I. Call to order
   A. Meeting called to order at 7:02 PM
II. Reading and approval of minutes
   A. Senator Tan moves to approve the minutes
   B. Senator Chong seconds
   C. Minutes approved as read
III. Approval of the agenda
   A. Senator Sherman moves to approve the agenda
   B. Senator Savage seconds
   C. Voting
      1. Approval of agenda passes unanimously (12-0-0)
IV. Open Forum
   A. None
V. Reports of officers and directors
   A. Keisuke Fujiwara, Senior Director of Programming
      1. The highlight for this past month is that Programming and Communications had a joint meeting.
      2. SDOP Update
         a) Joint meeting with Comm -- 9/12
         b) More 1:1’s with all Directors and AD’s
         c) Continue attending GM’s
      3. ACA
      4. APASA -- had a couple events
         a) Not complete list -- highlight
      5. ESA
      6. ISA
      7. LSA
      8. PSA
         a) Highlight: heard National Voter Registration Day was a large success!
      9. QuASA
10. SSA
11. SAGE
12. Concerts Committee
13. Speakers Committee
14. Special Events Committee -- did not have events this past month but will have a movie night
15. Trojan Pride

B. Matthew Crane, Speaker Pro Tempore
   1. Senate Aide Hirings
      a) Last Year: 28 applicants, 27 interviews
      b) This year: 56 applicants, 35 interviews
      c) Improvements
         o Ranking process blinded
         o Included CDO’s in process
         o Headshots + audio recorded
         o Orientation + curriculum
      d) 12 Accepted
         o Matched process
            (a) Almost everyone got 1st choice
      e) Requirements
         o 2 hours, Senate attendance
      f) Meet Your Aides -- listed off the aides

2. Personal Updates
   a) Interviews

3. Platform Updates
   a) Team #Health_Safety
   b) CPR/First Aid
      o Resident Assistants
         (a) All RA’s will have information available
      o Panhellenic Council
      o Interfraternity Council
   c) Flu Shots
      o Engemann Social Media Partnership
   d) Emergency Pamphlet
      o Collect at the USG office
   e) Adding another hour for high-risk training

VI. Presentations
   A. Manda Bwerevu, Senator
      1. Project Updates
         a) Homeless Student Initiative
         b) Spring Admit Fall accessibility issues
         c) USG Pay Equalization
         d) Diversity Fund
2. Personal Updates
   a) Co-founding nonprofit in Ghana and Nigeria
   b) A & F campus ambassador
      ○ Working on Splash Bash and Made in America Tidal Concert
   c) Spring Break Panama trip
   d) Lyft saga -- dealing with Lyft
      ○ Racially profiled by Lyft driver

3. Senate Aide
   a) Mae Gates
      ○ Sophomore studying Public Policy with a minor in Spanish

B. Amy Chong, Senator
   1. Who Am I?
      a) Moved from South Korea to US when 2 years old
      b) BS Public Policy
      c) Almost became a professional golfer
   2. Senate Aide
      a) Angela Chuang
      ○ Sophomore transfer from GWU studying political science
   3. Senate Projects
      a) Engemann
         ○ Improving mental health services
         ○ Transparent with insurance fee/health fee
      b) Improving transfer student experiences
         ○ Changing transfer orientation from one day to two days -- first-years get two days
         ○ Improving housing on campus -- finding housing ridiculously hard, on waiting list for months

VII. Unfinished business and general orders
    A. Hiring of Leadership Fund Assistant Director
       1. Senator Sherman moves to approve
       2. Senator Kohanteb seconds
       3. Voting
          a) Item (A) approved unanimously (12-0-0)

