



## SENATE

### WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS STUDENT UNION SENATE GENERAL SESSION

*DATE CONVENED // OCTOBER 10, 2017*

*LOCATION // SIMON 110*

*RECORDING SECRETARY // DANNY WEINER*

**TIME CONVENED // 8:07pm -- Speaker Lahoti calls to order**

#### *AGENDA*

1. Convention
2. Election Commissioner Presentation on Rule Changes
3. Town Hall for Black Students [Proposal](#)
4. Resolution: Formally Adopting Roll-Call Votes on all Final Votes
5. SPB Follow-up, Presented by Senator Olivia Williams
6. Open Forum
7. Adjournment

#### **Election Commissioner Presentation on Rule Changes**

- Election Commissioner Steven Kish takes the floor
- Tonight is only about discussion, not voting. 9:45pm hard deadline so Treasury can also discuss this tonight
  - Voting will commence on 10/24
- Meetings have been held to review these proposed changes, which were also discussed during his confirmation hearing
  - 8 hours of meetings
  - 3-4 constituent meetings for the last few weeks
  - Campus Life Advisors
- Election Rules Focus Committee
  - Treasury Representative Shelly Gupta
  - Chief Justice Tobi Henzer
  - SU Vice President of Programming Kyle Jeter
  - EC Steven Kish
  - Senator Joey Vettiankal



- Focus on how to better represent the student body, based on feedback given in open sessions
- These changes have 100% consensus from the Focus Committee

## Proposals

- Material Changes
  - 3 Rule Proposals
    - Campaign Rule #13 (incumbent tags)
      - Current rule: incumbent status is clearly noted on the ballot
      - Incumbent status will *not* be noted on the ballot, but can be noted in any way a candidate wishes in their statement
      - Rule #11 still applies: false information is punishable
      - Deemed to give an unfair advantage to incumbents, at least in a visual sense on the ballot
    - Campaign Rule #14
      - New, formal change, although something of a clarification to other standing rules
      - New rule: “Tables, booths, and other reasonable types of physical spaces may be set up by candidates and/or campaign staff in order to campaign; however, when election polls are open, no voting may actually” occur at such a space
    - Expenses and Expenditure Reports #3
      - Current rule places the value of goods and services at “fair market price” (subject to amateur/professional, skilled/unskilled qualifications) on the expenditure report
      - New rule:
        - Estimated value of goods at fair market price, but donated time and services can be valued at \$0
        - All donated goods and services must be approved by the EC
  - 1 Discussion Item: Endorsements
    - Tonight’s discussion will formulate a later proposal
    - Current rule: no elected representative may endorse a candidate within their same branch. SU executive officers may not endorse any candidates.
- Claiifications
- Appendix



## Q&A

- Incumbent Tags
  - Senator Kadish
    - Does EC Kish believe the student body's opinion of SU to be positive or negative?
      - Negative
    - Does EC Kish believe that listing incumbent status could hurt senators?
      - It is a more complicated answer than yes or no
      - People know what is affecting them and are in tune with their opinion
      - Here, the voter base (student body) may not pay as much attention, and removing the tag should level the playing field
    - Pass
  - Senator Adler:
    - The incumbent tag might be useful for the student body to know who they do and do not support. Could removing it hamper the information a voter may have?
      - It is a fine line
      - Taking away the tag may mean that people do not know as clearly who the incumbents are
      - The vast majority of students still are not going to be paying that much attention. Those who are paying attention will not be hurt by this
    - Are candidates statements required?
      - Maximum limit, but not minimum
  - Senator Mather:
    - Hearsay indicates that many students want to vote out every sitting senator
    - Can senators eliminate accountability by not including their incumbent status in their statement?
      - The SU-mandated piece of information is removed
      - Every constituent meeting EC Kish has had has been overwhelmingly in favor of removing the tags
        - Not a single one has said otherwise
        - First time candidates are disadvantaged by incumbent tags more than anything



