Graduate Representative Organization
GC Meeting Agenda
Date/Time: 18:00 PM ET Oct 17th, 2022
Hybrid: Gilman 132, [Zoom](#)

I. **Call to Order and Agenda Review**
   a. The meeting is called to order at 6:07 PM.

II. **Approval of [10/03/22 GC Minutes](#)**
   a. *Alakarthika*: Motion to approve the previous minutes
      i. *Heramb*: Second
      ii. Yea: 31, Nay: 0, Abstain: 1
      iii. The motion is passed

III. **EBoard Reports (Vinay & Michael):**
   a. Gradually Shifting GC Meeting Format
      i. *Michael*: We're thinking about gradually shifting the meeting format, but gradually there. According to the bylaws, in the event that the GC is unable to meet in person due to extreme circumstances, we may basically meet online. However, we have noticed that, and I think this is a fair statement, which is when you're online, it's a lot harder to pay attention and not want a multitask… generally I've noticed participation is a lot lower because many people are online. In the spring, we'd like to move into in-person completely, but for today, we would like to just request that you turn your cameras on during the meeting. If you're not able to because you're not set up in a place to do that, or whatever that's completely fine. Again if you need to turn it off temporarily to go do something, rest, or whatever it's fine like… we're not gonna like police this heavily…
      ii. *Chloe*: I just wanna kind of gently interrogate what feels like a little bit of a surveyly tone to that… If we're participating enough to register our votes in the way that we feel represents our department and our department's interests, I don't understand fully what the benefit to the rest of the reps, knowing that our eyes are on the screen all the time, and I will say that it's a very interactive meeting anyway, right the fact that we have to be typing into the chat bar and registering our votes, we do have to be attentive. But it seems like imposing what feels like a sort of freshman-level surveillance onto graduate students…. who are, you know, colleagues and scholars?
      iii. *Michael*: We're not trying to do that… I'll be completely frank when I was a LCSR rep… I paid attention, but I often I would chat with people and people would be like… Oh, crap there's a vote, let me quickly read the discussion and hit yeah… Granted there's a lot of people who actively chime in and chat and have conversations. But realistically, it's often the conversation between 2 or 3 people total in the GC. It wasn't like that before we move to zoom.
      iv. *Chloe*: I'm a fifth year student here, so it's not that I became a graduate student during the era of zoom or something. And I'm seeing a lot of people in the chat who seem to feel the same way, and it might

be easy if those people were willing to speak up, or if we could read these comments out just so that we're on the same page about this kind of thing?

v. *Unknown*: Yeah, Hello! I'm one of the students typing in the chat. I can't put my camera on for a number of reasons, but I just wanted to say that especially given the time of day of the business meetings at 6 pm, that can pose a number of problems for reps trying to be camera on during attending the zoom meetings. It can be really tricky to have the proper setup for that. So I just wanted to second Chloe's concerns.

vi. *Michael*: I mean part of what we put here is… We're not gonna force you to do anything more…. It was more just a request and if you have the capacity to we'd like you to do. We're all adults, I'm not gonna force you to do some of your situation doesn't entail it. Again, these meetings used to be in person… so there was this in person component.

vii. *Caroline*: I just wanna note that… if it were an in-person thing where everyone was mandated to attend in person, that would be a different story. But for a lot of us, different socioeconomic status, different factors play into the role that.. some of us are maybe not allowed into our building past a certain time, or allowed into our offices, and like physically, do not have the capacity to zoom in from a professional desk space. I think that… it has differential effects, depending on socioeconomic status, depending on background, etc. Some of us, we don't have a space that we feel comfortable turning our cameras on during zoom meetings, and that is completely okay, and we should still be represented. Zoom is a really powerful tool. It can be incredibly harmful in some senses, so let's set a great precedent and make sure that no one feels that they shouldn't be able to share their point of view, because they come from a different socioeconomic status, they have a different housing situation. I think that's actually incredibly exclusionary and really just not the right way to go. Not everyone is comfortable vocalizing those preferences, those needs… we don't need to interrogate people… no one should have to have extenuating circumstances to be in a constant recurring situation where it's just not possible for them. And honestly I think we're actually targeting people that don't have that don't feel comfortable doing that by saying extenuating circumstances, which can mean a lot of things… that could mean having to explain yourself in a way that no one should be obligated to.

