General Council Meeting Agenda
November 6, 5:30 PM in 6-120

1. Introduction, Dinner, New Faces (5:30 – 5:40 PM)
   a. 5 new faces
   b. Quorum Check
      i. 46 attended
   c. Approval of October GCM Minutes
      i. Seconded and approved.

2. AAU Survey - Chancellor Cindy Barnhart (5:40 – 6:40 PM)
   a. Chancellor Barnhart – 28 years on faculty, was a student at MIT
   b. Talking about sexual misconduct today, esp. re the AAU survey
   c. Goal is to give everyone a sense of what information they can get from
      the survey, as well as ways to analyze the data
   d. What do we do in the office of the chancellor?
      i. Kim Haberlim and Jag Patel work in the chancellor’s office
      ii. What does the Chancellor do?

   1. The position is unique at MIT – reports to the President.
      Typically, the job of the Provost is split between the
      Provost and the Chancellor. The chancellor is responsible
      for everything student-related.
   2. Graduate admissions are done at the program level
   3. We work on providing financial aid to undergrads. We
      do need-blind admissions and meet demonstrated need
      for ALL students.
   4. We work on improving the academic experience, esp. 1st
      year undergrads. Our programs are owned by
      departments.
   5. Cindy is 6 years into tenure as Chancellor, and a main
      priority is helping student wellbeing.
   6. We work with student leaders on shared governance.
   7. We’re working on living spaces (new dorm),
      commitment to new grad housing (we hope to have an
      update on that soon, and will be looking for your input),
      launched MHH (trying to expand the Mens et Manus
      mantra to Mind, Hand, and Heart – not only focus on
learning by doing, but also taking care of yourself and caring for others). One of the thing we did was launch the Title IX and Bias Response office. We’re at a phase where we’re building it out even more, and will be the place for all students/faculty/staff/etc. to go.

e. Tonight’s topic: sexual assault survey sent out to everyone in Spring last year.

f. Also want to talk about National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine – they had a report on sexual assault in academia, and I want to talk about our follow-up

g. We charged 4 groups to look at training and prevention, leadership and engagement, policies and reporting, and academic and organizational relationships. The last one is the working group that Cindy was placing a lot of hope on (included Paula Hammond). Trying to think about power dynamics and how we manage those.

i. As all of you know well, as a graduate student, there can be extreme reliance on thesis supervisor, so if things go wrong, there needs to be recourse and protection from retaliation.

h. We sent out an email last week with all the working group reports. Take a look at them, especially the last one. The reports are also on chancellor.mit.edu.

i. Before we start talking about these topics, here is a list of resources.

j. Did anyone go to the forum yesterday? (2 people went)

k. Kinds of information collected on the survey

i. Learn about harassing behavior and harassment

ii. Especially relevant for grad students.

iii. Stalking and intimate partner violence

iv. Ways to measure non-consensual sexual contact.

v. What I want to highlight here are that results in red are MIT results, and the blue bar is the aggregate results for all schools that took the survey with us (33 universities, many of which are peers).

vi. One of the first thing to note is that the red bar is generally smaller than the blue bar, the bad thing is that the red bar exists.