VIII. New Business
    A. None

IX. Announcements
    A. None

X. Discussion
    A. Senator Geschwind -- With Ben Shapiro coming to speak, I’ve spoken with people and fellow Senators. It’s imperative for me to provide an alternative perspective. The chairman for Young Americans for Freedom is here, as well. I want to thank you for coming, too, Max. I decided to come with prepared remarks at tonight’s
Senate meeting to carefully and coherently share my thoughts on Thursday’s event at Bovard featuring Ben Shapiro. I want to inform my fellow Senators, USG representatives in attendance, guests, the USC community (and readers of the Daily Trojan wink wink) that I fully intend on walking into Bovard, taking a seat, and attending Mr. Shapiro’s lecture on Thursday. Attending does not denote a full endorsement of everything that Mr. Shapiro stands for nor believes in. Rather, my intended attendance of YAF's event on Thursday represents an endorsement for the much needed intellectual diversity and diversity of thoughts and ideas that often goes unnoticed and disregarded by students and college campuses across this country. I am a senior here at USC. I’m a senior and this is the first time I can remember that there will be a conservative speaking on campus. That is unacceptable, shameful and goes against everything an institution of higher education stands for. Colleges and universities are supposedly spaces meant to provoke, challenge, and, yes, even offend for that is the way toward discovering and solidifying your own political point of view. Being unchallenged for what you believe in during your most impressionable years in life won’t do you an ounce of favors. In the past couple years alone, we’ve had many outstanding speaker events from well-regarded liberals and member of the left such as Gloria Steinem, Angela Davis, Barbara Boxer and just a week ago Jose Antonio Vargas. All or nearly all supported by USG. To my understanding, all events ran smoothly with little to no resistance or disruption from people who disagreed. I can only hope that our fellow Trojans will give the same respect to Mr. Shapiro exercising his constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom of speech when he visits our campus in two days and to the students and guests attending YAF’s event including myself. I also look forward to the the protests and demonstrations being planned by BSA, LSA, SAGE, and other motivated student activists to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed first amendment right in expressing their disagreement with Mr. Shapiro. I commend YAF for funding $1,000 in accommodating protestors to ensure that they will have a space on campus to gather and demonstrate. Speech with which you disagree with does not make it hate speech. It’s simply speech with which you disagree with. And the effort to try to shut down someone’s speech with which you disagree with is fascism. And so while I’m supportive of the act of free assembly in exercising the right to protest, I am just as supportive of these dissenters, many of which are in this room, to challenge Mr. Shapiro on Thursday. Call him out, put his feet to the fire, challenge him! Make him answer for his perceived controversial views. After all, isn’t this what a college is all about? The confrontation of two people with opposing viewpoints. More speech, more differing speech, leads to the truth rising to the top and is the answer. Mr. Shapiro seems to agree as he is known for always insisting on having those that disagree with him to ask questions first during the Q&A portion of the event and cutting the conservatives in line to the microphone. So my anti-Shapiro friends, protest. But protest and challenge. Attend and participate. Max and my friends at YAF: you’re not totally off the
hook either. I am incredibly upset and disappointed that you had cancelled tickets of those students who have registered simply because you had suspicion they would disrupt. We should all be treated equally and innocent until proven guilty. I understand that there were folks on the left that intentionally got tickets to take up space under made up names such as “F you scum” however, I am dismayed and saddened that you cancelled the tickets of our fellow Trojans who registered under actual real names. And so by asking my anti-Shapiro friends to attend and challenge, I would like to ask my YAF friends to reinstate the tickets of those you had initially revoked. In conclusion, putting political viewpoints aside, we are all Trojans. Let’s coexist peacefully and respectfully together Thursday evening. For those attending and protesting, let’s be proud of the interactions we have with one another. Free of insults and innuendos, vulgarity and personal attacks. Those in and near Bovard Thursday evening will send shockwaves throughout campus, the state of California, the country, and the world the following morning on how USC is able to handle the existence of opposing ideas in a compact space. Will we be known for being peaceful, courteous, and civil? Or will we be seen as disruptors, insolent and unable to hear thoughts with which we disagree with? Whichever pathway we choose Thursday as student leaders on campus, and as Trojans, will have ramifications in the days, weeks, months and perhaps years to come. My only wish is that we choose the former.

B. Senator Murphy -- Thank you for being here. I appreciate that there might be a certain discomfort in being here. It can be difficult for people with inherently politicized identities. I’d like to have it on record why student tickets were revoked. I can’t help but think that the leg that you have to stand on is shattered when you deny those same students the right to come out, especially if you say that Ben Shapiro lets others cut the line. What criteria was used, besides what Senator Geschwind just mentioned? What was the criteria, how did this happen? I don’t think that a $1000 corral for protestors is enough of a consolation prize for these actions.