viii. *Michael*: I think for now, we'll just stick with it being a request. I don't think we're gonna move to like requirement or shifting format or anything like that. If we do ship format in person over the spring, like those will be conversations towards the end of fall.

ix. *Unknown*: I just want to vocalize that a lot of people in the chat are also talking about the fact that a lot of us live off campus with long walks in the dark. I just wanted to put that on everyone's radar as well, as we consider moving fully in person in the spring.

x. *Caleb*: If we are going to do this in person, I would request that we try to actually keep these meetings on time, because asking that people do a whole work day, and then hang out and buy their own dinner, because there used to be a thing that was offered, but isn't anymore, and then stick around until like 8:39 is a little bit unreasonable of an expectation. Even if this is something we all volunteer for, I still think that is something to be considered, that we're asking a lot of our GC reps here.

b. Freedom of Speech Concerns Email

i. *Michael*: Given recent student protest events taking place at Town Halls regarding the implementation of the JHPD, the GRO is aware of ongoing conflicts between student protestors, university administration, and campus security. Though we disagree with many of the policies, we want to keep our graduate students safe. We wanna make sure that we're keeping students safe and providing them with what the university allows. Again, I don't agree with what the University allows, but I'd rather students know about these specific guidelines.

ii. *Caroline*: We actually had this discussion about how we should send out this mail. We thought that it would be better if we mentioned explicitly that we did not agree with all of the policies that we put out there, but since we want the students to be safe on campus and stick to the policies that the university mandated, we put it out in such a way that we have all the required policies…

iii. *Nicole*: We're gonna make like a short statement, saying the GRO is aware of what's going on right now. We also provide them with who they can reach out to if they're facing hearings. In the second page, these are some of the list that we say what you can do, and you cannot do based on the student conduct… Also like additional information about the resources where we find all this.

c. EBoard is meeting with President Daniels Oct 24th

i. *Michael*: President Daniel's wanted to specifically meet with the Eboard on October 24th in our next Eboard meeting. We want to basically open up the floor: if you have any questions to ask, you can put it in the chat or feel free to email us.

d. GRO Conference Grants Round 1 Complete and Winners Selected

i. *Michael*: We also want to let you know that conference grants one was completed. We had 4 of the 20 participatns that were selected as winners of the conference grants. Unfortunately, there are some departments… And we got some emails about this and we're gonna be actively investigating the departments that… to double check that they actually did miss all the meetings that made them ineligible. We want to emphasize that it's extremely important for you all to attend these GC meetings and that if there are any departments you have colleagues that don't have reps, encourage those departments to join! The next lottery is in the first week of January for applications submitted by the end of December.

ii. *Morganne*: We're one of the departments that is contesting that we weren't here last semester and we've just been trying to reach out to members of the GRO for about a week and a half, so I just wanted to know a timeframe when we can expect to hear back.

iii. *Michael*: I only saw the last email that you sent today. I unfortunately didn't see the previous email so apologies for that, but I'll be following up basically within the next couple of days with Karen, who would have a specific statistics on that. The moment we sort that out, we'll get it back to you.

iv. *Emily*: I'm a new GC rep, I just started about a month ago, and our department was also one of the ones those are excluded, and I know that you're looking into that… I just wanna make sure this doesn't happen again, so can you comment on how attendance is taken?

v. *Michael*: We've kind of improved it for this year. Basically the voting is how we take attendance. If we have recorded that you voted during meetings, we know that you were in attendance.

vi. *Unknown*: How do we know if we met the eligibility requirements? I don't think my department had any people who applied for this round, but I want to ensure that anybody applying for the next round will be marked as eligible rather than ineligible.

vii. *Michael*: We have kept that on the website that was recently updated. But on the conference grant form and on the website, there should be a list of eligible departments. I've asked our communication chair and secretary to update thatm so hopefully, that should be up to date.

viii. *Caroline*: We should be really on top of making sure that, especially newly appointed, GRO reps, are invited and have access to the mailing list, to have access to all the resources necessary to participate in these meetings.

ix. *Michael*: No, I totally agree. Typically, whenever we get a new rep, we try our best to basically get them on the mailing list as fast as possible. We had to go back and forth on it a little bit. We also now have the room listed on our website.

x. *Heramb*: To the point where everyone is raising that there should not be a requirement of attendance for getting grant access… They are discussed last year… The GC believed that, it was kind of necessary, because that makes sure that everyone is present and active. And that is the reason we have that in the bylaw system.

