Keywords: Labor/USLAC and Sun Services, divestment from fossil fuels, grading mode changes, winter session (“J-Term”).

Agenda:
Opening of the Meeting: Meeting called to order at 7:00pm

1. Fight song and role call
   a. 4 non-members present.
   b. Fred enjoyed the fight song.

2. Open Forum

3. Labor Resolution
   a. David Whitney ‘16, Susannah Greenblatt ‘16, Claire Marshall ‘17, Alma Sanchez-Eppler ‘14 are present from USLAC to discuss a resolution proposal that they wrote about the treatment of custodial workers.
   b. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: We’re hoping this resolution gets the university to start thinking about what kinds of standards for people who are contracted on campus, like the custodial workers. We are proposing to form a committee of students, faculty, administrators, and workers to investigate into any grievances against the Code of Conduct for subcontractors on campus (2000). That committee would take a look at the document and revise it. We want to make sure it’s up to a standard that we’re proud of and that we can enforce it. Other proposal is that Wesleyan break or amend contract with Sun Services to facilitate the addition of five new positions-- there were ten more positions this year than there were last year. We’re hoping to expand this full-time.
   c. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: Why is it our responsibility to dictate to this company the Code of Conduct to these workers? Why not change the company?
   d. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: We have a contract with the Sun Services, and Wesleyan pays the salaries of these workers but they’re hired through the company directly, so to hire 5 more people, the company would need to receive more money from Wesleyan. Sun Services has made it clear that in an ideal world, Wesleyan would give them more money to hire more people, but that’s not going to happen under the current contract. That contract is not fair to workers.
   e. Susannah Greenblatt: This would be a standard for Wesleyan’s conduct with any contractors, regardless of who it is.
f. Scott Elias: In urging Wesleyan to break their contract, is the goal to have a different contractor or have just a different contract?

g. David Whitney: This document was signed under Doug Bennet, and part of this document states that this type of committee for subcontractor conduct would exist but it wasn’t. We’re asking that this committee be set up now. As for what contractor we use, that’s secondary for us. But that depends on us coming up with a standard we’re comfortable with.

h. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: Wesleyan has no direct contact with the workers in terms of their contracts with the company, which means there’s no accountability from Wesleyan to think of the workers as community members whose rights are protected on this campus.

i. Jason Shatz: In looking through these articles [wesleying refs in res], I agree that these workers are members of our community and we should respect them as such. Has there been any consideration as to the line between student action and work action? I believe that students are just as responsible for keeping the spaces on this campus clean.

j. Claire Marshall: there are health codes that prevent students from cleaning up toilets and other areas. Getting students more aware is a big issue.

k. David Whitney: Part of the discussion are that industry standards that are being leveraged on us. We’re questioning whether the standards take into account the people who are inhabiting these spaces. Part of the issue is that these places are continually dirtier than usual.

l. Bruno Machiavelo: can we just break contract? Ramifications?

m. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: it is legally-binding. In order to make changes, Wesleyan would need to hire lawyers to do so. Unsure if there’s a way to amend contract without going into a legal conflict.

n. Glenn Cantave: Are there are reasons why ten workers decided to leave? Is Wesleyan prepared to hire five more workers? What are the standards of proper treatment?

o. David Whitney: When Wesleyan decided to put the contract up for bids, they did that for several reasons. All we know is that there are gaps in resources and people and we think that’s completely ridiculous. We are proposing that the cost shift from the workers to the university because that makes more sense.

p. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: These are people’s jobs and they work very hard. They’re going to be doing a lot of work. But we’re also trying to give these workers a voice. They’re in charge of a ridiculous amount of cleaning, and we’re trying to give them a voice. These do meet very loose standards, but it is also means that stuff is just not getting cleaned or not getting cleaned as well. People need more time to clean, and it isn’t happening right now.

q. Claire Marshall: We need a formation of committee that is a platform to determine what standards should be. We want to have a committee that seeks to determine how its
community members should be treated and go piece-by-piece through industry standards to determine how they’re not being met.

r. Martin Malabanan: Why is Sun not replacing retiring staff? Can’t the university be the ones to directly hire the 5 extra staff requested? We should research costs of getting more workers versus breaking the contract.

s. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: Wesleyan has a few custodians that are still hired in-house, but they’re trying to move away from that model. In-house custodians are paid at a rate starting at $17/hr, and people who are here for a while have pay raises, but it’s certainly much more than the employees through Sun Services receive. Sun Services employees get around $14/hr, which is the starting wage for union employees. The work is being done, but we have this separate standard for these other employees on campus, which is pretty problematic. The budget for this whole operation comes directly from John Meerts’ office.

t. Nicole Updegrove: The industry standards for how much space can reasonably be cleaned per person in a day makes a lot of sense for modern, dense, office-based spaces, but Wesleyan doesn’t fit that mold. We have old buildings that accumulate dirt quickly, utilities that constantly break, many many people using the same spaces with high traffic, students on substances, and custodians who are not in their twenties or thirties any more. Custodians are also cleaning while we’re in the spaces, which can add further delays. The industry standards just don’t make sense as a definition of a reasonable workload at a place like Wesleyan. In terms of money - hiring more custodians is going to cost money, but the status quo creates unsafe work conditions for people who have been working for Wes for decades, and that’s unacceptable.

u. Aidan Martinez: Who’s creating the unsafe work environment, and what grievances are the workers communicating to you?

v. Susannah Greenblatt: We’re concerned that the contract is insufficient, not that Sun Services isn’t being compliant. I’ve talked to so many workers who have had huge issues and have such physical and emotional strains due to their work.

w. David Whitney: One important clarification is that the reason that this is all coming to a head now is that they were reorganized this past summer with new workloads, and they’ve been in this weird “period of experimentation”. Second, we would assert that they’ve violated their contract by giving unreasonable workloads, but also that they been using equipment that is just not updated. Also, they’ve said that some of their managers have been doing the work because they haven’t been able to finish the work.

x. Straw poll taken: 21 support the Resolution. 9 undecided. none oppose.

y. Andrew Trexler: People who left because of attrition left because the contract was terrible. I would suggest making some friendly amendments to the resolution: taking out my quote and changing “highlighting” to “acknowledging”.

z. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: they signed contract to go to 50 workers. Why should we need
to break the contract to change that? Why should Wesleyan negotiate rather than the Union? Why should the WSA go to the administration when the workers already have a union?

aa. Susannah Greenblatt: This document is written for the Wesleyan community; the workers’ union has nothing to do with this and should not. This is our place to step in. Because we’re leaders we have a responsibility and change things.

bb. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: I also want to clarify that there are two separate contracts that are unrelated. There’s one between the union and the company which talks about worker benefits and their pay, and there’s another between the company and Wesleyan, and that’s the one that we’re addressing here that establishes what cleaning will look on Wesleyan’s campus without regard to the people. Then there’s a third document which is the code of conduct for subcontracted companies at Wesleyan. That puts out all these standards but doesn’t have any regulatory power right now. That’s just to clarify.

c. Claire Marshall: The union is doing its job, but we want to rise above the union because we don’t support the standards they’re setting; we want to have a higher standard.

dd. Susannah Greenblatt: we’re trying to revise and enforce the code of conduct that’s already in place

e. Matan Koplin-Green: Have you done other research to companies that are more up to standards and research to situations like this at other schools?

ff. Susannah Greenblatt: We’ve talked to the president of Sun Services and workers, and they’ve said that the way to do this is to go through the university.

gg. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: In all honesty, Sun Services is a good company. Their promise concerning how to treat workers was better than competition. However, they haven’t lived up to expectations.

hh. Alton Wang: We’ve discussed in the past whether this is our place. It is our place—we need to take a stand. If Wesleyan is going to break contract, how feasible is that?

ii. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: They can do it; we just need to push them to do it.

jj. Martin Malabanan: My problem is that there needs to be more numbers to this. How much will the budget increase for custodians, how much work do the workers do, what are the benefits of the union, etc.? Also, some citations are missing from the resolution, so I would love to have those numbers.

kk. Susannah Greenblatt: Sun Services has no reason not to hire more workers as it makes their account larger.

ll. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: we will continue to look into numbers and revise.

mm. Claire Marshall: The problem is that a lot of numbers have to do with square footage and a lot of qualitative issues.

nn. Susannah Greenblatt: This is a qualitative process rather just than a quantitative argument.
oo. Colin O’Keefe: why wasn’t committee formed?

pp. Susannah Greenblatt: the committee wasn’t allowed to have any teeth or any workers on it.