C. Max -- Ideally, we wouldn’t have had to waste our time cancelling tickets. We cancelled the tickets of those who were going to try to disrupt the event and ultimately try to shut it down. We’re going to listen and then come and ask questions. I don’t want to listen to people who won’t do that. I also don’t want people to end up on YouTube. There were some individuals who had evidence. As far as the protest area, there’s been changes in the original plan. That was for security in the area. Protestors get Tommy Trojan and Alumni Park. Anyone who wants to try to disrupt will get an SJACS hearing. We want an event where people can listen and then ask their questions.

D. Senator Lane -- I have respect for everyone in this room as a person but I think the problem is that this whole situation has not exemplified a reciprocation of that respect. There’s no way someone can tell me that someone can get up and tell me that black and black violence is our fault. Hate speech, you can google the things the man says. It’s evident that he is looking to provoke this type of reaction
from someone like me and make me feel unsafe. The fact that my money is being used to fund someone to say things like this is not right. Humanity is a fundamental issue. Senator Geschwind, I agree with what you said, but this is an extreme example of that and I’m nervous for Thursday but I’m hoping for a safe and productive event. So we’ll see what happens.

E. Senator Crane moves to extend time of debate by 45 minutes
   1. Senator Murphy seconds
   2. Voting
      a) Item approved unanimously (12-0-0)

F. Senator Lane -- There are so many different communities who have been hurt and shaken by this. I hope that we can see why, the same way we’re being asked to be comfortable with disagreement. I hope we can use that same mindset to understand empathy, how it affects people of my community, or the LGBT community, how it feels in a community where this is defended so rigorously.

G. Senator Bwerevu -- I would also like to thank you for coming. It’s not just that there are differing ideologies. It’s people who are being affected by these ideas. As a black person, to know that someone that I paid for can come and tell me how institutionalized racism does not exist, I am living and experiencing that every day. It’s a privilege to be able to say, let’s be intellectuals about this, but this is a humanity issue. There are people who are being affected by this. There might be communities who do not have to deal with this. I would love to set aside my politics, but it’s not something I can deny or look the other way on. It’s not just an ideology issue, it’s something more. Senator Geschwind, I would just challenge you on your point about how being offended can lead to something -- I don’t think offending someone is a great way to make them understand something about themselves. I think talking about things would be a better way to push them. We’re obviously going to have controversial issues come up. I would just urge people who are wondering to talk to people and try to understand. I think it’s important for all of us to be a lot more direct with each other. I’m glad you made an appearance tonight and I would urge you to take what we said back to your community.

H. Mae Gates -- I’m an individual that had their ticket cancelled. Up until now, I had definitely been silent about it. My background, I am speaking from a particular perspective, I can’t help but to say that I’m disappointed and feel disrespected. I’ve put in 6 hours a week into USG that is unpaid, then I go back to meetings, do paperwork, talk about the Diversity Amendment, sign in, sign out, cooperate, do my part. I’ve done my part and have done way more than my part. I’ve done way more than people who get paid do. I find it disheartening that I pay $64 a year and that money is going to someone like that, but also that I have to pay but continue to be unpaid to be disrespected. I just also found out that there’s a Campus Activities investigation that found out that there was no bias. I’m doing all this work out of the true goodness of my heart, not because I’m being compensated. To me, it seems like I’m being asked to be a part of the Trojan
Family that doesn’t have the decency to send out a Memo that an investigation had been launched, and people are sincerely confused. I had to stand up and explain why people are angry. I have to explain why it’s a problem because people sincerely don’t understand. Why is there an uproar? Why are they trying to break it down? It’s unfair for all the reasons I just laid out. Put yourself in my shoes, put yourself in others’ shoes and imagine what it’s like to be in this situation. People sincerely don’t understand why. Anyone who came to this room and didn’t understand why there’s uproar and backlash, now you know. Now you don’t have the privilege to say that you’re ignorant about it. At the very least, I expect everyone in this room and in this organization, regardless of whether you agree with me, I’d be damned if you come to me and say that you don’t understand why. This is so much larger than this one event. USG and USC has failed me as a student. It is not Ben Shapiro’s fault. They have failed us. This is the result. We are now reaping the poor decisions of people for years. Now you have all of the perspectives, data, knowledge to go make a change that needs to happen. If I don’t see that change. I’ll know that it’s truly because people don’t care not because they’re unaware.

Senator Lane -- What was the process for selecting Ben Shapiro as the speaker?