xi. *Michael*: We actually hosted the poll. Isaiah hosted a poll and we asked if the grant thing wasn't a requirement would you attend this GC meeting, and I think 33% of people said no.

xii. *Chloe*: I recognize now might not be the time for this discussion, but I think that we really do need to address the fact that the reason that we should be drawn to this meeting is that we're doing important things, and I think some of us are objecting to the fact that it feels like a lot of what we do in these meetings is elect a social chair, which maybe doesn't feel like the kind of thing that motivates us to attend something at 6 PM on a Monday night after a long day working. I think that.. the kind of work we're doing tonight, this is the kind of stuff that people want to show up for. I think a lot of times we meet, we don't do work on this scale. And I think it's not surprising that people won't show up for that, and the fact that we're hearing first year master students representing departments… How well those students are able to meaningfully represent a department or how well somebody who's abroad is able to meaningfully represent a department? A lot of the times, the departments are finding anyone who can dig deep enough to show up for these, and the fact that we're able to get a quorum just for the sake of having a quorum maybe isn't telling us what we imagine it's telling us. And so maybe this form of reward system isn't actually doing what we hope it's doing.

xiii. *Michael*: There is, unfortunately, the reducible minimum of people which again was something like a third of the people last year that they say I would not attend these if it wasn't for this. I fully agree with

you that hopefully, this shouldn't be the incentive and you should just want to attend because we're discussing important things. To your second point, we open people to submit items to the agenda however they want. What ends up happening, at least for these past couple weeks… No one's really been submitting anything, so it's just kind of been like what the Eboard can reasonably generate, which you know we're one specific group of people; we don't represent all the departments… there might be more innovative or more pressing things that maybe we're just glossing over so we would love for all of these meetings to be exactly like this meeting.

xiv. *Heramb*: I do realize that we have to discuss significant and important things that matter. That is the reason I came up with the concept of the focus group meetings when I every week emailed the GC Reps. But frankly I don't think I've held any meeting for the last 3 weeks, because the form which I circulate is empty and that is not even a single GC rep who wants to talk about something significant. What the concept of that is if any GC reps want to talk about something, they can voice or open it to me, I can get in front of the Eboard, and then we can put that in the GC meeting, so that GC can talk about it. But again, there is not a lot of participation there.

xv. *Michael*: I do think having a warning system is a good idea.

IV. GRO stance on JHPD (Caleb Andrews)
a. Discussion and vote on [Final Statement]
   i. *Michael:* We had a lot of really great feedback from folks on this statement, we've got this nice draft together on the screen up here. Basically, what we're voting on today, is if we want this statement to be our statement.
   ii. **Changes made:** corrected several minor grammatical errors
   iii. *Caleb*: Outside of the 2 grammatical changes, how do people feel about the total striking and the overall message? I think that's kind of critical before we talk about how to send this out, when to send this out, etc.
   iv. *Chloe*: Yeah, I think in general, I was pretty impressed by a lot of the ideas expressed here. These are things I would stand behind and I think that students of the history department would.
   v. *Michael*: We really try to strike that balance of like… We want this to be like a dialogue, and we want to work with the Public Safety office to do other things.
   vi. *Alakarthika*: Motion to approve this to be our statement to be sent out
      1. *Unknown*: Second
      2. Yea: 36, Nay: 0, Abstain: 0
      3. The motion is passed
b. Discussion and vote on when to send out the Final Statement
   i. *Michael*: The harder discussion is a discussion on when to send this out... this is tricky for a couple of reasons…. First, we are currently working with Dr. Bard to get hand in shuttle routes now. In a perfect world, we could send this out and Dr. Bard can be an adult and just be like, yeah. But you also want to make sure that public safety will keep working with you. I'm a little bit reticent to send it out right now in the middle negotiations with him… I can very easily see him turning on, saying like, oh you're super against my department; we're not giving you any funding again. Point number 2, someone sent us an email basically stating that there was that email chain that went out recently with the string of armed robberies or shootings or something like that. So it might be worthwhile to actually send a poll out to the graduate student body, if they are okay with this statement.
   ii. *Chloe*: I think it seems to me that theoretically we're representatives…. and we in all these other ways we act on behalf of the graduate student body. And so it doesn't seem to me this is a particularly different case.
   iii. *Caleb*: I see these emails, and I try to respond to people who send these reports to me with their concerns. I certainly agree with the point that it's okay, admin does have a narrative here, that especially now, I don't think they're sending us out in 2018 prior to kind of mention of the police force, but I think more towards how do we wanna shape that survey. If we send out, do you support or not support the JHPD, that is not going to be a very effective tool. And so if we actually want to poll the student body, my input here is the security current concerns chair is… can we also use this opportunity to ask about what are other alternative measures you would like to see and actually have it be a more impactful survey. But I'm also open to just sending it out, saying, do you support an armed private police force on campus. I think, in the interest of time, I would learn toward the first option of just sending out a very basic one-question poll.

