



## Graduate Representative Organization

### GC Meeting Agenda

Date/Time: 18:00 PM ET Nov 14th, 2022

Online: [Zoom](#)

---

#### I. Call to Order and Agenda Review

- a. The meeting is called to order at 6:06 PM.

#### II. Approval of [10/31/2022 Minutes](#)

- a. *Caleb*: Motion to approve the 10/31 meeting minutes
  - i. *Michael*: Seconded
  - ii. Yea: 31, Nay: 0, Abstain: 1
  - iii. The motion is passed

#### III. EBoard Reports (Vinay & Michael)

##### a. GRO email fixed but some emails are not visible

- i. *Vinay*: The GRO email is fixed, but some of the previous board emails are not visible. We are just letting you know this information because just in case you have to go and find any information from like the last 2 or 3 year, then it's a little hard for us.
- ii. *Michael*: Basically, just everyone is aware of what happened... So I guess, like GRO JHU is just an alias for some other email, and it was originally being aliased to an email that was no longer working. But I think, the JHU IT just never caught it, so it kind of just barely worked, and then I don't know IT didn't update or something like that, and just everything crashed, the list got messed up like all of that. So they finally have us migrated over to the correct email. But that means that all of the old emails from the one that we were previously hosted on are completely gone. So, if there are things from like a month ago, or something that we haven't gotten back to you on, please resend that to us, because we're basically on a completely new inbox. But it should be all set now.

##### b. Election Preview

- i. *Vinay*: Some of the EBoard members will be graduating after the current semester, so we will be having elections for the following positions the next GC meeting, since it will be the last GC meeting for the semester.
- ii. *Michael*: We'll be sending out an email to all the graduate students hopefully tomorrow morning about elections, so that people have enough time to do nominations and things like

- that. But we wanted to give you guys a heads up also because elections make the meetings go really long, so please attend on time so that we can really just knock through these elections.
- iii. Needed Positions
    1. Co-Chair (1)
    2. Social Chair (1)
    3. Advocacy Chairs (2)
    4. Health and Wellness Chair (1)
    5. Funding Chair (1)
  - c. **Reminder of [Attendance and Conference Lottery](#)**
    - i. *Vinay*: The next thing is just a reminder of the GC attendance and conference grant eligibility. Conference grant eligibility is determined by the attendance of a department's elected/appointed representative. In order to be eligible, a department must attend at least 50% of GRO General Council meetings on the semester prior to the current lottery period.
    - ii. *Michael*: The next lottery is happening basically at the end of December. And then we'll pull the results in January. So basically this semester is worth of attendance is what counts for the the next lottery. For those who are getting close to ineligibility, we reached out to all of you. And we also have the eligibility at the top of the agenda each time, so we'll make sure to keep people in the loop on that.
  - d. **Call for headshots**
    - i. *Vinay*: We haven't received the headshots from all the GC members yet. For those who have already sent it, thank you so much. For those that haven't sent it, please forward it to us.
  - e. **E-board will be meeting with President Daniels and Nancy Kass on Nov 29th**
    - i. *Vinay*: If the GC members have any questions, please send them to us.

#### IV. Group Funding Requests (Kefan Zhou)

- a. Thanksgiving Gospel Event by Chinese-Speaking Christine Fellowship
  - i. *Enze*: We invite JHU students and scholars to join this special event to celebrate Thanksgiving. We will use this opportunity to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ to JHU students and scholars and address their questions and doubts in Christianity. The event will feature worship songs and testimony share, followed by a dinner that facilitates small-group follow-up conversations. This special event is open to all JHU departments and campuses. We believe it will be a great opportunity for JHU students and scholars to gather, to learn more about Christianity, and to make new friends. It has been held several times in past years during the Thanksgiving holiday and has always been well received by the participants. The time of the event will be November 19th 4:30pm - 8:30pm. The expected attendance is 60 with 45 graduate students. The event budget is \$800: we are requesting \$750 from the GRO (<95% limit) while raise the other \$50 through contribution from group members. \$300 will be for the speaker fee, \$450 for food and non-alcoholic drinks, and \$50 for supplies (including utensils and flyers).
  - ii. Questions
    1. *Michael*: Do you have a location already?
    2. *Enze*: Yes, we have the location already, we have booked Charles Commons for the event.
    3. *Michael*: Do you also have the speaker ready to go?
    4. *Enze*: Yes, we also have the speaker reserved and ready to go.
    5. *KeFan*: How are you going to ask for the 50USD?
    6. *Enze*: We are going to raise the funding from our 20-30 group members. Participants won't have to pay any money to join the event.