l. If you look at where you have the highest rate of occurrence is in harassing behavior:
m. Next slide gives a sense of the type of information you can get
   i. Rates of nonconsensual sexual contact using physical force or inability to stop what’s happening.
   ii. Original results vs. gender demographics, etc.
   iii. We can break out results by school, but can’t break it down by department (couldn’t collect that information); can break down by location as well.
   iv. What’s shown here: MIT is the red bar, and there are 2 blue bars (light blue bar was the 2015 and dark blue bar is 2019)
      1. From 2015 to 2019 in every category, everything got worse
      2. There are certain populations where the rates are higher, e.g. undergraduate women and transgender/questioning/nonbinary.
   v. Question: How does this compare to 2014 data?
      1. It’s hard to compare, partly because in 2014, we were the first ones to administer such a survey; the questions between 2014 and 2019 are not exactly the same.
      2. I could say something about the 2014 survey, but it would be imprecise.
      3. A lot of the information we would have wanted to compare isn’t there.
      4. For some, the numbers are better in 2019. There is another complexity in that results are weighted. Overall, they are very close, and a number of metrics could be better, and for a few we did worse. You can get more details via the AAU email that Cindy sent out.
      5. We did see that there was a doubling in reporting. The numbers are still small though.
   vi. Another thing to talk about: if any of you have read the National Academy report on harassment, they say that some behaviors are very visible (e.g. sexual assault, unwanted sexual touching, etc.), and many behaviors that are less visible and beneath the surface (e.g. microaggressions, extremely prevalent, what I hear a lot from MIT students are suggestions/implications that women don’t have to meet the same standards as men to get in).
vii. One the things we heard from undergrads was that they feel they have quite a bit of education re. “above the water” harassment, but feel much less confident about approaching “below the water” topics.

viii. 40% of students experience harassing behaviors.
1. The types of harassing behaviors are broken down with rates.
2. The red bars are shorter than the blue bars, though 40% is a huge number.

ix. Some examples where we asked the same questions in 2014 and 2019:
1. Class of 2014 was the 2014 survey
2. What caught our attention was that for undergrads between 2014 and 2019, the occurrence of these types of behaviors seems to be reduced. But for graduate students, it went up; in some cases, alarmingly so. Went up for women and men.
3. If you look at the questions, you can see that some of the questions ask “have you experienced or know someone who experienced xyz”, which could explain the increase for men.

x. Chart: Harassing behaviors that result in things like interfering with academic or professional performance or limiting ability to participate in an academic program. Rate is 16.3% for MIT grad students.

1. We can break it out by demographic. What we can see (highlighted in red) the rate for harassment for grad women.
2. We took data from peers’ news releases to compare to other schools
3. We compare favorable to other schools in most demographics except for grad women…

xi. We asked students about who was involved in harassing behaviors
1. We find that faculty or instructors were involved 35.3% of the time for grad women.
2. We also find that research staff have a disproportionate impact on grad women.
3. (Numbers don’t add to 100% since people can report harassment by multiple demographics)

n. Multi-faceted approach to addressing sexual misconduct and improving culture and climate
   i. There’s been a lot of discussion, particularly this semester, about culture and climate.
   ii. One thing we’ve learned at MIT is that you need to engage with people affected by problems. We want to design solutions by and for the community.
   iii. We’ve seen committees come up with different strategies (e.g. ChemE is having mentoring/coaching workshops for all faculty, starting with junior faculty).
   iv. We need to strengthen prevention with in-person, ongoing, tailored education.
   v. We need policies that hold people accountable. Allow people to report what’s happening, and have transparency when a report is made against faculty. Students often complain that faculty can do whatever they want, and are putting themselves at jeopardy if they report.
   vi. Do you have priorities as a group for what should be addressed?
      1. If you come to us with priorities, we will work with you to find the experts/resources to address what you’d like.

o. Open for questions, comments
   i. GWAMIT representative: A couple of months ago we met with VPR, and were talking about the success of the ChemE and Chem programs. There’s demand from departments to do this, but they don’t seem to have the resources to do this.
      1. Cindy: You can’t do this without resources. What we have been seeing is that these in-person lab or group trainings are popular, so more and more of the departments are asking for it, including student groups etc. We’ve hired two more people in the Title IX and Bias Response office, we are committed to adding more resources to VPR. We know we have to have more people to help out, and are committed to help out.
2. Is there a timeline on that commitment?
   a. Yes, now
   b. We are recruiting right now.
   c. We need to strike now, since there has been a lot of attention on this topic, there is a lot of momentum in terms of wanting change, so as a result, there's a feeling that this has to be a priority in terms of resource allocation. Met a month ago with the executive committee of the Corporation (board of Trustees); I was presenting some of these results, and they asked “do you have the resources you need to do this”, and Cindy said she will produce a plan and they said ok.

ii. Social sciences program rep: to what extent is the Chancellor’s office involved in structural change beyond departmental actions. Is your office a place to go re. improving social sciences education at MIT?