qq. Aidan Martinez: I agree with your resolutions, but I’m struggling with the second part of your resolution because I have issues with breaking a contract. I would just recommend fixing the language.

rr. Susannah Greenblatt: Workers wouldn’t lose job. Sun Services wouldn’t be resentful over breaking contract; they want this account.

ss. Scott Elias: I would make friendly amendment to the clauses. But I think this is the most relevant resolution we’ve faced, and that’s awesome, so I’d love for us to pass this resolution. This is students showing their concerns and us trying to make a better community, and we should further this resolution because of that.

tt. Richard Fessler: It’s been said that these standards often don’t apply to us. It would be nice to develop standards that do apply to us.

uu. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: The standards are a little tricky because of the university’s involvement, so it’s a “blanket” topic. But everywhere on campus differs from everywhere else, so it’s hard to put standards on buildings (academics buildings differ greatly from program houses, etc.).

vv. Susannah Greenblatt: Changing industry standards is so difficult, but changing Wesleyan standards is much easier.

ww. Richard Fessler: What do peer institutions like Williams doing?

xx. Susannah Greenblatt: Our peer institutions are in similar boats. Will address when place is reached in stack.

yy. Rebecca Hutman: I was wondering if there’s been any preliminary between your group and the administration? Also, just in regard to the two solution, it seems like the first is creating a group that will provide/discuss standards, but the second offers up that standards are already in place, so would the adoption of the second solution “hush” the product of the first solution?

zz. Susannah Greenblatt: We would hope to anticipate future problems, things that aren’t so quantifiable. The first resolution has been adopted, just not enforced. Second part is budget question, worth fighting for.

aaa. Andrew Trexler: Every time we’ve changed management companies, the old workers have been kept on. Why are we doing this? Because we care about members of our community. We as a body, the WSA, have a responsibility to influence the actions of Wesleyan as a whole. In this case, the students think we need to change this contract. To answer Richard’s question, I think we just need to look at ourselves from the recent past to see what something acceptable looks like.

bbb. Alma Sanchez-Eppler: There were a lot of management issues under ABM.

ccc. Jason Shatz: Susannah alluded to one of the points I was going to make. So I was
wondering about other schools’ work on this issue?

Susannah Greenblatt: will address during place in stack

Martin Malabanan: When does this contract expire?

Alma Sanchez-Eppler: It’s a three-year contract with renewal possibility of twelve years. There will soon be rebidding process and it’s expected that if Sun has done well, they will get the next contract.

Susannah Greenblatt: So a lot of people have brought up what our peer institutions are doing, and I don’t think that that’s completely necessary. It’s about rising above what the standards are, and Wesleyan is known for being progressive and creating new standards. So this is an awesome opportunity to use this power that we have to change things here than it is in other institutions.

Claire Marshall: looking to other institutions would be to ignore what’s going on where. We were better in the past; let’s phase back to that.

Jacob Munisky: Resolution will be voted on next week (13/10/13)

Open Forum re-opened.

4. Minutes: Approved

5. Divestment Resolution


b. Angus McLean: We are asking the administration to divest from fossil fuel companies. It’s not a very practical request at the moment, but this is a very long-term process. This resolution makes a lot of powerful statements. This is a very complex topic, and we haven’t gotten the administration’s opinions of it. Michael Roth thinks that the endowment is not a social policy vehicle, but it has come to my attention that he has asked investors not to invest with companies associated with tobacco.

c. Pierre Gerard: As of January 2013, Wesleyan has invested in all sorts of fossil fuels. Fossil fuel companies represent 5% of endowments at most college. I don’t understand why we’re still invested in these companies beyond our .3% returns. Walter Energy and Occidental Petroleum are the two companies involved.

d. Zach Wulderk: I wanted to talk about how fossil fuel companies. Their environmental and health impacts are problematic. In 2001, American Lung Association stated that air pollution is worse for minority regions.

e. Maya McDonnell: We don’t have large endowment, currently in process of making it bigger. We want to ensure that alumni are aware of how their donations are being used in terms of fossil fuel investment.

f. Abby Smith: Wesleyan should be at the front of this movement as the country moves away from fossil fuels.

g. Zach Kramer: There is an ethical and environmental side to argument. Investing in
renewable resources would be long-term investment due to evidence of carbon bubble.

h. Andrew Trexler: Portion of fossil fuels in endowment is significantly larger at Wesleyan. Regarding alumni donations, be cautious about using that argument because last year was our best year for donations.