7. *Trevor (Robotics)*: The wording feels a bit like you are trying to push a bit more Christianity on people. I don't know if the GRO wants to be caught up on some religious things. If this is something about pushing Christianity, I'm not sure if GRO should fund this.
  8. *Enze*: This event is open to everyone, people of all faith.
  9. *Michael*: Can you walk us through how the event will go? The schedule? Maybe that will take away some of the concerns people have.
  10. *Enze*: We're going to start around 5pm and start from playing the song and singing together. That's going to be like half an hour or something. Then we're gonna have the speaker to give an introduction of Thanksgiving, of how Thanksgiving is related to Christianity, until around 6 or 6:30. Then we're going to have dinner. We aim to end the event around 8. We will certainly still admit people if they show up late or don't come to the first sessions.
  11. *Trevor*: Just for clarification, will the speaker be in English or Chinese?
  12. *Enze*: The speaker will be in Chinese, but when the speaker presents, we will translate it sentence by sentence to English.
  13. *Kathryn (Classics)*: Could you say more about the content of the speech, as it regards to the so-called Thanksgiving story, and the impact upon native American people?
  14. *Enze*: Because we have this event before, we tend to connect the Thanksgiving story to Christianity behind the the entire background. The story is about when people came from England, they suffer from lots of restrictions of religious freedom, so they decided to move here. But they suffer from lack of food in the winter, so they had to get help from the Indians. There are also lots of things from the Constitution that are actually inspired by the Bible, so we're just trying to connect these things, and relate Thanksgiving to get a very brief introduction to Christianity to the student who are not familiar with it.
- iii. *KeFan*: Motion to approve the 750 USD funding for the Chinese-Speaking Christine Fellowship event
1. *Unknown*: Seconded
  2. Yea: 22, Nay: 4, Abstain: 12
  3. The motion is passed

## V. Discussion of [New Draft JHPD Statement](#)

- a. *Michael*: After this meeting, I wanna give at least a week or so for people to continue editing this draft. This is just us putting something ahead of time and just like, hey, here are the general ideas that we're trying to encapsulate and wanted to get feedback on, and then we'll have like a week or 2 depending on what we decide at the end of this meeting, or at the end of this discussion to actually hammer out the full draft, so we're not voting on this today. The tone of the statement, as you can tell, is pretty drastically shifted, so right now it's kind of like a town hall, open panel of like our thoughts on the things that are encapsulated in the new statement. And if there are things that we should be encapsulating instead, other ideas that we might want to include in here, things that are in here currently that we don't want in here. It's just a discussion on like the current statement on this draft.
- b. *Unknown*: I saw a suggestion in the mail... I think it was by Caleb about having 2 separate mails and just sending out the results of the poll and then also thinking about a statement separately. I would suggest first talking about separating them, because I think that's a very good idea.

- c. *Michael*: I think it's a reasonable discussion to have. My only concern of just sending out the poll is we'd have to put some text around the poll and do we literally just want to say: here are the results, please stay tuned for an actual statement from us. It seems like that's not very useful, like to not say something more actually in depth about the results of the poll. But I'm open to hear what other people think on that.
- d. *Caleb*: I think, with a week of time to draft it, as long as everyone has time to discuss and provide input into what they need to do.... And that was my only concern with that sort of a comment... was basically let's just make sure that everyone has enough time to talk and work on this, rather than just let's send out as soon as possible. My only feedback to this, in addition to what I edited there, I think this is great, because it only focuses on the stuff that people agree on, which one of my initial concerns of sending out a statement that was sort of just saying, well we're in the middle, and oh that it'll anger people from either side of this argument. I think that's probably the best we can do with this sort of state.
- e. *Morganne Ottobre (Near Eastern Studies)*: \*IN TEXT\* I think they need to be kept together - just receiving the results may be confusing, and I think students will want to know why we asked for their input. I think we need to be honest with the division and highlight that we all agree that safety on campus is important.
- f. *Caleb Andrews (Sec. Concern Chair)*: \*IN TEXT\* Yeah I agree, more clear on the messaging.
- g. *Kathryn (Classics)*: About the section that Caleb highlighted in that paragraph. The solutions we originally proposed are the ones that we're currently working on implementing. As Caleb noted in the comment, Dr. Bard isn't necessarily working with us on all of these solutions. I'm just curious about why we're taking responsibility for this, because I feel like the tone has shifted from we are opposed to JHPD to we are working with the University, and I think in that shift, there's a problem in terms of do we have any particular power in the situation? I wonder if we're ultimately taking responsibility for something that we don't actually have much power to change is sort of something that concerns me.
- h. *Michael*: No I mean that's a very fair point. I mean we do have the ability to annoy people in a way that other random students can't and potentially push the needle forward on it. But I agree this isn't something that we have full responsibility on, and I think in wording, I agree with Caleb, better messaging, it is definitely helpful on this. What I didn't want is here's things we need to have done with the graduate representative organization. We're just saying they need to be done and we're not going to show that we're making any effort, to help the graduate students right because like I think there's some expectation that the GRO has some ability to at least be the advocates for the students, and try to push things forward a little bit, because we have some amount of power to do that right?
- i. *Kathryn (Classics)*: I think it would be more truthful and hopefully more actually impactful if specifically, that sentence and any other sentences that talk about working with the office of public safety, focus upon the fact that we are calling for these changes to be enacted, because they're not currently being enacted, and what we have noticed through the survey is that, by and large the the overall agreement on the survey is that people don't feel safe, and what's happening is that nothing the University is doing is making everyone else, but like the graduate students as a whole feel safe because we don't.
- j. *Unknown*: Are we sending the data with which was before you publish the interim results? Or was it the data which in the end was there?