Matt -- He’s gained a lot of popularity, we feel he’s pretty frank in what he says, he’s open to have a discussion with anyone. We agree with the majority of what he has to say and we think that him coming to a college campus starts a conversation. Even saying you were Republican at USC is a social death sentence. Students fear writing anything that’s even quasi-conservative. We’ve felt that students here and in USG are mostly left-leaning. We brought him because we want to hear him and he gets the conversation starting.

Senator Lane -- My knowledge is that there have been protests, Youtube videos, etc. on other campuses. How did that factor into your decision?

Matt -- I was surprised by how much security they felt was needed. Most students are either left-leaning or apathetic. We were surprised so we didn’t expect there would be this many issues. We assumed there would be protests but we didn’t think we’d need this much security or have this much need for.

Senator Geschwind -- Ben Shapiro was on this campus in 2015 and there were $0 of security. There was security in 2016 at Berkeley, but the year before was $0.

Matt -- He spoke at a room in Taper, no security.

Senator Lane -- I’m more so asking if you knew, based on interactions with other campuses, that people would feel how they felt, how was that considered, not necessarily about the controversial reaction -- but the offense reaction? How was that factored in?

Matt -- It’s not our fault that people get offended. We’re tired as an organization of tailoring our events to what people would be comfortable. If people want to react by peacefully protesting, I can support that right. If people want to try to be violent or shut down our event, 1300 schools wanted to hear him speak and we were one of the 6 chosen.
Q. Senate Aide -- Generally speaking, does anyone know if USC has a policy on hate speech, just out of curiosity?

R. Milton -- I will be reading the university’s policy on this:

1. “In exercising its responsibility to provide and maintain an atmosphere of free inquiry and expression, the university may establish reasonable time, place and manner restrictions for the purpose of avoiding disruption to or substantial interference with its regular and essential operations and activities. The university will not base decisions regarding time, place and manner upon the content of the message, except as permitted in those narrow areas of expression devoid of federal or state constitutional protection. The university recognizes the crucial importance of preserving First Amendment rights and maintaining open communication and dialogue in the process of identifying and resolving problems which arise in the dynamics of life in a university community. The legitimate expression of differing opinions and concerns, including unpopular, controversial or dissident viewpoints, is an essential element of the academic process; the imposition of these opinions and concerns upon those who in turn dissent from them is not to be condoned and is inconsistent with a university’s process and function. Lawful and peaceful demonstration as an expression of favor or dissent will be permitted and protected. On the other hand, the university will not tolerate coercive disruption, defined generally herein as activity that imposes the will of other persons or groups within the university community, outside of the established university procedures and policies for the expression of opinion and the resolution of differences. Coercive disruption is construed to include any activity which, contrary to law, denies the rights of other students, the faculty or the staff of the university and:

2. I. Disrupts or obstructs educational or other activities of the university.

3. II. Reacts to the expression of the peaceful dissent of others by attempting to deny their rights.

4. III. Obstructs or restricts free movement of persons on any part of the university campus, including the free entry to or exit from university facilities.

5. IV. Denies or interferes with the standard operations, or use, of offices or other facilities to the students, faculty, officers, staff or guests of the university.

6. V. Threatens or endangers the safety of any person on the university campus. This includes but is not limited to signs on any forms of stakes.

7. VI. Results in damage to or destruction of property.

8. VII. Contains “fighting words” where (a) the speech, considered objectively, is abusive and insulting rather than a communication of ideas and (b) it is actually used in an abusive manner in a situation that presents an actual danger.
9. VIII. Constitutes “hate violence,” meaning any act of physical intimidation or physical harassment, physical force or physical violence, or the threat of physical force or physical violence, that is directed against any person or group, or the property of any person or group because of the ethnicity, race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability, or political or religious beliefs of that person or group. (Acts shall not be considered “hate violence” based on speech alone, except upon a showing that the speech itself threatens violence against a specific person or group, that the person or group against whom the threat is directed reasonably fears that the violence will be committed because of the speech, and that the person threatening violence had the apparent ability to carry out the threat.)