## SENATE

- Removing the tags will always help first time candidates more than anything
  - The vast majority of the student body will likely vote for incumbents regardless, if indicated
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Of the students EC Kish met with, have any of them opposed the removal of incumbent tags?
    - No
  - It does not seem like there has been outreach to those who are happy with the status quo
    - EC Kish has not reached out to those he knows will be on one side or the other
    - Individuals have reached out to EC Kish
  - Are those who vote without paying as much attention voicing their opinion in that way? Is there a bias towards those who are unhappy with the status quo over those who support it?
    - Not a single person has come out in support of keeping the tags
    - EC Kish prioritizes fairness in elections
    - EC Kish acknowledges this is not a perfect solution, but a step towards fairness
  - Is EC Kish elected or appointed? Does it apply to him?
    - Appointed, so it does not apply
- Stephen Bertelsman:
  - Confirms this is a Q&A only
  - How long are candidate statements?
    - Varied in the past
    - WUGO caps each at 150 words (~9-10 lines)
    - Order of the candidates on each ballot will be re-randomized
  - How will cluttered ballots be avoided? Can it be kept user-friendly?
    - This new system will be more cluttered, but more fair
    - Sacrifice visual cleanliness for level playing field
  - How can the ballot be fair if statements auto-open and still prominently display incumbent status? Is this not the same?
    - The new system makes it so *all* candidates' statements must be seen, even if not read
- Senator Smith:
  - Is the word "incumbent" included in the word limit?
    - Yes, because it is the choice of the candidate to display this



- Are there statistics on incumbent reelection rates? Especially in spring elections
  - EC Kish does not currently have a hard number; however, examining the past ballots have demonstrated a very high reelection rate (~85+%)
- Where does EC Kish's constituent sample come from? Is it representative of most students? Age breakdown?
  - Most students have been first-year students, likely because of the recent FYCC elections
  - Students from other classes have been involved as well
- Senator Kadish:
  - Notes he will not be re-running, so he does not benefit from this at all
  - Can EC Kish clarify "overwhelming"?
    - Focus Committee has seen 30-50 students (admittedly not a huge sample), but every single one has been vehemently in favor of removing tags
  - By removing the incumbent tags and randomizing the ballot, are the elections simply being made random? Is information being removed? Is this a good tradeoff?
    - EC Kish does not believe that that tradeoff exists
    - Those who are helped by the existence of the tags are a small few; these tags do not translate to informing enough students to make a difference
  - Removing the incumbent tag forces the onus for research onto the students, especially when this information is not easily available. How do you remedy incumbents being able to erase their accountability?
    - Anyone who seeks to remove incumbents is welcome to acquire that information
    - The fact that Senate information is not online is Senate's fault. Incumbent status can be noted elsewhere
- Speaker Lahoti wants to open discussion to all topics

## Discussion

- Senator Tanenbaum makes a point of information: what is the process going forward?
  - Open Houses to discuss this will be available next week
    - Wednesday, 10/18: 10-11am
    - Thursday, 10/19: 11:30am-1:30pm
  - (216) 816-6266



- [elections@su.wustl.edu](mailto:elections@su.wustl.edu)
- Auriann Sehi
  - First-year student
  - The questions tonight seem to be opposed to the proposal. Who is eligible for reelection? Hands are raised
- Senator Mather:
  - Why not have a list, instead of opened up candidate statements?
    - EC Kish likes this idea
  - Should flyering be indicated in the budget?
    - Donated unskilled labor is always valued at \$0
  - Impartial, but the cons of having the tags removed does not necessarily beat the cons of having them there
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Why does EC Kish not believe that Senate and Treasury would not pass anything entirely removing the incumbent tags?
    - Senator Vettiankal and Treasury Representative Gupta expressed their expert opinions on their respective bodies
    - Senate and Treasury feedback, at large, may not have been taken into account until now, but that is in spite of many, many opportunities made available by EC Kish
  - On the topic of fairness: is it fair to assume that incumbents are not going to vote on something that does not have the incumbent tag?
    - Senator Vettiankal makes a point of order: this question is not relevant
      - Speaker Lahoti sustains
- Stephen Bertelsman:
  - Why were more fair proposals not considered?
    - Hours and hours were spent discussing these rules before coming to us tonight
    - Other options were considered, but this proposal was seen to have the greatest realistic chance of passage
    - Senators did not provide feedback before tonight, per their own choice
  - Are these constitutional amendments?
    - No. These are proposed changes to election rules, which only require majority approval from Senate and Treasury
  - In favor of the list proposed by Senator Mather
  - Clear that Senate is opposed to changing the incumbent tag rule
  - Encourages EC Kish to put this list proposal before Senate and Treasury for a formal vote