- k. *Michael*: So it depends... So no matter what, we'll be publishing data that's just filtered for Homewood students. Just because we're the Homewood graduate organization, and I think it makes more sense for us to send things Homewood-related. There's also a very statistically different bias with the kind of way the voting goes for the East Baltimore versus Homewood, which makes sense because they have different concerns than our students do to some degree on some things. I did, unfortunately noticed that pretty quickly, after sending out that email through various channels, that there was just a sudden spike in the amount of people who were surveying. Maybe that was just people reaching out, but the time correlation between that going out and the spike in the number of respondents seems like it was pretty clearly like people trying to potentially biasing the data. Not that I'm saying people were filling it out multiple times, but they might be checking out to their friends and saying, hey, the GRO might be leaning this way. I don't want... it's not my job to point fingers. It was more just that there was clearly data biasing, so I'm more inclined to send that interim analysis as opposed to the results now, but I'm also open to people's feedback on that.
- l. *Unknown*: I totally agree with Michael. It's a total bias... you cannot show the final results now... like you need to show the pre-results. I was just thinking that maybe to give it more depth... If people have been biased then of course people from one side and the other side would have been sending out to their friends actively vote for it. So this will actively influence the end result.
- m. *Kathryn (Classics)*: I absolutely see why that's a problem, but the issue would not have happened, if the interim data hadn't been released. I get why we can't say like the results were biased, and we can't release them. But it still feels like since that was a problem that happened, we can't just pretend it didn't happen in terms of dealing with how we should release some of these results like, I just honestly I struggle with the idea, releasing the results at all given that issue with the data biasing.
- n. *Michael*: Well, there were pre-data biased results too right?
- o. *Unknown*: I think I agree with Caleb, like if people wanna push people to vote. Problem is that the results were released and I see Michael already apologize for it, but it's a very serious thing and it's really unfortunate, but now we have to kind of work with that, and I think if we can post the results, because at least they show that up to these 2 days there's a pretty big divide in the main opinion about JHPD. But then there's also a consensus on people feeling unsafe and want more Lyft credits, or something like that. So I think the results can be published, but I think it's really important also to say that these are only results of the first 3 or 4 days.
- p. *Kathryn (Classics)*: I just think that we need to be transparent that these only represents some responses, if we were only to release those preliminary results.
- q. *Michael*: Yeah I think we can be honest! Specifically for Homewood, I think it represented closer to like 590 or 625 students, or something like that. We can be honest on the numbers and say like this was x percentage of the total results. 600 is also more than... that percentage is more than even some exit surveys, and some like current enrolled student surveys from the admin get, so this for a GRO survey, that is an incredible response rate. We usually don't get anywhere near that high of a response.
- r. *Caleb*: Even though that is a pretty high response, and I think the statement already reflects this, and I think this can be something we clearly have in that. It's saying that, we know that this isn't the full representation of everyone at Homewood, these are just the results that we got in our survey. And also saying, these aren't necessarily the means, and the statistics we report, these are

not necessarily the views of the GRO either. Again, to Kathryn's point about trying to not take responsibility for the opinions they're in right. We're just saying these are what the people who respond to said.