1. Cindy: The role we play is around graduate student support, which is another top priority. We have had at least four conversations on the topic of grad student support today and the need for providing (there is already a commitment in place) full financial support to graduate students. We’ve been working a lot on graduate families and how to support them. We’ve also been working on the cost to advisers for your education, and thinking about how MIT can subsidize tuition (currently, we subsidize 50% tuition, and how can we move that number up so we can be more competitive and attract top faculty and students).

2. Cindy: In terms of the programs, the departments and schools own the degree programs. If you think about changes to the organizational structure e.g. via College of Computing, those fall under the Provost. Cindy is more involved with Dean for Student Life and OVC.

3. Question asker: I’m concerned about our ability to teach ethics in the classroom.
a. Cindy: these conversations greatly interest me, and I think this is an interesting time for MIT, and it’s critical that these conversations be as open and inclusive as possible. One of the hardest things is to communicate well, and that’s always a challenge. With the College of Computing, things have moved quickly, and there is a lot of uncertainty and discomfort.

4. Question asker: did the National Academies survey include the Humanities?

a. The National Academies sponsored the report. One of the lead coauthors was a faculty member in Aero/Astro.

iii. ChemE Rep: I’m surprised where undergrad/grad students lie relative to national average. There was a comment about how the undergrad level has more holistic recruitment, which is not translated to the graduate and faculty levels. Are there plans to not just recruit, but accept and hire underrepresented groups (e.g. women) – this is something we don’t do well on. At what point will we make that an active priority?

1. Cindy: Undergrad admissions reports to Cindy, graduate admissions does not. I’ve been on many graduate admissions committees; when you leave it to the hands of a few faculty, it’s not the same process. Is there something we can focus on there (how grad admissions are done)? If you look at these reports, schools asked what their values and expectations are, and had those drive departmental and school-wide activities. They have a number of ideas around things like “let’s make sure that on the faculty and personnel record, we have information related to what kind of a mentor you would want”

2. Question asker: We treat the graduate programs like they’re off-limits or out of control. If we think like that, nothing is going to change.

3. Cindy: after yesterday’s forum, I was thinking about how we have a strong shared governance model here. There is no one who could just mandate a change here, e.g. like
“grad admissions will no longer be owned by departments”. It will have to be a process where faculty can buy into it, so change will be hard and slow; however, that doesn’t mean that it’s not worth trying to make it happen.

iv. For 35% of grad women, the source of harassment was faculty or instructor. If you get reports against tenured faculty, are you developing an action plan for consequences?

1. Cindy: over the past year, we have a committee that was formed maybe 5 years ago when we were first starting working on this (committee of Sexual Misconduct prevention and response, with 29 people representing all groups) – they said we need to take a look at our policy for processing reports against faculty and how we provide information to the community about sanctions, while ensuring confidentiality. That policy has now been approved, and this semester, the deans from each school suggested faculty to serve on these sanctioning/hearing committees. We'll have trained investigators provide a report. Then we'll have faculty not in the same school as that in which the complaint was brought up.

2. Question: why is the committee other faculty, not students or staff?
   a. Cindy: I am not advocating that faculty just set rules for themselves. When you ask a question like that, it can be discussed. The sexual misconduct policies that we have in place for students can be changed.

3. Question: what kinds of consequences are there?
   a. Cindy: can go up to revocation of tenure.
   b. We need to be transparent with the community about other kinds of sanctions: for example, you can prevent a faculty member from taking grad students.
   c. There will be a range of sanctions. In some cases, it can be coaching, etc.
4. Question: re. the panels, what about making it gender balanced or having members of LGBTQ community on the panels?
   a. Cindy: we wanted to put together a trained, diverse group of faculty for this.

