1. Introduction (5:30-5:40)
   a. New faces
      i. 5 students introduced themselves
   b. Quorum check*
      i. Reps are keeping GCM Voting page open until archivist vote.
      ii. Quorum reached with 40+ respondents
   c. Approval of August minutes*
      i. Reps are keeping GCM Voting tool open until archivist vote.
      ii. Passed with 38+ yes and multiple abstains

2. Presentation on the new Title IX regulations (with guest Sarah Rankin, 5:40-6:10)
   a. Rankin looking to reach out to student orgs
   b. Feel free to ping Sarah Rankin anytime afterwards
   c. Agenda
      i. IDHR Overview
         1. Origin: MIT people were confused about where to go to for what
         2. What we do
            a. Prevention education
            b. Supportive members
            c. Resolution (Alternative/Formal)
            d. Patterns & Trends
      ii. Overview of new regulations
         1. Narrow down what constitutes a Title IX violation to sexual harassment (quid pro quo) or hostile environment (severe and pervasive and objectively offensive)
         2. Scope of institutional responsibility: “actual knowledge” of “sexual harassment” in United
States that occurred in “education program or activity”

3. Investigation prohibits use of single investigator model; parties must have access to all related evidence. Decision makers should be free from bias or conflict; training material must be publicly posted.

4. Hearings should be live, with cross-examinations by parties’ advisors; cannot consider information from anyone who did not submit to cross at hearing; MIT must provide an advisor to conduct cross-examination of party does not have their own suitable advisor.

5. Conduct outside jurisdiction: school can address it through its own system, even if they don’t meet Title IX definition of harassment, it occurred outside of school’s education program, or occurred against a person outside the US.

iii. MIT’s Title IX decisions

1. Maintains policy that captures conduct beyond Title IX
2. Only apply required Title IX procedures to cases that meet Title IX definition and jurisdiction. Continue to apply MIT’s procedures to all cases.
3. Decisions on process: MIT provide an external attorney to serve as advisor; hire external professional to serve as voting chair.

iv. Next steps

1. Redesign IDHR website
2. Train hearing panels
3. Secure pool of external advisors and chairs
4. Develop communication tools for complainants and respondents
5. Develop communication plan for community
6. Offer information sessions on new process for key groups
Questions

1. What counts as severe/pervasive?
   a. Federally, sexual jokes/comments would not be considered severe. MIT’s procedures use severe or pervasive

2. What is the procedure for non-Title IX complaints?
   a. There will be an analysis by investigators, resulting in a recommendation, e.g. a hearing by Committee on Discipline.

3. Differences reporting to faculty and students
   a. Before the new regulations came out, there was confusion about how to handle issues. Now IDHR is the central portal for any question about discrimination/harassment against protected identities.

4. Restorative justice?
   a. Construct a dialogue where the person who has committed the harm hear the dialogue and come to a mutually-agreed-upon decision on how to address the harm.

5. Re. procedures for minimizing trauma: will those be clarified? Hopefully those will be broadly disseminated.
   a. We’ll walking people through these procedures. Some things we do are in practice, not in policy. For example, for COD, their practice will be that before advisors can cross-examine themselves, panelists will ask questions first. This is so that aggressive questions that could be asked by an attorney could be asked by the panels, so the panel chair can tell the attorney that the question has already been answered.
      i. Response; it could help people on the fence to know that
3. Vote: allocation of funds to GSC Archivist position (6:10-6:20)*

The GSC has a decades-long history...

- But we can’t easily access it!
  - Some piles of papers, some jumbled Dropbox folders
  - Not easily searchable

- History matters!
  - How did we win housing victories in the past?
  - What’s happened to the grad student Cost of Living over time?

- What we need:
  - Several months of dedicated, professional work
  - Close collaboration with ExComm

a.
b. Proposal: expand budget by $9,100 via reserve funds to hire a historian to
   
i. Digitize, encode, and organize GSC archives
   
ii. Donate a copy of those archives to the MIT library system
   
iii. Compile a report at the end of the year answering historical questions of interest to the current members of the GSC
   
iv. Today, we’re voting on an allocation, not on the exact terms.
   
v. Where is $ coming from?
      
1. Reserves
   
2. We are using previous years’ budget because the archiving should have been done at some point in the past, so ok to use past $.
   
vi. Do we need to specify that this is specifically for next year? (e.g. FY21 is in the statement) – do we need to vote on endowing this in perpetuity?
      