- s. *Morganne Ottobre (Near Eastern Studies)*: \*IN TEXT\* But if we don't take responsibility for the responses what are we for?
- t. *Kathryn (Classics)*: I think I understand the instinct to say... Morganne I'm so sorry if I miss pronounced your name in the comment box... I'm also kind of mixed on the concept of whether or not we feel we're taking responsibility for these results because we are, in releasing this statement, I feel like taking some responsibility for the results, even if they don't represent our opinions. And I guess the question is, are we going to do anything to address the fact that we, as a graduate representative organization, seem to have a proportionally different opinion, because we voted to release an initial statement that is very different from this statement. So like are we gonna do anything to mitigate the fact that we appear to have a different perspective as the GRO as compared to what seems to be the opinion of the graduate student body from this survey, if we're taking this to be an accurate representation of the graduate student body.
- u. *Morganne Ottobre (Near Eastern Studies)*: \*IN TEXT\* I think that would be a good step if this happens again in the future - I just don't want the GRO to be a place where we express and vote on personal beliefs if we are meant to be representative
- v. *Michael*: I think my hope with this without saying it explicitly... My hope with this was that the reps here if they weren't sure, I mean maybe we don't know how sure we are if we're being representative... But like would actually poll their own departments, right. So maybe in the future, if the reps are unsure of if their own personal opinions, and how those might align with the rest of the students that they represent, maybe polling their own students.
- w. *Luke (MLL)*: This is kind of in a different direction, so not talking about the results. But I'm wondering... I don't know if there's a way to do this without making the email or the statement too long, but I don't know if anyone has visited the JHPD implementation website, but it's not very navigable. I mean it. There are lots of links to click on, and some stuff is in like serious legal cases that you have to read through, and not everyone really understands that. So I'm wondering if there's a way that we could tell people what it means that there will be a police force on campus, because especially, if you look in the frequently asked questions there, one of the quite frequently asked questions is, will the police force be armed; and then it starts off with this answer, saying, oh yeah, they're all certified in firearm training, and it's like, so yeah, they are going to be armed. It's also like if you read through that paragraph, they're like well, there won't be any military grade weaponry unless it's legal in Maryland, and so it's like it could almost certainly mean that there could be military grade weaponry and military grade vehicles. That is terrifying.
- x. *Michael*: I've brought up a lot of these exact issues to Dr. Bard, like what does those things mean and I think part of the issue is it's hard for us to make an interpretation of what these things mean when we also don't even know what those things are. We don't want to cause more confusion potentially and trying to interpret what the website says. That's why I tried to at least put a point on there like clearly, the website is not good enough. I guess to Kathryn's point earlier, we need to call for Dr. Bard and push Dr. Bard to make these things much more readily transparent, because it's not our responsibility to make these things more transparent. But yeah, I've addressed him directly on a lot of these same issues, and it's hard to get a straight answer out of a lot of these things, so I fully agree and feel with that.



- y. *Kathryn*: I think in some ways, this comes down to the question of what our role is like. Are we an institution that collaborates with the university hierarchy? Are we working with or are we calling for action on behalf of the graduate students?
- z. *Michael*: Yeah, I think, at least in my role as co-chair, I kind of both right? I work directly with the vice Dean of KSAS and WSE directly, so I often do work with them, but they're oftentimes where there are things that they can't control. For example, they tried their damn just to get stipend increases for everyone, and they also ran into university hierarchy that they just couldn't get passed. And so then maybe those are the times where it's like we need to also call upon the university to do these things. So I think we can do both, it's just how we do both is really important.
- aa. *Luke (MLL)*: Yeah, I just wanted to comment on... I'm not sure with the wording of taking responsibility of the results. I don't know what that means. Does that mean we sit there and say yes, we are for JHPD and against JHPD. I think there's 2 parts to the statements, maybe in like one, this is the results... I think we're taking some sort of responsibility with what we see with the results in our actions. But I don't think we can take that direct responsibility. You cannot directly represent the 600 voices there. I don't think that's possible, that's also not what's happening in a democratic organization. I just don't think we need to exactly reflect the results of everybody, because normally it just works out but I think we need to at least show everybody what are the results of everybody, and then say, okay, we are going to take these actions. We are going to call for that. We don't have power but we got to call for it.
- bb. *Michael*: Yeah, I think kind of to your point, I think maybe we do need to put in there a little bit of like, letting people understand that we're just a graduate organization. There's very limited ability we have to actually do these things. So maybe just being very direct about that to a degree like in this statement of like, we don't have direct influence over these things, unfortunately, but we're gonna try our best to call for these things.
- cc. *Michael*: Motion to take a week to discuss this and have a vote on sending this out after a week
  - i. *Unknown*: Seconded
  - ii. Yea: 37, Nay: 0, Abstain: 0
  - iii. The motion is passed