i. Kate Cullen: Peter Shumlin has voiced support for divestment. By passing resolution, Wesleyan is making statement that we’re committed to divestment even if it takes a while. This would set the tone.

j. Scott Elias: I think sometimes we take it for granted at Wesleyan that we all assume that climate change is happening, and there are other people that are actively trying to stop these climate change ideas. One of the few things we can do is taking action on our own campus, and there’s nothing better than stuff like this resolution. It won’t make the administration change their mind immediately, but it’ll start the conversation and start a domino effect. We could inspire other universities to divest.

k. Jason Shatz: Zach Wulderk mentioned that one of the top ten cities for lung pollution is Bridgeport. Is there a way we can make this campaign conducive to phenomena right in our area? They must have some real consequences, so how do you plan to highlight those?

l. Zach Wulderk: We’re trying to solve the issues at the university first before moving on to actual cities, but the citizens of Bridgeport have in fact complained. So hopefully with this passing, we can show that there’s university support, and we can then help them.

m. Martin Malabanan: Would you be open to investing in natural gas over coal and oil? Natural gas is low-carbon emitting; better than Walter and Occidental.

n. Zach Kramer: There are a lot of research projects going on to get new carbon material. They’ve been spending billions of dollars wasting away trying to research new methods.

o. Straw poll on feelings about passing this resolution: 17 undecided. 11 support. 1 oppose.

p. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: I commend the co-sponsors for their amendments on this resolution. It’s great to see such hard work. I want to just pull us back on defining the values of our community. If we want to say we’re environmentally friendly now and in the future, this is a great way to say that. I encourage everyone to vote for this resolution.

q. Pierre Gerard: In terms of Roth’s comment on endowment and social vehicle, I want to highlight political and cultural values of divestment. Roth is wrong to say that the issues are not politicized.

r. Colin O’Keefe: Have concerned alumni already contacted administration?

s. Maya McDonnell: They came to us. There are a lot of people who are willing to show support for this cause.

t. Madison Moore: There’s definitely the endowment to think about; we’d be losing over $100 million. There’s a lot of other things to think about. We need to understand where
this money from fossil fuels is coming.
u. Andrew Trexler: To answer Madison, there are a lot of things to do with $100 million. We should wait until the CIR report is released to vote to firm up financial specifics. I recommend taking out anything related to money in resolution. We will win based on the social change aspects of argument.
v. Nicole Updegrove: Point of information, the CIR report with their official stance on divestment should come out this week.
w. Izzy Linzer: How would you address the health impacts of fracking and the extraction of other fossil fuels?
x. Maya McDonnell: We are not in support of natural gas.
y. Zach Kramer: There’s some great evidence that says these companies are over-valued. I really think that the endowment argument is weak.
z. Andrew Trexler: The facts won’t necessarily change the minds of the administration.

aa. Rebecca Hutman: First I want to say that I personally am absolutely in favor of divestment but I have issues with the focus of this resolution. Angus said the issue is transparency, and I think that the resolution should emphasize. We don’t want to lose credibility so early in this conversation.

bb. Angus McLean: We want to set tone that this is what students care about at Wesleyan. It’s important that this body represents the community as a whole-- Wesleyan students care about this issue.

c. Bruno Machiavelo: I was undecided, but now I’m moving towards support. It doesn’t matter if the administration looks at issue; the students need to be heard. Point of resolution isn’t to change administration’s mind, just used as a voice in this issue.

dd. Aidan Martinez: I wanted to speak to those who are unsure. We have to vote on this because time is running out. If nothing is done, the environment will look totally different in 100 years than what it looks like today. There’s a lot better places to invest in than fossil fuels. There are tons of other environmental companies that look promising.

e. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: On Bruno’s point, I now support issue. I think it’s important to define what we want the student culture to be. We need to put pressure on the administration somehow. I don’t know when we’re going to do it if we don’t do it now.

ff. Chris Caines: Just out of curiosity, how many schools have already divested, and what are the details:

g. Angus McLean: There are six schools that have done this. Unity College in Maine is the most informed. They started this process in 2008 and have fully divested. So far, they have not had any adverse impacts to their endowment. They’ve seen a lot of new interest in the school from applicants and alumni donations. But they also didn’t have a huge portion of fossil fuels in their endowment.