1. We can’t vote on anything other than FY21.
   
2. Webmaster is *chosen* to be renewed every year.
   
vii. This might be a lot of work for one person
      
1. We’d be open to adding the option, but not requirement, for 2 people. There’s a certain justice
in having it one person because it allows for good compensation.

viii. Amendment: change graduate student to 1-2 graduate students.
   1. Comments?
      a. No comments
   2. 34/51 approve; 3 abstain
ix. Does anyone else want to raise any other questions before voting?
   1. Confirm: such a position would be available to anyone on a student visa. This is an internal MIT position, so we’d assume so.
      a. If we run into problems, we will work with Lauren.
   c. Voting
      i. Approved with 31 yes, multiple abstains, and 2 no’s.
   a. Testing for grad students accessing campus
      i. COVID-19 testing ramped up to 2x/weekly for residents + people accessing campus 4+ times/week, 1x/weekly for people accessing campus less frequently
      ii. Time in queue “on the clock” for hourly workers; PI’s must accommodate
      iii. If the queue is physically inaccessible to you, you can get a letter allowing you to check in another way. Start by emailing das-students@mit.edu. For a religious accommodation, email askachaplain@mit.edu.
   iv. GSC officers are happy to provide support.
   v. Where is all the data going?
      1. MIT COVID response system: data-driven pandemic response
         a. MIT decision makers view de-identified aggregate building data
         b. Users of data register with Legal, Ethical, Equity committee.
b. Why is MIT communicating results as “cases per # tests”? What about inconclusive status
   i. There were a lot of people in COVIDPass who weren’t actually accessing campus. That’s the hangup in reporting exactly how many people have been positive.

5. Updated budget (6:30-6:40)
   a. Conversation re. updated budget.
   b. COVID is restricting a lot of activities we can do, which affects things like travel grant. Our funding is greatly affected, given SLF is not being collected this year.

6. Officer updates (6:40-6:50)
   a. Jerry will be reaching out to all departments. Opportunity for GSC to advocate for departments more comprehensively.

7. Committee updates (6:50-7:10)
   a. ARC
      i. Two events upcoming: Talk series (“Innovation during the days of COVID19”
      ii. Orientation Advising 101: ~150 students attended
      iii. ARC Advising working on survey on advising.
      iv. Interested in joining? Feel free to reach out at gsc-arc-chair@mit.edu
   b. AC
      i. Updates
         1. Selection of co-chair for the Grad arts forum. Open to volunteers – people who have a passion for arts (both visual and performing) – message us or email AC
   c. ASA
      i. Midway happened 8/27: lots of traffic and website crashed. Technical issues for ~30 min.
      ii. Midway.mit.edu will be up for students to explore.
      iii. Finalizing new system for group applications
      iv. No word on LEF/ARCADE $$$
   d. DEI
i. Graduate enrolled student survey data request form

ii. Upcoming events: DEI orientation event and conduit meet & greet.

iv. Next meeting Tues. Sept. 15 at 4pm via Zoom.

e. EAB

i. Statements passed: RISE Act Endorsement, Endless Frontier Act Endorsement, Supporting Early-Career Researchers Act

ii. Currently working on: candidate questionnaire (for state/federal level candidates), fall events, advocacy newsletter, affordable housing overly, public outreach.

iii. Orientation Events

   1. Intro to state and local politics 9/1; Intro to federal politics 9/3

iv. Advocacy 101 (email gsc-eab@mit.edu for more info) – Sept 23, Sept 30, Oct 7 (policy panel)

f. HCA

i. Working closely with grad dorms and MIT administration to optimized COVID-related policies

   1. We pushed for a review of the guest policy (currently, no guests allowed at any time). A committee will be formed early October to review this policy. If you’re interested in participating, let us know (gsc-hca-chair@mit.edu).
ii. Advocacy subcommittee working on designing 2020 cost-of-living survey; working with private company “American Campus Communities” to optimize the design of new Vassar street dorm.

g. Muddy
i. The muddy Charles pub wants you! Next meeting 9/14 @ 7pm Eastern. Email Jennifer Kaczmarek with any questions

h. OC

i. Orientation calendars: still taking events.

iii. Canvas site

8. Open Floor (7:10 on)

a. Looping back – are there any things we should be upset about re. IDHR

i. We want a 3rd party option esp when it comes to faculty adjudicating faculty issues.

b. Faculty review of faculty policies is something that faculty would want to hold on to – lots of faculty are discontent with their available power.