5. How many complaints are lodged per year?
   a. Cindy: I don’t know.
   b. We are expanding the Title IX and Bias Response office to be for all members of the community. Why? Then, we will have a central place for information to get collected. For students, we have that now. Right now, the process goes through departments, maybe goes up to dean level, maybe goes up through central HR. There is a dispersed set of information that we don’t have a good handle on.
   c. How many for students? Approx a couple dozen per year go through process of hearing and sanctions. The number that go forward into a case is tiny, in the single digit range. Some issues include “I didn’t have time”, “I didn’t want to get anyone in trouble”

v. Question: Going back to investigation process – if the department is imposing sanctions, but relies on the success of the faculty, isn’t that a conflict of interest?
   1. Cindy: Yes, we have professional investigators hired by MIT, but they are professional investigators who compare cases against to written policies. I really do believe our investigators will do the right thing. The problem with the current process is that your department head is in charge of this process, but is also a peer of their department’s faculty. The new process is meant to remove that conflict of interest.

vi. Question: How will this complaint process play out if a harassment situation happens off campus or outside the US?
   1. Cindy: One thing I didn’t tell you is that sometime this month, we will get regulations from the Department of
Education on how to handle misconduct. MIT will deal with cases that don’t happen on campus (even though they are not on paper obligated to).

2. What if the event happens over the summer, etc.? Cindy: That has happened in the past and dealt with those situations.

vii. Question from DEI: can students report microaggressions through IDHR?

1. Cindy: One of the recommendations was to have an information repository for people to report microaggressions, but don’t want to take action on it alone, but they want action taken in other situations. Having such a repository could be useful for tracking repeated behavior. Recommendations are open for comment until Nov 15. I think this will sit in IDHR, but it is yet to be decided.

viii. Question: are there issues with faculty buy-in on the repository of students “tattling” on them?

1. Cindy: My experience is that that faculty can’t say no if the policy is mandated. Part of the buy-in process is that we have a committee recommendation, and that there will be buy-in. There will be some pushback; one time, there was pushback from a policy recommender. Sometimes, people change their thinking on things. We have to have a process where students, faculty, and staff all say “this is what we want to do”.

ix. Question: process of getting feedback on faculty from students. This could be difficult due to privacy concerns. Would the implementation be difficult?

1. Cindy: similar to the aggregate thesis advisor evaluations at the end of each semester. We want to tell department heads what their faculty look like in general. Not ideal, but department head can do something to fix the situation.

2. Question: How do you identify who’s doing the bad stuff?

a. Cindy: sometimes, the department head might know. As you can see, I don’t know the answers,
but the group working on power dynamics had interesting ideas, and there are very different practices by discipline, and it was interesting to think about how to transfer those practices between disciplines.

x. Question: is there anything you’re excited about here?

I. Cindy: I’m interested in addressing issues re. graduate students. It’s not acceptable that we have this kind of climate, and how these things are translating into promotions and hires. This is such a busy place all the time, and it’s hard to get people’s time and attention for something like this, so I’m excited at the moment that there a lot of people who care and want to do something.

3. Student Committees (6:40 – 7:00 PM)
   a. UA and GSC have jointly formed new committees.
   b. The first one is on outside engagements.
   c. We would like your feedback on the nom board selections.
   d. The goal here is to get your feedback on the list of candidates – are there any demographics not being represented, etc.? If we’ve missed a stakeholder group, we have the opportunity to add people.
   e. The percentage of votes represent the percentage of students who selected a given candidate. This was meant to downselect students.
   f. We don’t know yet who the UA will nominate.
   g. Were students aware that their demographic information would be made public?
      i. We could have been more explicit about which would be public and which won’t. (One comment we got was that we didn’t publicize everything.) For next time, we’ll try to be more specific.
   h. Can you show us the other committee? Who applied to both? (Michael and Joe)
      i. Neither is on the other committee.
   i. Nominations board believes that the roster is good in that it is diverse, but yes, neither Michael nor Joe were selected due to school considerations and ultimately that if we had more spots. (Both were #6’s for both). We didn’t want to make the committees too large. We want to wait until we hear from the UA.
j. Can you explain why you put Abraham but not Joe? Why not go through election data alone? If you’re trying to balance for diversity, I believe you can’t work off Abraham’s limited demographic data.
   i. The election data is only 5% of the student population, so it could be swayed easily.

