

Community Time: New Dudley House rep!

Presidential Update

- Dean Khurana meeting, first one of term. Bridging and Belonging fund was a big topic.
- April is Sexual Assault Awareness month - perhaps collab with freshmen since they have the same formal date; walk in Boston?; throw safe inclusive parties (team up with HoCo?) Send us an email if you're interested!
- **Sunday, Feb 21st - Town Hall with Harvard Foundation!** Very important - probably between 12 pm and 6.

Committee Updates

- LMD Star - send out the pub when I send it to you! Reaching out to student groups, still talking with Savannah Fritz
- Freshman health week brainstorming/planning happening right now!
- Food Market coming up, John Harvard proposal sent, Crimson Key collab dance? Harvard Project-esque social event competition.
- Tell SRC about your cool projects so they can put it on the website! + pics next week for website bios! Video for Datamatch partnership
- Fi Com - watch for more emails coming soon!

Spring Grants Pack 1

- Very under budget- why? Not sure - reached out to previous email lists and treasurers

Passed by unanimous consent

New Projector

Passed by unanimous consent

Food Market

- Space: Northwest Labs, requires deposit of \$250, and then \$300 for the rest of the event
- Groups will not be applying to Fi Com for money. Part of it coming from the Office of the Dean. Not coming from Bridging and Belonging.

Passed by unanimous consent

Datamatch

- Add more money so that people can go on dates to Clover (doubling amount of dates, also adding another venue). Also getting publicity!

- Not mentioned in emails from Datamatch - didn't want to put our name on it until this legislation was passed. Also video.

Passed by unanimous consent

SHARC Safe Sex Event

- Requires no money - just a campus-wide email!
- Implicit endorsement - follow endorsement rules? Yes. Official endorsement has to go through Rules Committee but if we're just emailing something out and not saying endorsed by UC, does not have to go through Rules Committee!

Voice vote: Passed!

Bridging and Belonging

- Started in term of Gus and Sietse - UC gave us 15k and we agreed to match for a total of 30k - purpose was for bridging and belonging. Front money first and then show Dean Khurana's office receipts retroactively
- At the beginning of the term, look at B&B and decide if we should put up 15k again.
- Confusing - when do we use this fund and for what kind of events? Has it made a difference?
- Now: beginning of every presidential term, prez & vp will present "Compelling Interests" to Council - what the school is specifically focused on at the time. Cooperation with UC and the administration. Council votes them through or votes them down - Exec will whittle them down (can't increase because pre-negotiated with College).
- Any college organization can apply for this fund. Students not formally recognized in an organization can also come together and apply.
- No source of funding in which clubs can apply for an event that is entirely new
- Executive Board shall determine application process? What does that mean? Metrics of success?
 - Exec team to come up with rubric because they will be judging apps
 - OSL putting up 15k and FiCom putting up 15k
 - Not developing metrics for a Council that many of us won't be on
 - Some guidelines for success: number of events, number of people that show up for events
- Discussing new name possibilities as Council
- Not possibility for a lot of change - UC doesn't agree with any compelling interests for example, could only reduce - might be a problem!

- Underutilized currently - expand on marketing campaign?
 - Takes weeks to get funding also.
 - Meeting with every major organization to talk about this program and encourage UC reps to join in effort of pubbing
- Do changes go back to Council? Funds roll over to what? General budgeting pool? Back to Bridging and Belonging for next year?
 - Yes, Exec will deliberate and then will have it brought back to the Council
 - Not going to pile up- every fiscal year, restored to 15k. Also start at 30k no matter how much has been rolled over from previous year.
Possibility for increasing money in the future - 2 year review process.
- Con: Not comfortable, great idea, but there are few line-by-line issues. Should be some space to add/change from a member not on Exec. Not clear where underutilized money goes. Could be changed by amendments - perhaps and revise and bring back next week?
- Point of Inquiry: harms of tabling?
Marketing strategy- want to present this at Town Hall, also need to present Compelling Interests at next meeting.
- Point of Inquiry: irreparably harmed? Administration also waiting for us.
- Point of Inquiry: what is tabling procedure? Majority vote.

Motion to Table via hand vote. 8-24-0

- Pro: Revolutionary role. Turning campaign talk into actionable items. Best way is with money. Concept of compelling interests is itself very compelling. Important for us to address the issues on students' minds. Sometimes we have failed to do so and hopefully this will allow UC debates to become more relevant to debates in dorms.
- Con: Control forfeited to Exec board over how these funds will be spent. Hasn't gone through Rules - concerning. Needs to go through Rules so it can be binding. Piece of legislation will expire by end of semester. Won't delay - bring this along with Compelling Interests at next meeting.
- Pro: Why can't we address these issues now? Why are we passing it off now? Already discussed issues - can propose actual amendments. Our responsibility is to sit here and hash out these problems.
- Point of Inquiry: Will this have to be passed again if this doesn't go through Rules? Fiscal angle won't be binding but legislation in general does carry over.

Amendment:

In Section IV, Part B, replace, "The OSL shall finance half the allocated expenses" with "The OSL shall match the aforementioned commitment, at this time set at \$15,000."

In Section IV, Part C, replace, "For the 2-year program, the fund shall be restored to \$30,000" with "Each fiscal year, the Fund's own, separate budgetary coffers, should they fall below \$30,000 in total, shall be refinanced to the amount requisite to return the Fund to \$30,000, finance half by the Undergraduate Council and half by the Office of Student Life."

- Every fiscal year, this brought up

Passed by unanimous consent.

Oliver's Amendment:

Amend II.B.2 to:

"Should a simple majority not be attained, the Executive Board re-deliberates on the compelling interests. After re-deliberation, the matter shall be returned to the General Body for a vote."

and IV.C.2 to:

"Un-utilized dollars from the Fund shall rollover to the next year into the Bridging and Belonging fund. The Fund shall never exceed \$30,000."

- Eliminates stipulation that Compelling Interests can be increased or changed. Full Council will vote on final decision.
- Still doesn't address the Exec Board autonomy
- Room for negotiation with administration - limiting direction we can adjust doesn't take this into account.

Meggy's Amendment: "

V. Approval

A. The full body of the Undergraduate Council shall approve the final allocation of any and all funds recommended by the Executive Board."

- We need to look at this legislation for what it is, not just assume good intentions
- Efficiency? Concerned sheer amount of money that Exec Board will be in charge of

Motion to Table: Failed by voice vote

- Con: Exec Board is voted in by all of the UC. General UC can question Exec decisions at any point anyway. Grants Pack-esque amendment coming.
- Pro: Want as much of UC to be engaged when so much money is involved
- Con: Student body elected Shaiba and Danny to lead. Discussion to be had, but they need this power to get things done.

- Pro: How clear should this legislation be? Legislation should be as clear as possible - easy solution is to just have this clearly written out. Mentioning Greenlaw's amendment but that shouldn't be an issue when we're debating this amendment.

Meggy's Amendment Passed by Roll Call: 21-5-6

Oliver's Amendment by hand vote: passes unanimously

Total legislation by hand vote: Passed 28-0-1

LMD/Star

- Pub email will be coming out!

Passed by unanimous consent

Operational Spending

- Secretarial errors resolved from last meeting - common sense piece of legislation
- Bylaws amendment

Passed by unanimous consent