

UC General Meeting  
9/25/16

### Presidential Updates

- Title IX module complete, up and running! Exciting
- Omni app - local deals in the Square on the app! E.g. \$4 burritos from Felipe's for college students this week, etc
- Club 1636 - next event at the Kong, Sunday of Columbus Day Weekend

### SLAM

- 97% of workers voted to strike, with 80% turn-out rate
- Minimum 35k a year and affordable health care plan
- Average HUDS worker makes less than 35k and also work 38/52 weeks - which is basically stretching a year paycheck of 8 months. Hard to find work over the summer - try to work overtime, 80 hours a week, etc.
- Boston/Cambridge very expensive to live in - 35k not very sustainable, especially for workers with children. Does not include benefits.
- Increase in copay - HUDS workers currently pay \$40 to visit an emergency room, \$15 for anything else. New plan: 60% increase for a visit to the family doctor. 150% increase in how much it costs to go to the emergency room. Negotiating team proposing where HUDS pay \$100 anytime they have in-patient/out-patient
- Harvard workers would have better coverages if they had the Massachusetts plan for employers with not enough money to buy health care for their workers
- Workers disincentivized by system to go to a doctor instead of working
- How can students help?
  - Almost 2800 signatures on a petition
  - Hoping for a UC endorsement
  - Workers always empowered when they feel like the students are supporting them
- Harvard has justified this through the new copay reimbursements
- Union that has accepted this plan has a lot of internal dissent - clerical and technical workers, who are paid more than HUDS
- Average of \$11 increase per month. Still a big increase for average HUDS worker. Not an increase in the deductible. Increases in the copays. Average of \$11 includes young people who may not go to the doctor as much, etc.

### Updates & Fun Stuff

- Run for parliamentarian!

### Grants Pack 1

- Don't fund anything in Opening Days or Reading Period

- EMT uniforms? Don't pay for T-shirts, long sleeves, crewnecks, etc. but we do pay for costumes and reusable things
- TEDx contentious - they charge for tickets. Now \$15 for students. Historically consistent. Also SEFable
- Con: Any event that charges is required to provide a lottery/ offer a certain number of tickets for free - did TEDx do that? Don't think so.
- Pro: We will be cracking down on things like this. Have never used ticketing as discriminatory mechanism on theater shows and etc.
- Con: What would happen if we decided not to fund it? It already happened.
- Pro: Clerical errors? Common App for grant applications - attribute errors to this organization
- Con: Funding outside organization - TEDx is funded and organized by a corporation. Technically a student organization, just part of umbrella organization
- Pro: What was the money used for? Food, publicity, venue, equipment
- Con: Stated that when you apply for retroactive funding, have to provide tickets? Rules is that if it's ticketed, have to give certain amount of tickets as lottery
- Pro: Another conference this weekend - why weren't they funded? Someone didn't fill out the form right.

**Amendment: Strike funding, add audit what the money was used for**

- Publicity for this event - \$1000, almost 10% of our budget. Didn't even know this was happening.
- Impact if we don't fund this? Does this look bad?
- Discussion? What does this do for us?
- Worried this is going to have repercussions - student organizations will be afraid to get UC funding.
- Could anybody else have funded TEDx? Possibly.
- Con: Publicity questions are subjective. Auditing is not possible. They are a Harvard entity, officially recognized by college.
- Pro: Actually \$20. College requires each organization to have no outside ties- might be a failure on OSL's part, etc. Just good to give reps more time to make an informed decision.
- Con: Already investigated this a lot. Apparently TEDx Harvard has local autonomy, just uses the name.
- Pro: Big difference between paying royalties and using the particular name. Troubling and dangerous precedent for rewarding clubs for just lowering prices.

**Passed by hand vote**

**Legislation passed by voice vote**