k. Turnout for the first was 337 students. The turnout was about 5%. For outside engagements,

l. In the future, in the interest of transparency, it would be helpful to include that there would be a GSC-wide discussion of candidates.

m. Will people get a chance to vote again? It doesn’t seem that you are regarding the vote results? (e.g. with Michael)
   i. We’re probably not going to have another election

n. I can see a counterargument that Vanessa and Michael are both school of Sloan, so if you were to only vote for one of the two, you would put one of them on.

o. Why aren’t we working together with faculty committee on this?
   i. We really wanted a student on the faculty committee for the sake of transparency, but that didn’t fly. Faculty are just as disappointed in the corporation as students. Specifically, their committee doesn’t want to give MIT corporation any chance of giving an excuse that they don’t want to share information with faculty because there’s a student there.
   ii. We know this looks really bad, but this is the tradeoff we decided on.

p. Any comments on outside engagements?
   i. I heard a comment about reconsidering Joe
   ii. Any other comments on groups we forgot?
      i. There’s no one from humanities for that one.
   iii. One thing to add: one of the people you’ve added has made uncomfortable comments about certain demographics. If there are strong reservations about candidates, please let us know.
   iv. Any other comments or concerns? (none)

q. We will let you know about the progress of this – committees will be formed by next week.

r. If you have comments or concerns, please email gsc@mit.edu.

4. Initiative Application (7:00 – 7:30 PM)
   a. Sustainability in Sidpac and Ashdown
i. We were initially going to vote on a new initiative, as we found that some of the other measures we put in place were very successful.

ii. We wanted to limit the use of single-use plastics, etc.

iii. Completely got rid of reusables at coffee hours, and for brunch, we decided to create two separate lines: one for people who bring their own plates, and one for those who don’t. We’ve seen that in the latest brunch, we only distributed around 7 plates out of 200 or so people.

iv. Bottom line is that if your departments have a strong incentive structure (e.g. getting food first) or paying a small fee for plastic, etc., that works really well. We didn’t get a decline in attendance! A little bit of incentive or disincentive will go a large way..

v. Ashdown has also in May started eliminating disposables at Coffee Hour events. That turned out very successful, and starting this August, Brunch committee started implementing policies, which turned out to be successful. Brunch is a monthly event, and people seem to start developing good habits. We have brunch punch cards for bringing disposables. We also have a house-wide email chain addressing the changes. Publicity efforts seem to help push forward environmental friendliness.

b. If you guys want to be more sustainable, please reach out to Sidpac and Ashdown and ask for some input.

c. Any questions for the two?
   i. None

5. **66.gsc.4 - Bylaws Update (7:30 – 7:50 PM)**

   a. There are three motivations for this: one is that ExComm doesn’t have a qorum requirement, the other is that we have a stabilization fund (for some context, the stabilization fund exists in the budget, and back when we were funded by career fair, the revenue was pretty unstable, so we needed a fund that insulated us against variations in our budget. However, we’re now funded by student fees, so $ is more stable. We wanted to have a requirement to keep $ in our reserves, which will simplify the process so we don’t have to have a separate account rather than using stabilization funds as a cushion), and the third one is the ASA (essentially, the ASA wants to restructure to make individuals more
accountable for specific tasks. The idea is to recognize formal chairs and get rid of at-large positions. We made a few changes to allow this to happen.)

b. We deleted the stabilization fund and added a line that during budget increase years, $ needs to be dropped into reserves. If the amount of revenue in a given year decreases, we can use some padding that will last for a year. The scenario we’re talking about here is that $ has been cut substantially, and the cushion year is for reorganization. We also removed references to stabilization fund.

c. We added a quorum requirement for ExComm.

d. For the ASA, we added chairs.

i. Question: what happens if the ASA treasurer is the student on the board? Robin: The wording is that in addition to the treasurer, there should be another graduate student.

ii. Added formal chair positions who can appoint additional members.