- Senator Vettiankal:
  - Served on Election Rules Focus Committee
  - There is overwhelming feedback from students that they are not in favor of incumbent tags
  - Only currently elected officials are in favor of these tags
  - The people who are consistently at the top of the vote share are incumbents
  - How do we hold people accountable for controversies? Roll call votes.
  - There have been multiple opportunities to voice concerns, without any input from Senators
  - Senators are elected to represent what the student body wants, and they are clearly against the tags, so they ought to listen
- Senator Smith:
  - During discussion, was there ever talk about difference in incumbent tags for Senate vs. Treasury?
    - Many conversations about this
    - EC Kish believed that it would be hard to pass this in Treasury and Senate, but not for Exec
    - Committee does not believe varying the incumbent tag rule by body is fair or a good idea
    - EC Kish wants every voter to have more of a voice in who represents them, so their voice and this principle should not falter based on body
  - Notes that she is unaffected by this change
- Nathan Card:
  - Speaks in favor of the proposed rule on candidate booths and banning polling stations
    - Danger of coercion
    - Uncomfortability
  - He has yet to find a single person who supports incumbent tags, in his own informal polling
  - Believes that the removal of incumbent tags makes Senators more accountable to the students, because they will have to demonstrate to the student body that they are truly able and willing to represent their voice
- Senator Adler:
  - Agrees with Nathan Card
  - In favor of Senator Mather's proposal
  - Is up for reelection
  - Overwhelming consensus among students is that incumbency tags are unfair and prevent first time candidates from winning seats



- Suggests that Speaker Lahoti conduct a straw poll on the two main proposals on the floor tonight
- Senator Mather:
  - Ideas of changing endorsements, but we have not discussed the logic behind this
  - Did we previously allow staff and faculty to endorse?
    - Yes
  - What ideas were thrown around?
    - How much freedom do we want to give elected officials in who they choose to endorse?
      - Should they be entirely restricted or equally able to endorse, just as any other student
    - Should fall seats be able to endorse spring seats? Vice versa?
    - Should sitting executive members be allowed to endorse candidates for other branches?
    - Should outgoing executive members be allowed to endorse executive candidate?
  - Opposed to any change, because there is more weight carried by these elected voices and a fair assessment comparing candidates cannot be by sitting members
  - Believes that EC Kish is doing a fantastic job
- Speaker Lahoti wants to do the straw polls at 9:25pm (currently 9:08pm) and asks to limit a back and forth
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Thanks constituents in attendance
  - Wants to clarify that he is not up for reelection and has no agenda for personal gain in discussing these proposed changes
  - Points out that Senate is giving feedback now and is doing its best
  - It is a little unfair for some of the questions and comments in the room to be painting a negative picture
  - It is important to note that there are reasons why people did not show up to the meetings EC Kish held
- Mia Hamernik:
  - Since they first started coming to Senate sessions on 9/17, brought up the importance of putting a face to SU. This has not happened
  - There is pretty much no information about senators online, and this is not difficult to arrange
  - Senators seem to be very critical of something they have been silent about up until this moment
  - Disappointing that only Senator Vettiankal was present at meetings



- Also a student, also very busy, and yet attended almost every available meeting: one could argue that they have been more involved in this process than any Senator
- Talking about how student body dislikes Senate
- Talking about how students click random names on the ballot
- There is a lot of work to do in making Senate more accessible, transparent, and accountable
- Cannot comprehend why someone would vote against this
- Clayton Covington:
  - Wants to specifically address Senator Tanenbaum's comment about unfairness
  - Acknowledges that Senators have burden, but this burden has not changed, other than in visibility
  - It is unfair for people like Clayton and Mia to have to come to Senate to tell them how to do their role
  - When there are people whining about how difficult it is to be a Senator right now, this is disrespectful
  - When a constituent feels their needs are not being met, they have every right to vote officers out and hold them accountable
  - Here on his own volition to try and navigate this space
  - The reason he is here is because Senate will shut down voices, particularly underprivileged voices
- Senator Kadish moves away from incumbent tags and notes that many rules require specific approval from EC Kish
  - 11, 12, 14, Expenses & Expenditure Reports 2-3, Campaign Reports
  - Will all rulings be documented and justified?
    - In past practice, this has not been done, but EC Kish is willing to do for his own accountability
- Auriann Sehi
  - Will be running in the fall
  - As a FYS, it is incredible to see the amount of backlash, hesitancy, and uncomfotability students have with Senate
    - Measures such as this are to the benefit of this body
      - Diversifying the body
      - Making sure more voices are heard
  - EC Kish is doing an amazing job, despite his lack of experience. This is exemplary of the unfairness in prioritizing perceived experience
  - Reiterates Clayton Covington in that it is important for Senate to understand that running for a position is holding oneself accountable to one's platform



