Wrap-up post GBM

- People liked it! We did good - space signatories having to be students was only pushback (MTG stage techs, alumni, ...convenience things)
  - RE. cross-registration, definition of roles debated. Currently Pres. and Treasurer need to be MIT students, 50% rule already exists.
  - Alum/non-student group takeovers exist and the existing rules don’t provide hard enough line.
  - VP and secretary not technically defined under existing ASA guidelines
  - Proposal: all voting members / board members have to be students? This would exclude space signatories, center the organization on students, resolve complaints. **Discuss more next week post-ASA official, @board send suggestions for further debate**

- Hardly anyone tried to submit suggestions on the guidelines changes
- **To do:** diff the list of engage groups w/ those who checked in, bump them *in conjunction with* the ASA official information (“see the email for make-up dates and let us know”) @sabina

- Make up session: @becca @jay pick times to run make ups

- **Next couple days:** make up dates on the ASA Official, procedures, one last week to send us thoughts on the guidelines changes. Make it explicitly clear changes are happening!
  - GBM vetoes any guideline changes they don’t like - we’ll vote as a board and then GSC/UA can also veto at the presidential level. Unlikely we’ll have a GBM veto, but regardless we’re seeking input now to mitigate this.

Ethical Leadership Statement

- Statement to define the expectations of the MIT community and how we consider ‘ethical leadership’ - got feedback from GSC and awaiting UA feedback
  - Will link this document online / within the ASA Official
  - Statement debugged extensively, we like it
    - *The ASA board likes Oxford Commas*

- For the future: relationship statement of how organizations relate to the Institute and where they fit in. This would act as an introduction to our Student Handbook - *what does a group look like?* Expect this down the pipeline
Group Applications

- Lots of people wrote back! To consider:
  - microProjects Society (speak to relevant parties, IP, making progress)
  - QOL+ (national foundation - speak to relevant parties)
  - Surfrider Foundation (national foundation - speak to relevant parties)
  - Venture Association (merger w finance, agreement w VC firm may counter ASA)
  - Greater China Vision (vision seems unique - need to explicitly talk to other groups)
  - Euchre (RECOGNIZED FOR FUNDING)

- Food groups!
  - PlanEAT is distinct as an advocacy organization, worth waiting another week for. However, if they're not a recognized group they can't use the MIT name, advertise, etc.
  - Other groups want to meet together, mergers are in progress

- Leadership and Human Capital:
  - Objective is explicitly not a Sloan thing - it already exists within Sloan and has a massive following for events. Wants this to become a leadership hub and make a push for corporate engagement etc.
  - Need to push into main MIT userspace - positive reception from ideation. Started conversations w/ other leadership groups on campus
  - We'll have further conversations about this! Talk with existing faculty leadership advisors - collaboration is a good idea