to the administration about like funding to our usual getting our usual funding. And they told us, basically, you've been cut off... like club is being like liquidated... you can just spend out your money. I'm curious how do I even go about addressing that issue? It was a decision made by KSAS finance, but I guess officially, the the money does come through MLL, or rather like it's part of the MLL.
 - ii. *Michael*: I think the issue of department-based club is you first go to your department and see why they cut funding. Unfortunately, if your department says sorry we don't want to fund you, you could potentially go to Christine Kavanaugh or Renee about this. There is also... your group is not excluded from group funding... So if there's a specific event that you need funding for, you could potentially go through the GRO, we give up to up to \$1,000 per semester.
 - iii. *Vinay*: *IN TEXT* Renee Eastwood, rseitz5@jhu.edu, Assistant Dean for Graduate and Postdoctoral, Academic and Student Affairs (for KSAS)
- c. Student disability services request
 - i. *Ales*: Just received a request yesterday from the student disability services. They're conducting an evaluation right now. Want to hear any ideas, opinions, complaints... So I will try to bring this forward to the GRO in the next few days. And we'll have multiple conversations with them, but I just want to go open this up if you can think of something. And in the next week or 2, we'll probably be gathering as much opinion as possible.
 - ii. *Michael*: Previously they sent out a survey, but I don't think they ever published the results.
 - iii. *Ales*: That's what they're working on right now.
 - iv. *Michael*: If they have it done before the next GC meeting, I'll make sure to send out tp all the GC reps to fill out. If they don't have it done before, I'll say Ales's email address is on the GRO website, so you can just directly email them with your concerns. I certainly have a list of stuff that I brought up in the past with them.

VI. Adjournment

- a. *Michael*: Motion to end the meeting
 - i. *Alakarthika*: seconded
 - ii. Yea: 23, Nay: 0, Abstain: 1
 - iii. The motion is passed
- b. The meeting adjourns at 7:20 pm.

VII. Voting Details

Voting Motion ID	2	3	4
Motion	Approve the bylaw changes	Motion to have a stance on the issue of JHPD	Approve to end the 9/19 GC meeting
Anthropology			
Applied Mathematics & Statistics (AMS)			
History of Art	Yea	Yea	Yea
Biology	Yea	Abstain	
Biomedical Engineering (BME)			
Biophysics	Yea	Yea	Yea
Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering			
Chemistry			
Civil Engineering	Yea	Yea	Yea
Classics	Yea	Yea	Yea
Cognitive Science	Yea	Yea	Yea
Computer Science			
Economics	Yea		
Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE)			
Engineering Management	Yea	Yea	Yea
English	Yea	Yea	Abstain
Environmental Health and Engineering (formerly DOGEE)		Yea	Yea
EPS (Earth and Planetary Sciences)	Yea	Yea	
Modern Languages and Literatures (Formerly GRLL)	Yea	Yea	Yea
History	Yea	Yea	Yea
History of Science and Technology	Yea	Yea	
Comp Thought and Literature	Yea	Yea	
Information Security Inst		Yea	
Materials Science & Engineering			
Mathematics			
Mechanical Engineering			
Near Eastern Studies (NES)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Philosophy	Yea	Yea	
Physics and Astronomy		Yea	Yea
Political Science	Yea	Yea	Yea
Psychological and Brain Sciences	Yea	Yea	Yea
Sociology	Yea	Yea	Yea
Writing Seminars			
Robotics			
Co-Chair (Michael Wilkinson)	Yea	Abstain	Yea
Co-Chair (Vinay Mahajan)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Secretary (Karen Yang)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Treasurer (Esther Xu)			
Admin & Funding (KeFan Zhuo)	Yea	Yea	
Social (Alakarthika)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Social (Tram)	Yea	Abstain	Yea
Advocacy (Nicole Chen)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Advocacy (Caroline Maria John)	Yea	Yea	Yea
Communications (Nick Zhang)			
Diversity (Soumya Behera)	Yea		Yea
Graduate Involvement Chair (Heramb Gupta)			
Intercampus Chair (Louise Chen)	Yea	Yea	
E-sports coordinator (Emi Lou Mondragon)			
Health & Wellness (Ales Varabyou)	Yea	Nay	Yea
Security Concerns Chair (Caleb Andrew)			
Yea	30	27	23
Nay	0	1	0
Abstain	0	3	1