- It is unfair to complain about pressures, because this burden is taken
- It is not necessarily an honor to be in this Senate, but a responsibility and a burden
- Wants to be sure that Senate is listening to many different facets of the student body
- Senator Mather:
  - Kind of on the fence before, but no longer
  - With the idea of no incumbent tags and a list, will this not move to a more even distribution in time?
    - EC Kish says this is an experiment: new rules that have not been explored before
    - This experiment is grounded in the hours of work put in by the Election Rules Focus Committee and feedback from Senate and Treasury tonight
  - Point of information: how many left on the Speaker's List?
    - 1
  - Point of information: can we have 3 straw poll options?
    - 3
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - He is not complaining, but acknowledging
  - Cites how many hours of meetings he has sat in
  - Walks up to the front of the room to gather the placards that are uncollected
  - Speaker Lahoti intervenes to ask if this point is germane to conversation

### Straw Poll

- Keep incumbent tags as is
  - 1
- Recommendation given by EC Kish: having incumbent tags removed by statements fully open
  - 2
- Senator Mather's proposal: list with no incumbent tags, still have to press to open statements
  - 8

### Town Hall for Black Students Proposal

- Kielah Harbert and Clayton Covington take the floor
- Overview:



- Asking administration to meet with black students at Wash U for them to gain better understanding of experiences here
- Offer solutions that are not currently in place in regards to the five year plan on diversity and inclusion
- Senate will be voting on whether or not to endorse this
- Questions, concerns, comments?
  - Senator Mather:
    - Are there any solidified plans on date, etc.?
      - It depends on the schedule of administrators, so the goal is to present this request to the administration and work from there
      - Goal is to have it within the month within which it is submitted
    - Is this open to all students?
      - Only open to black students on campus to have a space to safely speak directly with the administration
    - How will this be facilitated?
      - Town hall
        - Panel of students who volunteer to be the main voices
        - Students line up to present questions and concerns
      - Goal is to present the letter as it is
  - Senator Vettiankal:
    - Thanks the presenters for coming
    - Is this the first time they have reached out to administration?
      - No. Meetings have happened in the past and are not typically ignored
    - Administration has met with black students but not addressed concerns?
      - Essentially. There is a niche group of black students who typically meets with administrators, so this would open up opportunities to more than just the select few
  - Justice Meg Stolberg
    - Who is this letter signed by?
      - List of students who decide to support it
  - Senator Adler:
    - Are recurring town halls under consideration?
      - This is a really good idea to represent more students
    - How can he best sign his name and help in this endeavor?
      - Will get back to him
    - Strongly in favor: can he sign it today?
      - Yes. It will be sent out



- Assistant Director of Campus Life for Student Involvement: Peggy Hermes:
  - Why the specific administrators at the bottom? Have other staff members' names been discussed?
    - A very important point, especially with the announcement of Chancellor Wrighton's resignation
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Is this open to all students to attend?
    - No
  - Is this open to all students to listen, but not speak?
    - This will be a closed forum for black identifying students to increase levels of comfortability
  - How will all the relevant individuals be brought into the room?
    - Likely impossible to get all Board members in the room
    - For those who can be held accountable, they will
    - The rest will be pressured to step up
      - Protests
      - Visibility
    - Black Alumni Council has indicated that the Board has been restrictive of all black and/or all Latinx spaces, because of donors
  - Why must the Board be included?
    - All stakeholders, especially those with power and influence, should be aware
    - They are charged with appointing the next chancellor
    - Individual members are directly accountable for issues facing black individuals
      - Ex: violence against black bodies via support for prison-industrial complex
- Speaker Lahoti:
  - How else can SU help, besides endorsing this letter?
    - This is not an easy or brief answer
    - For tonight, stick to this specific proposal
    - There are many things SU could do for black students on campus, but this is not necessarily the space for all of them
    - Signing this letter is the first step
    - Public support
    - Depending on response, a letter of support from Senate directly
- Senator Smith:



- Will this letter be a second step to first reaching out? Suggests giving an introduction first
  - This letter is that first introduction and invitation
- Senator Olivia Williams:
  - Should SU sign it, or should SU Senate sign it?
    - President Robinson:
      - Senate's vote tonight will be taken as feedback and Exec will follow up on the possibility of their signatures
    - Justice Stolberg:
      - Notes difference between individual signatories and Senate signature
    - Important that the institution get behind this letter
- Senator Berkowitz:
  - Signing this is advocacy
  - What is the timeline?
    - It would be untimely to come back with another proposal
    - Two weeks, maximum. Trying to submit this in October
- Senator Vettiankal passes
- Senator Bash passes
- Senator Mather:
  - On the topic of a closed session: are there plans to disclose minutes from the discussion, or only a final statement?
    - Something to discuss amongst those in attendance
    - A lot of emotional labor that comes with sharing stories
    - Leaning towards latter option because public grievance is emotionally taxing
    - However, it would be helpful to have minutes to have things on the record
  - If backed by Senate, does Senate have access to this meeting and its logistics?
    - This is a legitimate concern, but the connotation that SU has with students, particularly black students, means the presence of non-black senators may be counterproductive
  - Does this interfere with the political clause of the constitution?
    - In general, the constitution has it so SU can get involved if an issue affects constituents' directly capacity as students
  - The conversation about full SU backing involves a conversation



## SENATE

- Asks that Senate advocate in such a forum, affirming that this letter must be passed in support of students and their direct capacity
- Makes a point of clarification about the process for approving this letter
- Senator Adler motions to vote
  - Speaker Lahoti clarifies that this is not a direct vote tonight
- Vice President of Administration Tess Mandoli passes
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Do the presenters plan to return for a vote in two weeks?
    - Major commentary so far has been related to grammar and style, so an endorsement note would be ideal and feasible
    - Can give option to remove endorsement later, but no major changes are envisioned
  - Could the letter clarify why certain administrators are included?
- Senator Weiner passes
- Senator Olivia Williams motions to vote
  - Motion fails
- Senator Smith:
  - Concerned about SU involvement
  - Would Senate be kept in the loop about planning and marketing the event? In order to endorse, would like to know involvement
    - Keep open mind about communication
    - Would love to get ideas, but cannot guarantee input will be used
    - Point of compromise: could have a Q&A afterwards
- Senator Mather:
  - Totally behind this letter
  - Notes that there are many comments made on the draft given to Senate
  - Does not believe this to be a sufficiently finalized document to warrant a yes vote. Would like a return visit to be made to keep themselves accountable
    - Next week is Fall Break
    - Understand that it is not yet done, but asks that Senate understand why not
      - Basic premise is there
      - Not every grammatical nuance may be conveyed
      - If you agree with the sentiment, please trust in the authors
    - Not much will change
- Senator Tanenbaum:



- Fully supports this
- Willing to vote on it tonight, with contingency of the appendix he proposed earlier
- Will sign as an individual, if necessary
- Senator Weiner:
  - SU endorsing this letter or supporting this letter should not be co-opting it and making it into an SU event
  - Senate needs to respect where this event came from
  - Advocacy is not telling others how to think, feel, be, react, etc.
  - The letter is complete in spirit and sentiment, and the grammaticality is not a reason to vote no
- Senator Berkowitz:
  - Agrees with Senator Weiner
  - Wholeheartedly supports this letter
- Senator Vettiankal:
  - Senate should respect the authors of this letter and their ownership
  - Take a step back and look at the bigger picture here
- Clayton Covington:
  - Returning to the point of the event being a black space, asks Senate to think about the history of the relationship between SU and black students
  - Also notes how it is only the two presenters here tonight, and asks Senate to consider why and what that means
- Senator Tanenbaum motions to vote with his contingency of an appendix
- Senator Vettiankal motions to vote as is
  - Senator Tanenbaum objects, asking for clarification on whether his proposal will be considered
    - It will be considered
- **Vote to endorse passes unanimously**

## **Resolution: Formally Adopting Roll-Call Votes on all Final Votes**

### Q&A

- Senator Smith: would Senator Kadish be amenable to allowing a closed ballot vote, to prevent bias, and have this be reflected ex post facto?
  - Yes
- Carolyn Perlmutter:



- How will these votes be publicized, especially given how Senate has difficulty publicizing the body?
  - It will be read into the minutes
  - Names are attached to votes
- Praises minutes (Recording Secretary Weiner appreciates this)
- Could the resolution include a more specific form of publicity?
  - Senator Olivia Williams makes a point of clarification: minutes are available on the SU website