iii. 70 Amherst will be added to the formal list of dorms.

e. Does anyone have questions or comments? You have a month to take this back to your constituents?

i. Can you make this more flexible to changes in dorms?

ii. There’s two perspectives: the first one is specifically naming the dorms. If we could add dorms at will, then that would be a loophole. Historically, the number of dorms hasn’t changed, but with the new dorms, it’s worth thinking about. The name of Site 4 is likely to change. We’ll look into this.

f. Can you explain where the 10% and 30% numbers are coming from?

i. There wasn’t much of a rationale, but it was to keep things in line with the actual size of the stabilization fund and reserves.

ii. Alex: The way to think about it is to avoid the situation where you accumulate money each year. We’re essentially being paid by student fees now, so the fees should go to students.

iii. We’re starting out with reserves. We actually have fairly substantial reserves. We’ve never really withdrawn from the stabilization fund. We almost did in 2015, but recovered $ from GradRat.

iv. Question: What will happen to stabilization $? Answer: Will be put into the reserves?
v. It would be nice to open up the reserves to let clubs make capital purchases. We could also do temporary additions to funding board or travel grant.

g. Any other comments? (None)
h. This will be voted on next month, with a minor addition of 70 Amherst.

6. Officer Updates (7:50 – 8:00 PM)  
a. We’ve been talking about Nom board and have an opening right now. As you saw, we want to fill that position up again. If one of you or your peers wants to be on there, we can vote on that next month.
   i. Anyone can nominate anyone as long as they’re a grad student. A simple majority of GCM can confirm on the Nom board.

b. The big work of the Nominations board is happening for the May application to fill Institute committees.

c. It is pretty low-time-commitment, and there is a financial incentive ($50 TechCash) if there are meetings.

d. When does the Nom Board commitment end? Answer: usually after the new officers are installed (i.e. in May), that’s when it ends. (Goes with academic year, for 1 year, except for right now).

e. Any other questions? (None)

f. Looking for 2 new orientation chairs!
   i. If you are interested, or know someone who might be interested, let us know. Planning starts early. It is important to welcome incoming grads, so please nominate. Elections will happen @ Orientation committee meeting in December. Feel free to reach out to us or Somesh if interested.

7. Committee Updates (8:00 – 8:15 PM)  
a. ARC (Sylvia)
i. Had meeting re. advising, created goals. Provided advice for student groups and departments. We will try to be a central repository for info on housing. We want to draft a letter to the Tech on grad Students for a Healthy MIT. We will talk about becoming a central resource for data collection.

ii. Oct 25th was Roads to Academia; Alumni Relations had fireside chat and alumni panel; VISTA had the FAIL! Conference with 500+ attendees; next one will be in April.

iii. Next meeting is Nov 21st at GSC office, 6pm. Email gsc-arc@mit.edu if you have questions

iv. Question: GradSAGE has been doing a lot of work on advisor-advisee relationships. Are you in contact with them?
   1. There is a direct link between both, e.g. one student is on both.
   2. We met with GradSAGE so that we wouldn’t be starting from scratch.

v. What is the op-ed in the Tech for Grad Students for a Healthy MIT?
   1. Less of a direct response to the Tech letter, but more as a recruiting drive.

b. AC (Ruoxuan)
   i. Next meeting is Thursday Nov 21st at 5pm. You are all welcome to join.
   ii. Apple picking was very nice, got an appreciation email.
   iii. Two coffee hours, very good. Monday one had advertising from Transportation Subcommittee.

iv. Paint night on Oct 16th.

v. Taste of Brazil went well – Brazilian BBQ.

vi. Art Gallery Tour on Oct 25th – not advertised outside Anno

vii. GradRat Ring Delivery on Nov 7 (tomorrow). Come for food, giveaways, and ring order!

viii. Taste of Turkey coming up


c. ASA (Becca)
   i. Not a lot has happened – biggest thing is a general body meeting (GBM).
ii. Purpose of that meeting was to implement bylaws changes.

iii. Changes will finally happen.