iv. *Michael*: I guess, like a bridged version of that… we could always send a survey with the pdf with this statement, and just say like, do you support the GRO sending out this statement. I think that at minimum we should wait 2 weeks.

v. *Caleb*: I do think that this also allows us to understand what students are actually feeling about this. They know, and we also account all reaction and all these things. But I think this is also good data for us to know where people are feeling towards.

vi. *Michael*: So maybe what we can do as an intermediate step is we can vote on having a survey, and then we can always move the actual approval of the specific survey to an email vote. So we don't have to wait for the next GC meeting to vote on that. In that way, Caleb can start drafting that up and then, the moment that's completed, we can kind of send it to the email list and have a 24-hour discussion period and vote on this survey.

vii. *Alakarthika*: Motion to approve making a survey for students
   1. *Unknown*: Second
   2. Yea: 31, Nay: 0, Abstain: 1
   3. The motion is passed

V. Discussion on Reaffirming/Updating Pro-[TRU](#) Union Statement (Michael Wilkinson/Caleb Andrews)
   a. [Past Statement](#)
      i. *Michael*: As the TRU Union campaign is gaining traction, we're going to start seeing anti-union propaganda/email blasts from admin. We had previously supported TRU's campaign in the fight for COVID-19 related issues, so putting our support behind them now can help bolster their overall union efforts. We would like to open a discussion/vote on making a new/updated statement and what the overall sentiment of that statement would be.
      ii. *Caleb*: I think specifically in the past, we supported the survey for increased wages and in basically trying to forward that, and I know both myself and other members of TRU in the past basically have the GRO circulate event flyers, which I know we can continue to do. The point where we are at right now in our campaign, we're gonna be doing a car drop on the 25th, and so trying to reach people that haven't yet been reached, this is basically, perhaps an endorsement for students who might feel threatened by this anti-union campaign that we we're expecting or seeing. I know we've had international student organizers tell us their professors have had them a lot of misinformation of like oh, this is gonna hurt your chances of employment and stuff like this. And so hopefully, the goal of this for me is to assuage some of those fears, because we can't file a 1 million dollar complaints and expect any action against a university this powerful in size. So I think word of mouth, and the word of fellow graduate students goes a much longer way than filing complaints to Government office.
      iii. *John*: *IN TEXT* I think that a pro-TRU statement is a good idea. My department would certainly be very supportive. I am not sure if that would complicate GRO's other work with the Admin though, who, as you mentioned, might be petty
      iv. *Michael*: John to your point: so I've actually talked at least with Christine Kavanaugh about this before, and I think at first, there's a little bit of misunderstanding of why we would be supported with that. But I think a lot of admin, at least ones that we work with directly, understand why and at the very least know at the end of the day, we're representative organization, right? So we are representing what our constituents want, and that's what our constituents want, like who are we to not do that. And they understand that. So I wouldn't worry about the admin that we specifically work with.
      v. *Tram*: On the topic of TRU hanging out flyers at GRO events, as a social chair, I would ask that TRU either gets GRO approval in advance, or let us know in advance for approval. The last coffee hours, I know TRU dropped in and like just left flyers there without informing all of us. We just don't want to be ambiguous on whether or not we are or not supporting TRU , and what our stances officially, so just want to have that clear moving onwards. I just wanna make it clear that, as right now, all social events if I see a TRU flyer without prior notice or prior approval from the Eboard, I will remove it. I just want to make that clear since the GRO have not made a clear stance or anything.
      vi. *Heramb*: I think that if someone wants to put up their flyers in an event, it should specifically go through another permission in respect to who that organization is, because keeping their flyers at an event says that you're supporting that event, and we have a significant way of approving distributions from the GRO.
   b. *Alakarthika*: Motion to make a new or updated statement
      i. *Unknown*: seconded