## Discussion

- Senator Mather:
  - Forced votes are reflected
  - Some senators are going to choose something based on the backlash they would receive
  - Against having a roll call for every vote we have
  - Minutes are published without approval; are there plans to approve them beforehand?
    - Speaker Lahoti: minutes are governed by parliamentary procedure, and SU operates on a modified version
  - Response:
    - The work we do as Senators is always public
    - Students who are unable to attend should still be aware of what has transpired
- Speaker Lahoti:
  - Suggests recording justification after each vote
  - Senator Mather makes a point of inquiry: how would the logistics of this be handled?
    - See amendment
- Senator Adler passes
- Senator Smith proposes an amendment:
  - When people are voting, they should be held accountable
  - However, social desirability bias
  - “Further be it resolved that the roll call vote shall be conducted by marked ballot, with the votes then being read aloud into the minutes”
  - Senator Adler supports this completely and motions to vote on this amendment
    - Senators Smith and Mather object
  - Senator Mather:
    - Wanted to read what was written



- Senator Bash agrees with Senator Adler
- Senator Berkowitz motions to vote on this amendment
  - Passes
- Senator Levinson:
  - Voices concern over political discussion and has concern with people seeing which way individual senators vote
  - May lead to more politicized elections
  - Does not believe ideologies are why Senators are here
- Senator Mather:
  - “Marked ballot” is not well defined
    - Senator Kadish explains this and encourages Senator Mather to propose an amendment to define this if he is interested
- Senator Vettiankal:
  - This passed the Resolutions Committee unanimously
  - This is an important step in accountability
  - Yields time to Assistant Director Hermes
    - Where does this resolution live after passage? How does it become actionable?
      - Speaker Lahoti responds by saying the Speaker has access to a compiled procedure list
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Can Senator Vettiankal define “being held accountable”?
    - Senator Vettiankal: people deserve to know how Senators vote and if they are representing students accurately and fairly
- Senator Levinson:
  - Suggests voluntary anonymous voting
- Senator Berkowitz:
  - Adjusting this more and more makes this no longer a roll call vote
- Senator Weiner:
  - Allowing optional anonymity negates the purpose of this resolution
  - Accountability and transparency
- Senator Mather motions to amend:
  - Include individual justifications with marked ballots
  - Senator Kadish views this as a friendly amendment
  - Senator Smith motions to vote
    - Passes
- Senator Berkowitz passes
- Senator Levinson passes



- Senator Smith passes
- Senator Tanenbaum:
  - Notes that Senate endorsing the Town Hall letter was endorsing a safe, exclusive space, and suggests that this resolution would deprive Senate of the same
- Speaker Lahoti notes that context matters
- Senator Pickman:
  - This is not the same situation as the town hall
  - What Senate discusses is
- Senator Kadish:
  - We are elected officials, and Clayton and Kielah are not
- Senator Vettiankal:
  - Agrees with Senator Kadish
- Senator Berkowitz:
  - Hears concerns of Senator Levinson
  - Open to ongoing dialogue about roll call vote with every docket item
- Senator Weiner:
  - Our identity as Senators is not the same as someone's identity as a black person
- Senator Olivia Williams:
  - Follows up with Senator Berkowitz
- Senator Levinson:
  - Clarifies concern about politicization: political affiliation may be more represented on the ballot than is desirable
- Senator Smith:
  - Contextualize concerns with an example: you may support ideas but not content, and justifications would help, but could lead to assumptions
- Motion to vote:
  - We do not have quorum

### **SPB Follow-up, Presented by Senator Olivia Williams**

- Tabled for later
- Will be sent out in the meantime

### **Open Forum**

- Executive Updates:
  - VPA Mandoli:
    - Returns to the idea of pairing Senators with student groups



## SENATE

- Asks Senators to sign up
  - Keep up the good work
- Senator Liu:
  - Potential other option for incumbent tags:
    - Suggests adding a line about what incumbents have been doing and what upcoming candidates want to do
- Senator Mather passes
- Senator Berkowitz:
  - Agrees with Senator Liu
  - Wishes everyone a good Fall Break
- Senator Smith passes

**TIME ADJOURNED // 10:39pm -- Speaker Lahoti adjourns the session**