hh. Sonia Max: Unity started off at 10% of their endowment; 10% is pretty substantial. at 3% they realized there were adverse effects and continued to divest.
ii. Colin O’Keefe: Going off of what Trexler was saying, I just feel like our endowment is a touchy issue with the administration, and trying to give financial advice won’t be productive. But I do support this resolution.

jj. Zach Krama: I would say that a lot of our arguments are financially based.

kk. Maya McDonnell: Last semester we had a conversation with President Roth, and he said we needed more hard facts and information to back up our claims, so that’s why we’re so heavy in terms of numbers.

ll. Andrew Trexler: Martin, divestment would take about eight years to complete based on current contracts.

mm. Nicole Updegrove: Props to Madison for voice a dissenting opinion! To break the echo chamber and speak for the other side - it is important to note that among 17 peer institutions, Wesleyan has the second lowest endowment-per-student ratio. Our endowment is not strong and we have to consider that we may not be in the right position to be taking a lead on this, given the financial risks.

nn. Madison Moore: Are there any larger schools that have divested other than Unity? We just need to remember that our endowment is still super important.

oo. Maya McDonnell: San Francisco State University divested last year, as have several other cities.

pp. Angus McLean: Our divestment would spark a national argument. The argument shouldn’t end in this room.

qq. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: We know we can’t start a national movement but we need to be part of a larger movement. We’re not going to be THE catalyst, but we have the chance to be on the forefront of a national movement. Let’s make a statement and be a part of the movement.

rr. Sonia Max: Many schools are in the midst of strong divestment. It would be great if Wesleyan was the first to really take action. We can’t wait longer environmentally. We need this movement to pick up. If we were divested, there might be more alumni contributions.

ss. Aidan Martinez: Unsure of what we’re invested in specifically. If carbon bubble pops, that would hurt endowment far more negatively than divestment right now. Domino effect will hit other schools based on what Wesleyan has done.

tt. Scott Elias: It is within our reach to divest. Saying that it isn’t sustainable isn’t a good argument. This is an ethical issue we need to address.

uu. Alton Wang: It’s interesting for me to be having this conversation. I’ve gone from supporting it to being against it. There’s a lot of speculation, and I’m uncomfortable with it. A lot of the alumni that are donating want more stability, and this could potentially create a ton of instability. At the end of the day, the university has a lot of issues financially, and we don’t need to make it worse. I’m all for divestment from fossil fuels as a political issues, but I don’t know how I like it in terms of Wesleyan.
vv. Bruno Machiavelo: I’m not uncertain. Are we willing to risk financial aid over this issue? Should we risk future generations of Wesleyan students coming here because of this issue?

ww. Zach Wulderk: This isn’t going to force the university to divest right away. What we want is transparency. I don’t see how supporting the fossil fuel industry is any kind of good thing.

xx. Zach Kramer: Divestment would not be a huge compromise to our endowment, as shown through research. It would at least be on par with what we make now.

yy. Angus McLean: Most of the opposition has been from the financial aspect. Passing this resolution won’t be into effect divestment right now. With passage, we can get more transparency and find out the true implications. This is a paradox with courses offered at Wesleyan and investment made.

zz. Scott Elias: There’s this strange idea that there’s going to be some swift divestment that will endanger our endowment, and that’s simply not true. The whole point is creating a process and making divestment a long-term conversation.

aaa. Angus McLean: All change comes from unrecognized acts of goodwill.

bbb. Andrew Trexler: Something undeniable is that climate change is real. Debatable things include whether or not divestment would negatively affect our endowment. Let’s focus on the values of the argument, not just the financial side of things.

6. Committee Reports
   a. Jacob Musinsky: Put laptops away! We have a policy.
   b. Andrew Trexler (for SBC): What are the proportions of equity versus other stuff?
   c. Matan Koplin-Green: Nope. I do not have the figures readily available.