      ii.   Yea: 31, Nay: 0, Abstain: 2
      iii. The motion is passed

VI. Follow-up from Meeting with Dean Celenza
    a. Discussion:
      i. *Michael*: We just wanted to follow up with the KSAS reps who were able to attend, kind of like what their overall sentiment of the meeting with the Dean was like. How likely is it do you think that he'll listen to your concerns that he'll actually be able to achieve the concerns that you have? We proposed the same question to the advisors, and the feedback we got from that side of it was that they thought that meeting went positively, that there's a lot of good ideas that you guys gave him to tackle, and that like he's prioritizing a lot of things.
      ii. *Heramb*: A lot of KSAS reps had submitted a list of questions we wanted to ask, and hope we would be able to discuss. So he just summarized them into 3 sets/domains; one was the sense of community, which is there in the KSAS in general, the physical spaces there are, and types of financial support. He took what questions and concerns regarding all 3 of them and he talked about how there are resources which the KSAS has set up, especially for PhD students who are graduating or facing problems because of Covid. One thing I would like to mention to not only the KSAS reps but also the WSE reps is how the students of their departmenst do not have adequate places to hold office hours or meetings, or study, because of how the offices are organized. So one thing I would like to bring to attention to everyone is that, GRO has a Levering lounge, even though it is not a very big space, students have access to that now.
      iii. *Unknown*: I thought it was ultimately useful and I'm glad that the lunch happened, and I would like more of these to occur. I do think that with regards to certain issues, the answer was presented to our reps as this is an issue that you should bring to your department chair rather than to the deans, and I'm not sure the utility of that, because ultimately all of these issues our department chairs would then have to bring to the Deans anyway. So in some cases, I think it was useful, but in some cases, I think the answer was basically, go back and talk to someone else, kind of twisting conversation into a loop of who was supposed to talk to whom.
      iv. *Michael*: So I can kind of guess what those were, but I guess we'll start with like what were the parts that you felt were useful, non-loopy conversation?
      v. *Unknown:* We had a very useful conversation about the problems faced by international students in terms of funding, and the way in which a lot of the funding systems have been failing international students. Renee Eastwood really jumped on that, and we talked about a lot of really good options for how to fix that system. So I think that more meetings to discuss how to make it absolutely certain that international students are paid on time would be great. I think that would be useful.
      vi. *Michael:* Cool, what are the loopy parts?
      vii. *Unknown*: I speak here largely for the humanities departments… I do think they directly addressed STEM students who are talking about facilities issues with their spaces, and the fact that it does seem like the university plans to resolve major facilities issues in STEM labs. But for space issues faced by humanity students who are largely squished into Gilman without individual offices and often without even working spaces, the Dean basically said just go to your department chairs, but that's going to be a major university issue, because the building is over full. So that's a bigger issue that I would love somebody to address, and it's clear the Deans aren't gonna do that. But our program directors won't be able to fix it on their own. So that I think, was ignored.
      viii. *Michael*: I mean it might be worthwhile to let your department chairs know that this is what the Dean said, and maybe putting some of the onus back on them. For WSE folks online, would you like us to try reaching out to the Dean and set up something similar for WSE? We have one Caleb nod, which is maybe enough to go off of, and a lot of maybe silent nods. Vinay and I can reach out to the Dean amd set something up.
    b. Notes provided by *Kathryn (Classics)*:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zoIXE1WBBEcc9BJWc_0anLbUeOYZ26yf_D2AH_moqHM/edit?usp=sharing

VII. Open Discussion & Questions
    a. Salary-related union effort

i. *John*: I don't know how much of this information is spread around the school, but the physics and astronomy department related to all of this the Union effort, and all this other stuff, sent a letter to the vice deans, with signatures from the students and the professors as well, asking for a meeting, talking about pay issues and sort of the lack of keeping the pay up and sort of just tying into this like dean's meeting. So before that, we had received information that, at sort of the Dean level, after the computer science department had raised pay for their students, that the Deans had sent out an order saying basically, no departments should be raising their pay for anyone unilaterally. But then, as we had these as our departments representatives started having these meetings with different Deans, they started giving us the same thing that Dean Salensus gave us saying basically, oh no, like you know, we just set a base and then the departments can set their own pay. And so I guess I found that sort of a major turnoff from the meeting of the same sort of pattern of… who is responsible for what and dishonesty regarding who does what?

