I. Call to order  
   A. Meeting called to order at 7:10 PM

II. Reading and approval of minutes  
   A. Senator Johnson moves to approve the minutes  
   B. Senator Donahue seconds  
   C. Minutes approved as read

III. Approval of the agenda  
   A. Senator Donahue moves to approve the agenda  
   B. Senator Anderson seconds  
   C. Voting  
      1. Approval of agenda passes unanimously (12-0-0)

IV. Open Forum  
   A. None

V. Reports of officers and directors  
   A. None

VI. Presentations  
   A. None

VII. Unfinished business and general orders  
   A. 2019-2020 Budget Proposal 6-2-2  
      1. Senator Johnson moves to approve Item (A)  
      2. Senator Donahue seconds  
      3. Debate  
         a) Amendment to drop the contingency on stipends  
            ○ Senator Garland moves to amend the 2019-2020 budget proposal to drop the contingency on stipends  
            ○ Senator Johnson seconds  
            ○ Senator Rosenthal-- For the volunteer center for the program specifically there are places we cut funding for, the center asked for $80,000. Giving money to executive will look like we are giving preferential treatment to RSVP. A lot of hesitancy to vote in favor of the amendment. Third
issue: we should trust the executive officers who spend 30 hours in meetings. Senator Johnson and Senator Garland were part of the training that they are trying to fund, and it is not our job as senators to pick what we like to give them more money. We shouldn’t just change the budget because it is something that we support, we should defer to what the executive committee laid out. There was no discussion on this until recently, so I don’t want to vote for this.

○ Senator Johnson-- This was not attended to be a last minute change. I am in favor of this amendment because by giving student stipends you are creating a better base for this program to have a better base and last longer. Without stipends, you are asking too much of the volunteers.

○ Matt-- I wasn’t aware of this change in the budget until last week. As far as deferring on the executive budget committee, while exec does have more information, senators are here to voice opinions. The people you are accusing who are putting towards things they are involved in make them advocates. They don’t have any hidden interest in this. This is not the same as us funding $80,000 volunteer center. This is an investment that will enable us to keep a student voice in bystander training. This program improves how confident people are and how they are feeling. Don’t need money for campus-wide stability. Need to continue the student representation that it has had without asking student volunteers to put 8-10 hours per day unpaid. The stipend is about half that of a senator. Implore every senator to vote for this amendment. This is what we worked for as a student government.

○ Senator Johnson-- If you want to avoid backlash, put some money to volunteer center as well.

○ Senator Robertson-- I don’t think that anyone is saying bystander training is operating in bad faith by paying students. The program will not die if we don’t fund student stipends. Not funding student stipends signals to admin that they have to fund the program, not just a USG effort. Having admin in the training helps them see the value of the program. The program was successful this year with admin running it. The small groups during the training provide you to learn from your peers. Even if admin leaves the program, there is no reason that the training wouldn’t
be valuable. Going to be someone who is passionate about the issue. The person currently leading it is 5 years older than us, they might be a peer but still, have experience in the student experience. I am hesitant to vote on this because we take away from student incentives to participate in. I yield my time to Matt.

○ Matt-- i don’t know what you are talking about with incentives. There is no tradeoff between incentives and stipends, that is not what the money’s for. Think about the training that people do before they come to school. The original idea was that students would come to training with about 50 people with no student small groups. This is what admin wants. The point of having student voices involved is to have a student experience. The program will become a checkbox if we let the admin run it and not as valuable as it could be. I agree the admin Sara Hong who runs it is amazing. Sara Hong doesn’t have student experiences related to USC. Taking away the student contribution, but it will check a box of it won’t be something that makes a big impact on campus.

○ Rohan-- the reason we did not include the stipend is for the sake of consistency. There were multiple requests for stipends from other groups we didn’t want to be partial to a certain group. Why should the stipends fall on USG.

○ Matt-- This started with $20000 training this semester, and USG put $5000 towards it this year. All of that will have to be covered by RSVP. This money would go to starting a new account separate of RSVP’s other accounts and we can get it covered. We don’t have student participation. My hope is that we fund student stipends and collect information to deliver to admin. Students find it meaningful when they have these conversations and we show this to admin. Next year will be a different conversation. Trying to prove a point to administrators without this precedent is going to be difficult.

○ Trenton-- Why can’t RSVP pay for the student stipends?