10. IX. Makes sustained or repeated noise in a manner which substantially interferes with a speaker’s ability to communicate their message or the rights of others to listen. Since a clear differentiation between lawful or peaceful dissent and coercive disruption may often be difficult, the foregoing list is illustrative and not exhaustive; this list is expected to evolve, based on experience and changes in the law. It should be understood that the application of this policy also takes situational factors into consideration. For example, conduct appropriate at a political rally might constitute a violation of this policy if it occurred within a classroom.

11. In all cases, the rights of students under the First Amendment to the Constitution, as applied by California law, will always be protected.

12. Any coercive disruption initiated by a visitor or a student member of the university community or occurring during any university-sanctioned activity or function may be met by the action of the university that is necessary to restore the order and communication required for the rational solution of problems and free debate. In addition, any coercive disruption by students may be subject to disciplinary action through the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards up to and including suspension or expulsion and/or legal action through local, state or federal courts.

13. If any member of the university community believes that disruption of or substantial interference with the regular and essential operations and activities of the university is occurring or that this policy is otherwise being violated, the established procedure is to inform university Public Safety officers and/or university administrators. It is the responsibility of designated university officials to protect the university community to the fullest extent possible.”

S. Guest -- What I wanted to engage with was when Senator Geschwind asked us to put politics aside for a second and consider that we are all Trojans and that no vulgarities should be present. Time again, Mr. Shapiro has not followed this himself. He has said transgender people do not exist. You spoke about how we
have to engage in dialogue to get to some higher truth. The fact remains that we need to ask what kind of truth does Mr. Shapiro want? He wrote an article saying transfer is not a dirty word. He advocated for Palestinian people being transferred. This is equivalent to any type of genocide. What does Ben Shapiro want? Does he want truth or something else? When he says these things or blames black people for the problems of racism, he wins. It’s so that his kids don’t have to compete on a level playing field with marginalized groups. He himself does not have to compete with women and blacks. We need to think about rather than inviting them here and everyone who opens their mouth, we need to think about whether they want truth or power. If they want power, they should not be allowed.

T. Parliamentarian Donahue -- I have another question. From my viewpoint, if the point of this event is to start a debate, but to me, it’s kind of heightened the polarization of different political viewpoints. It throws people on two ends. We’ve heard from people today how Ben Shapiro hurts marginalized people. I was just wondering, why did you pick him? There’s so many conservative speakers who aren’t so outspoken or who say things like “institutionalized racism does not exist”. Do you have plans to bring someone in who isn’t offending identities? Were there other people considered?

U. Matt -- Last year, one talked about socialism. Another talked about welfare reform. So we do bring in speakers who aren’t as big of names. But we had an opportunity. We only started as a club at this campus last year and it was a way for our presence to be known by applying to get him. We do have other speakers that we were considering. We’ve found people who are offended by pretty much anyone.

V. Mia -- I’m the co-director of BSA. My question for you, you feel like no matter who you bring, people will disagree with you -- are you so thirsty to make sure that people of your viewpoint come to this campus that it can hurt people here that you claim to be wanting to have discourse with? Violence is not coming from our side. How are you making the selection on people to cancel tickets? Mae is sitting here right now. She did not say anything, so why is she not coming to the Ben Shapiro event?

W. Matt -- It has been implied that we are profiling on a matter of opinion and race in cancelling tickets. We have better things to do than to cancel tickets on that basis. If someone felt like they were wrongly cancelled, they could have just emailed us.