7. Meeting closed: Approved.


9. Meeting re-opened: Approved.

10. Grading Mode Resolution
    a. Grant Tanenbaum: There’s a proposal from last year’s AAC Vice-Chair that says if a student is given the option of how to have their course graded, they should have more opportunity to do so other than Drop-Add. I think this is a no-brainer for students; it really just gives students more options.
    b. Jason Shatz: I want to add something to the argument in the resolution. Professors may or may not give assignments or examinations in this time-frame, so it might change how professors grade assignments.
    c. Grant Tanenbaum: It wouldn’t change how professors grade assignments. It’s just a bureaucratic change. I should also mention that the extra two-week period only allows for you to change your grading method once.
    d. Bruno Machiavelo: People forget to change the grading mode, so this will give people a
chance to actually do it. You also don’t typically have many important assignments in the first two weeks, so this will definitely help.

f. Glenn Cantave: Assembly should also consider course withdrawal period. At Northwestern, they can withdraw without seeing ‘W’ on transcript. Two weeks isn’t substantial to know how difficult course is.

g. Martin Malabanan: Do you see any opposition coming from the faculty?

h. Grant Tanenbaum: Sometimes. The only opposition is from professors who thinks students would try hard due to this flexibility, but this only affects professors who already support the system. And those professors agree with that.

i. Scott Elias: This is a no-brainer. This is way for students to get more power.

j. **Motion to suspend by-laws to vote on proposal tonight:** Approved.

k. **Motion to approve:** Approved.

11. Winter Session Resolution

a. Grant Tanenbaum: Some faculty are concerned that are required to teach courses-- it’s complete voluntary. This resolution just asks faculty to consider winter session. We’re hoping to vote on this today; EPC proposal will be attached when sent to faculty on 14th October.

b. Andrew Trexler: Let’s vote on this next week. Better if handed to faculty on paper instead of electronically.

c. Ben Marvin-Vanderryn: Better if we take care of voting right now.

d. Kate Cullen: Given the amount of things we have to do next week, I think it would be best to vote on this resolution this week.

e. Nicole Updegrove: This resolution has changed a lot as a direct result of speaking with faculty about their concerns. It’s really important to understand the opposition that winter session is going to face, and make sure that we can speak to it. I would really support us waiting a week to vote on this. In the meantime, please speak to your contacts within the faculty and determine where they stand and why.

f. Grant Tanenbaum: For that reason, let’s not bring this resolution to a vote tonight.

12. By-Law Approval

a. Nicole Updegrove: We need to discuss and vote on a number of by-law changes that have been made, both in terms of the changes that were approved during last year’s assembly and new changes to be presented now.

b. Grant Tanenbaum: We should change by-laws slowly because of large implications. We should postpone new changes for a week. Let’s take a stack to split the vote between old and new changes.

c. Nicole Updegrove: I definitely think we can vote on last year’s changes so that we have by-laws to operate by, then discuss new changes, potentially to vote on next week.

d. Andrew Trexler: The only reason we’re making changes is that there were several changes made that are not always how we operate.
e. Straw poll voting on how to split by-law discussions: Majority passes.
f. Motion to approve all of last year’s changes: 26 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstain.
g. Andrew Trexler: We’re now voting on whether or not we’re voting on IT positions within committees. We can only internally elect so many people, and it would’ve gotten ridiculous.
h. Grant Tanenbaum: I fear that people will vote carelessly, so let’s not vote on anything this week, only discuss.
i. Andrew Trexler: We’ll be voting on old by-laws but also new changes that were made over the summer.
j. Alton Wang: I also wanted to point out one substantive change, which includes renaming Sustainability, Finance, and Facilities Committee to Sustainable Finance and Facilities Committee.
k. Andrew Trexler: We are not beholden to Roth.
l. Scott Elias: Also, Michael Roth has a poor view of fraternities. Yeah, frats.
m. Nicole Updegrove: Before voting on our liaison to the IGC, let’s consider whether we should have liaisons to certain student groups over others.

n. Motion for twenty-minute extension of GA: majority denies.

13. New Business and Announcements
   a. Kate Cullen: WSA should come up with ideas for Roth concerning ResLife changes. Ask friends for ideas so we can present undergraduate residential life committee with them.
   b. Nicole Updegrove: First of all, I got the CIR divestment report (draft). Taken directly from their conclusion, divestment could potentially be very detrimental to Wesleyan’s endowment, so they want more research about the specifics of Wesleyan’s endowment and how it could be affected by divestment before they make a recommendation. Second, as I mentioned earlier, we’ll have talks about Privilege, Class, and Policy at Wesleyan on Thursday night at 7 in the DFC, and you should definitely come if you’re interested in these issues.
   c. Motion for five-minute extension of GA: Majority approves.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:00 pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Fred Ayres ‘17 and Lily Herman ‘16