○ Matt-- It’s not that they can’t. This money would go to them and they would administer it. The issue is that they already allocated their budget and don’t have $4000 this year. Within the timeline they have we can’t find that $4000.

○ Senator Roberton’s time elapses.
Senator Donahue-- A few questions: I am really hesitant on this amendment because other groups asked for things the university should be funding them. The university needs to put more emphasis on these programs. So the stipends would go to two students? If they aren’t funded will the peer model collapse?

Senator Johnson-- The key thing is that the timing of this. We believe that the university should be paying for these stipends. RSVP already has their budget allocated it is going to take too long for the admin to fund RSVP. The peer model won’t disintegrate but it is a lot to ask for volunteers to put in the time for a part-time job. There isn’t a set number of people in this program. I would be concerned with people who don’t have a personal connection to the project and may not have the incentive to work without funding.

Senator Donahue-- I was looking for more clarification for what their role would be. This is something we worry about if we were going to allocate stipends. Those people would be doing long training who are training the trainers to disperse this information. I believe in the peer model, but if we don’t directly fund this to student stipends I just don’t know how the whole thing would disintegrate. What would their role be and how would it be distributed to the?

Matt-- the 8-hour training cost 20000 it included student, staff, and faculty. There were 15 students and 25 staff and faculty. Another full day after that to refine the curriculum to what is applicable to being a student at USC. Now we have a workable curriculum. To make trainers there is a 3 hours curriculum. A lot of people have been through it. Rohan has been through it. These are people who are equipped to stand in front of the classroom and talk about sexual assault. As far as the stipend, I can’t expect Rohan, Emily or Hailey to talk in front of multiple classrooms on a volunteer basis. The person will be working on refining the curriculum and working with administrators.

Senator Donahue-- Could you speak about the interest? When talking to RSVP I know there were students interested in working?

Matt-- the training we have done with the two senators. It will be two people again. The program brings both students who are heavily involved over a long period and unique experiences.
○ Senator Donahue-- If RSVP is structuring this program with stipends, it’s hard to wrap my head around what will happen without it.
○ Rohan-- This was placed for the sake of constancy, consistency, and staying impartial. We believe that students should receive stipends but we must stay consistent.
○ Senator Donahue-- yes we all have issues we all advocate for, but we are also trying to advocate for the entire student body.
○ Senator Khoshniyati-- I am in favor of this amendment because it started at USG and it is so new. We need to support giving stipends to students who are giving their time for sexual harassment awareness. I know the training the admin has given students has been ineffective. A stipend is necessary to encourage students to participate.
○ Matt-- I understand the point about consistency. This is a project we are investing in. Trojan Food Pantry wouldn’t have started without USG investment. I don’t think there is anything that would make a bigger impact than putting our money and allowing this to give a voice to students.
○ Mahin-- The stipend would go to students to do the recruiting for different trainings and the back office work for the training. It wouldn’t go to students leading the training. The 8 hours would be outreach and managerial work.
○ Matt-- The stipend would include what Mahin mentioned, but it would also include student training and delivering the training. As for how the program will look like, I’m meeting with Gabe tomorrow.
○ Senator Ritch-- I support this amendment as well. I believe as senators representing the student body that we need to advocate for this. As a survivor of sexual assault, if I had been in this situation and opportunity ti would have made a big difference. It is a small amount of money that can make a big difference on campus. Having a student-led program is really really important. Admin is often disconnected and having one of us up there will ensure this is a successful program.
○ Senator Rosenthal-- Does USG value this program? Obviously, everyone up here does. The question of who is leading the training, I think it will be a student leading it. The stipend will go to back end managerial work. I am still
confused about the connection between us not giving stipends and the program becoming a checkbox for the administration. The point that I want to bring up that Matt suggested is that the way the current budget was allocated was the $4000 would not be for incentives for students to attend events. I’m not sure that without that $4000 that people will attend these events.

○ Trenton-- there is no contingency on that $4000. It is a blanket for whatever RSVP decides.

○ Senator Ritch-- This is a super important program especially with our admin that is changing.

○ Senator Rosenthal-- Even if we give this money, we allow RSVP to have more discretion with the money.

○ Matt-- The stipend contingency is the only contingency on the money. whoever received the stipend would be the lead instructor. RSVP and student government do not receive this same training. It includes instructors from RSVP and student leaders. We helped select this exact curriculum and if we take away the seat at the table it won’t have the same high impact.