ii. *Michael*: Yeah, I think the most generous interpretation of this that I've gotten from talking to some admin was that, I don't agree with it, but this idea of like departments can raise their stipends if they want, but they need to get approval from the Dean's office, and then they were upset with CS that they basically just did it unannounced, it never ran it by the Dean's office. Yeah that's a very generous interpretation. And from admin, there is maybe that gray area. But I agree, there is a little bit of this run around I'm like no you need to get permission from the deans, and it's like well, no, just go to your department and do it. And then cycle back and forth.

iii. *John*: So I guess that's why I view this all as sort of part of a broader anti-union effort, because it seems sort of just like the heat coming to them is started to increase gradually with students continuing to ask about pay and so they've been looking for things, and now they keep talking about… They mentioned this in the dean lunch too about this. They have an announcement coming in November about some potential pay raise or something like that. And I think that's sort of one of their ways of trying to kind of cool the temperature of things.

iv. *Michael*: So one thing on this topic… and I mentioned this earlier on: I actually gave a presentation to MechE folks today… Basically, it was like a myth-busting of like anti union propaganda. If people would like those… it basically just goes through like what is a union, what is collective bargaining, here's myths you're going to hear… if there are reps here that would like those slides to be presented for their own departments, or to send to students in their own departments and maybe assuage some of their fears, I'm more than happy to send those, so please just reach out to me if you would like those slides.

b. Changing zoom name in waiting room
   i. *Myriel Kim:* *IN TEXT* smaller technical fyi: there is no way for someone in a zoom waiting room to change their profile name or respond to messages from the host without joining.
   ii. *Michael*: There's no way for someone in a zoom waiting room to change the profile… I think we're gonna do a 2 tier system on this. So one, please try your best to just remember when you're joining the meeting to have both your name and your department. But we will also have a list of reps here, and Karen, you can have that off to side. And then like obviously, if we recognize you, we'll let you in if we don't recognize you. I think we're just trying to avoid, like the crazy bot situation that we got last time.
   iii. *Manuel (LCSR)*: *IN TEXT* You can't change it while on the waiting room but you can change it before you join.

VIII. Adjournment
a. *Unknown*: Motion to end the meeting
   i. *Unknown*: seconded
   ii. Yea: 31, Nay: 0, Abstain: 0
   iii. The motion is passed
b. The meeting adjourns at 7:35 pm.

IX. Voting Details

Voting Motion ID	11	12	13	14	15
Motion	Approve the GC meeting minutes on 10/03	Approve the JHPD final statement	Approve making a survey for students	Approve to make a statement for Pro-Union	Approve to end the 10/17 GC meeting
Anthropology			Yea	Yea	Yea
Applied Mathematics & Statistics (AMS)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
History of Art	Yea	Yea		Yea	Yea
Biology	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	
Biomedical Engineering (BME)	Yea		Yea		Yea
Biophysics					
Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering	Abstain	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Chemistry	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Civil Engineering	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Classics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Cognitive Science	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Computer Science					
Economics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	
Engineering Management		Yea			
English	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Environmental Health and Engineering (formerly DOGEE)	Yea	Yea		Yea	Yea
EPS (Earth and Planetary Sciences)					
Modern Languages and Literatures (Formerly GRLL)	Yea	Yea		Yea	Yea
History	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
History of Science and Technology	Yea	Yea		Yea	Yea
Comp Thought and Literature	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Information Security Inst					
Materials Science & Engineering					
Mathematics					
Mechanical Engineering	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Near Eastern Studies (NES)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Philosophy		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Physics and Astronomy	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Political Science	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Psychological and Brain Sciences	Yea	Yea			
Sociology					
Writing Seminars					
Robotics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Abstain	Yea
Co-Chair (Michael Wilkinson)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Co-Chair (Vinay Mahajan)	Yea	Yea	Abstain		Yea
Secretary (Karen Yang)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Treasurer (Esther Xu)	Yea	Yea	Yea		
Admin & Funding (KeFan Zhuo)		Yea	Yea	Yea	
Social (Alakarthika)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Social (Tram)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Advocacy (Nicole Chen)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Advocacy (Caroline Maria John)		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Communications (Nick Zhang)					
Diversity (Soumya Behera)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Graduate Involvement Chair (Heramb Gupta)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Abstain	
Intercampus Chair (Louise Chen)					
E-sports coordinator (Emi Lou Mondragon)					
Health & Wellness (Ales Varabyou)					
Security Concerns Chair (Caleb Andrew)		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Yea	31	36	31	31	31
Nay	0	0	0	0	0
Abstain	1	0	1	2	0