iv. Handled ~50 group applications. We’re starting to get appeals on decisions.

v. We want to create group guidelines so that new groups and new leaders can know what’s going on.

d. DEI (Bianca)

i. Sent in funding applications to MHH and CRD Grant for new fellows program to start next year to start intergroup dialogue series. GradSAGE has created DEI subcommittee.

ii. Met with MIT lawyers to release Grad Application Assistance program best practices.

iii. Student-wide subcommittee: looking for religious life or institutional representatives.

iv. In case you’d like more data about your department, we have the Student Survey Data Request Form.

e. EAB (Jack)

i. Next meeting is Nov 22nd, 5pm @ 50-220

ii. Recent/current activities:

1. Cambridge municipal elections
2. Ivy+ summit
3. NAGPS National Conference (ongoing) (Peter is there, in Kentucky)
4. Reviewing results of EAB survey (ongoing)
5. First Boston Federation Meeting of the academic year

f. HCA (Mohammad)

i. Had a meeting a few weeks ago

ii. Graduate Housing Implementation Team attended.

iii. 20 people came.

iv. Main changes:

1. Contracts for on-campus housing are now 2 years.
2. Some couples are in single housing.
3. Recently used self-selection system for housing waitlist, so they’re trying to figure out whether to use it for all of grad housing next year. They could achieve 99% occupancy.
v. Discussion points
   1. Making move-out experience sustainable
   2. Making things easier re. the gap between move-out and move-in
   3. On-campus rates: should housing be about community or convenience; how do we maintain incentives for house governments?

vi. November meeting
   1. Committee on Campus planning will be at December meeting
   2. Update bylaws to codify members of HCA, and include 70 Amherst there.

vii. Housing updates
   1. Site 4 will come online next year to replace Eastgate.
   2. Adds 250 beds

viii. If you’re on campus, you’ve seen Washlava come in. Reason was that previous contact with previous vendor expired in July.
   1. There wasn’t much student input on this
   2. We’re going to bug housing to keep us in the loop on things.

ix. Meetings happen w/ head of housing every 2 weeks; there are a lot of things going on, so if you want things to be heard, shoot me an email. (email gsc-hca-chair@mit.edu). We want to get student input and grievances on things.

  g. Muddy Charles
     i. Jazz Brunch on Dec 1.
     iii. The next Board Meeting is Nov 18th.
     iv. GSC is doing post-GCM socials. We have a tab open at the Muddy right now. If you wanna get free beer, we can do that.

  h. Orientation
     i. No updates

8. Open Floor (8:15 – 8:20 PM)
   a. Motion to adjourn and seconded.
9. Post-GCM Social @ the Muddy
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Muddy Charles Pub
Richard Park
gsc-muddy@mit.edu
Orientation (OC)
Somesh Mohapatra
gsc-oc@mit.edu
Administrative Staff
Lauren McLean
Elizabeth (Betsy) Granese
gsc-admin@mit.edu
GSC Office
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Room 50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: 617-253-2195
http://gsc.mit.edu
Upcoming GSC Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academics, Research, and Careers (ARC)</strong></td>
<td>Thursday, 11/21, 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visiting Students Association (VISTA)</strong></td>
<td>Every Monday, 7:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities Committee (AC)</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Affairs Board (EAB)</strong></td>
<td>Friday, 11/22, 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Affairs Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Local Affairs Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Outreach Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>Every Friday, 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Community Affairs (HCA)</strong></td>
<td>Wednesday, 11/13, 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-campus Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>Monday, 11/18, 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellness Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)</strong></td>
<td>Thursday, 11/14, 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muddy Charles Pub</strong></td>
<td>Monday, 11/18, 7:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation Committee (OC)</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee (ExComm)</strong></td>
<td>Wednesday, 11/20, 6:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unless otherwise indicated, all meetings are in the GSC Office (50-220)

Upcoming General Council Meetings (GCMs)

Note: Dinner starts at 5:00 PM and meetings start at 5:30 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December General Council Meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, 12/4, 32-155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>