## VI. Open Discussion & Questions

- a. Communication and Voting Issue:
  - i. *Unknown*: I think it was a good point... There was a motion to uphold the the poll longer, there was a second for that. We didn't vote on it, and we just closed the poll. I'm completely against that motion... like I would have voted no. I think it's fair if somebody else has some different opinions. I think it was right to close it but I think just in the principle, that we didn't vote on it is something I don't know if other people feel about it.
  - ii. *Alakarthika*: I kinda wanna agree. And I also wanna mention that during online voting, there's not much of like a response or a discussion that happens as much as it does during the GC meeting, which is a given, but still.
  - iii. *Caleb*: I think we can probably look at our communications policy and try to improve things for next time. My feedback is that this was sort of turned around really quick, and given the nature and sensitivity of the issue, I wish we would have had more discussion on it, especially because it was sort of just send out without clearing with myself, who made the poll. I'm just saying that if we want to improve things for next time, to just have a sort of chain of custody

of who's working on what, when, and when's the deadline. Because it did seem... You know we all do this part time. This is not our full time job and so sometimes it's easier to get to things than it is to others.

- iv. *Michael*: I was having this discussion with someone... in the bylaws, these things aren't super well covered as to like what the specific procedures are, and like what authority and power the EBoard has over doing these things versus like the GC. So I think that's definitely... I'm always a fan of more clarifications and less loopholes. So I'm happy to continue to look at our communications policy in our bylaws, and making sure that we tightened down on potentially troubling things.

## **VII. Adjournment**

- a. *Alakarthika*: Motion to end the meeting
  - i. *Heramb*: Seconded
  - ii. Yea: 37, Nay: 0, Abstain: 0
  - iii. The motion is passed
- b. The meeting adjourns at 7:18 pm.



## VIII. Voting Details

Voting Motion ID	21	22	23	24
<b>Motion</b>	Approve the 10/31 meeting minutes	Approve the 750 USD for the Chinese-Speaking Christine Fellowship event	(JHPD statement) Approve the motion to take a week to discuss this and have a vote on sending this out after a week	Approve to end the 11/14 GC meeting
Anthropology				
Applied Mathematics & Statistics (AMS)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
History of Art	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Biology	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Biomedical Engineering (BME)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Biophysics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Chemistry				
Civil Engineering	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Classics	Abstain	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Cognitive Science	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Computer Science		Yea	Yea	Yea
Economics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Engineering Management		Yea	Yea	Yea
English	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Environmental Health and Engineering (formerly DOGEE)				
EPS (Earth and Planetary Sciences)				
Modern Languages and Literatures (Formerly GRLL)	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
History				
History of Science and Technology		Abstain	Yea	Yea
Comp Thought and Literature	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Information Security Inst				
Materials Science & Engineering	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Mathematics				
Mechanical Engineering			Yea	Yea
Near Eastern Studies (NES)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Philosophy				
Physics and Astronomy	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Political Science	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea
Psychological and Brain Sciences	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea
Sociology	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Writing Seminars				
Robotics	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Co-Chair (Michael Wilkinson)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Co-Chair (Vinay Mahajan)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Secretary (Karen Yang)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Treasurer (Esther Xu)	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Admin & Funding (KeFan Zhuo)		Yea		
Social (Alakarhika)	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Social (Tram)	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea
Advocacy (Nicole Chen)		Yea	Yea	Yea
Advocacy (Caroline Maria John)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Communications (Nick Zhang)	Yea	Abstain		
Diversity (Soumya Behera)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea
Graduate Involvement Chair (Heramb Gupta)	Yea	Abstain	Yea	Yea
Intercampus Chair (Louise Chen)	Yea			
E-sports coordinator (Emi Lou Mondragon)				
Health & Wellness (Ales Varabyou)		Yea	Yea	Yea
Security Concerns Chair (Caleb Andrew)		Nay	Yea	Yea
<b>Yea</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Nay</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Abstain</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>