X. Mae -- We should not even be having that conversation because the tickets should not have been cancelled. Regardless of how I personally feel, regardless of what you have heard, regardless of where I stand, I am still a student, I am still a member of USG, I still paid the student fee, I followed the rules, I used my USC ID. I don’t care what was implied, what was not implied. By you saying that all I had to do was talk to you, no -- all you and the university had to do was make sure the tickets weren’t cancelled in the first place. I strongly encourage you to
take responsibility. If you don’t, all that tells me is that there’s something that is
going left. There’s a backlash because injustice is in your beliefs, not because
they’re different. If you can’t tell me directly that you cancelled my ticket because
of my positions, don’t tell me that’s because of BSA or Mia or USC.
Y. Matt -- We talked to the university, we feel that the actions we took were
necessary. If anyone thinks that their ticket was cancelled, I’m more than happy
to meet with anyone in person or over email.
Z. Mae -- We did not get that invitation to have that conversation. I don’t need your
permission to go to this event. It’s not up to you. That’s the heart of this issue. I
can’t cancel your ticket if you want to come to Black Family Dinner. Nothing
warrants me to not permit you to come. The point I’m trying to say is it’s not your
decision to make. It’s not based off of how you’re feeling. I shouldn’t even be
having to have this conversation. I don’t understand why you’re justifying. No,
the issue is that the ticket was cancelled in the first place.
AA. Matt -- It’s not a school-sponsored event. It’s within our discretion to cancel the
event.
BB. Mae -- I don’t want to continue the back-and-forth. I don’t think it’s beneficial to
keep that gong. If the university is going to support your decision, that’s an
institutional problem and we will continue this conversation to .
CC. Olivia -- If it’s so simple for her to email you, isn’t it so simple for you to just send
an email, instead of randomly cancelling tickets?
DD. Matt -- We would’ve preferred to do so, but we’d have to go through it
individually because of the way EventBrite is configured.
EE. Olivia -- Well, you did see their emails when you were cancelling them.
FF. Matt -- I will acknowledge there are things we could have done better.
GG. Mae -- But you won’t apologize.
HH. Matt -- I won’t apologize for something that’s created a headache for the last
two months.
II. Senator Murphy -- How many tickets did you lay out? Of the tickets that you laid
out, how many did you cancel?
JJ. Senator Lane moves to extend time by 10 minutes
KK. Senator Crane seconds
LL. Voting
   1. Unanimously approved (12-0-0)
MM. Matt -- 80-90 seats in the $500 range that have gone to alumni, students, etc.
   $250 tickets went to some students. The vast majority of general admission
tickets went to students.
NN. Senator Murphy -- How many did you cancel of students?
OO. Matt -- We cancelled 150, but I can’t tell you how many we thought were
   people who would disrupt.
PP. Senator Murphy -- Are you ever going to give out the evidence that you had about
why their RSVP was cancelled?
QQ. Max -- We’ll probably release it. It’s something we’re still talking about.
RR. Senator Lane -- Your demeanor, your tone is kind of a slap in the face. People are out here wearing their heart of their sleeve. I can understand that all of this is directed towards you. But I would challenge you to understand. We're not attacking you. We're not upset with you or because they feel hurt by you, but by the actions of your organization. I used two different emails, I spoke at the solidarity rally last week and my tickets were not cancelled. I'm genuinely confused. You say you have better things to do. Mae is unpaid doing all of this work. There are so many people who have done double-overtime to hear about people who have been hurt by this. You're looking me in the eyes and telling me you don't care, looking at me with your legs crossed like that, with that smirk on your face. The provost just talked about how free speech is okay concerning someone who has guns and talks about the KKK. People are fearful for Thursday. As great as this controversy is, me being afraid, hearing that there are dogs from LAPD, I would still feel unsafe. This extreme demonstration is still enough. You further silence people who are already feeling unsafe. The people who have questions aren't going to get to ask them. I'm tired of having to maintain decorum. I'm not getting through to you being objective. What you're doing is not the way to do it. Attacks on humanity and identity? I will roll over in hell before I see it happen.

SS. Mae -- I know this discussion is coming to an end soon. I want to take this meeting and use it as a call to action for USG and the institution of USG. I shared my personal story. I am a private person. I don't talk about my feelings a lot but I felt the need to do so tonight. We have bigger fish to fry. Ben Shapiro is not the issue. The issue is it's somehow possible to be in USG in unpaid positions and have that same organization come with funds that I paid, with time that I invest in this organization, and get the door closed in my face without any repercussion. That's not a Republican or Democrat, that's an institutional issue. This is bigger than USG as well. If you are still in a place of being silent, this conversation should be enough for you to take action. It is our responsibility as USG to acknowledge those issues, to find solutions for those issues. If anything, this opportunity that we've had together tonight has given you all the leverage to do your part as a Senator or as any member of USG. There's no more reason to be silent, no more time and effort and money that it's okay to put in without doing your part. But there's no longer excuses. If I still do not see change, I will be extremely disappointed. I will feel as if my time and value is not appreciated by this organization. Only you can take the action that you need to take. You now have the power and the knowledge to do what needs to be done.

XI. Adjournment
A. Senator Savage moves to adjourn the meeting
B. Senator Halperin seconds
C. VP Ackerman adjourns the meeting at 8:27 PM