○ Senator Johnson-- Not sure who has attended the training. Speak to why we need students to run it. I advocate for students teaching this program, but really it’s about connecting through personal experience. The first part of the program is talking about when you have or haven’t been a bystander. It is important for us to have this to have people connect to this. Being students we can connect personally to what is happening at USC. I want to advocate for this amendment in particular.

○ Senator Donahue-- We are still fully supporting this program, we are debating if it is contingent on whether it is dependent on stipends. If we don’t allow stipends, will the peer model fall apart? I work 6 hours at Peer Health exchange without compensation. If the stipends aren’t funded, is it not going to be the peer to peer?

○ Matt-- the model of it isn’t going to change. We look at a lot of different curriculums at least 4-5. Some curriculums only admin or don’t allow student leaders.

○ Senator Donahue-- Point of clarification: we can’t even fund this stipends?

○ Matt-- those are stipends that can be yielded to USG. Once the money is sent they can use it at your discretion
Kevin-- the volunteer center LeAD programs are account holders. RSVP can be a project funded through Exec/Leg. The line and account holder are allocations that can happen to those account holders. USG bylaws say that stipends can go to Exec/Leg.

Matt-- How has money in the past can be sent to stipends?

Kevin-- The money to the volunteer center has always been sent contingency that it won't be used for stipends.

Matt-- So have they been ignoring this and using stipends?

Kevin-- Yes

Trenton-- The reason we need to be careful is that sending external stipends leads to students making more than USG members.

Matt-- We move it to exec/leg and I will bring a resolution next week to move $5000 to exec/leg to put money to bystander intervention training.

Senator Rosenthal-- What exactly are you proposing? The money is already in exec/leg.

Matt-- If it is in exec/leg then we can send it to RSVP as a line holder.

Trenton-- The bystander intervention training falls under an account. I don’t understand the resolution that you are proposing.

Matt-- I’ll ask that we approve this, there is nothing that says we can’t do this. The $5000 dollars can go towards stipend or other areas of the program.

Senator Garcia-- I like the idea of a peer to peer connection. We are proposing that the money can go to stipends or back end administration things?

Matt-- if we approve this amendment then the money will go to stipends, if not it will go to other things like programs and marketing.

Senator Donahue-- this feels really rushed that we got this information. I didn’t have time to really research it. I know that exec has padding to fund certain things. It would be great to have stakeholders at a table to really go over this. I think we need to take the time and sit down and come up with the most effective solution at the table.

Mahin-- For the exec/leg bystander expenditure did that come from exec/leg?

Matt-- Yes it did come from exec/leg last semester. I would ask that we not do that this time. If stipends can be
sent, I say we send them. If not we show our support for the organization.

- Rohan-- This amendment is for removing the contingency on if the money can go to stipends.
- Senator Garcia-- Will we get a report of where all this money is going?
- Matt-- I will personally ensure receipts.
- Senator Khoshniyati-- Will we make sure the money goes to stipends?
- Senator Johnson-- We vote to approve this amendment and then we come back next week to discuss where the money will be going.
- Senator Garcia-- I agree we should make this open to
- Kevin-- the bylaws only outline USG positions and tell you how much for stipends. The trainers for RSVP are not listed in the constitution and cannot receive a stipend.
- Senator Garcia-- Does that mean under USG the trainers can receive stipends?
- Kevin-- No they can’t receive money, they don’t have a position.
- Senator Rosenthal-- once we vote on this, we can’t line item and go through the time.
- Mahin-- if we did make this amendment. Then there would be no contingency and then you would be voting on the entire budget.
- Matt-- I ask that we approve this amendment. Placing this contingency whether the agency uses it for this. If we can approve this tonight, we can find trainers for the program. If there are external issues for allocating stipends, I would like to have this conversation another time.
- Montana-- Even if we are voting to remove stipends, it doesn’t matter how that money can be used. It doesn’t make sense that the bylaws say we can’t fund stipends to remove this contingency because we can’t use them as stipends anyway.
- Rohan-- by removing contingency allows the money the openness to go through any areas.
- Senator Johnson-- from my understanding, is that we are setting ourselves up to give RSVP money that they could potentially use for stipends. It would give us more time to have outside conversations about how to use this money.
○ Matt-- Volunteer center money has been used for stipends, and that is my intention. If there is new information that there can’t be I’ll have that conversation tomorrow.
○ Senator Rosenthal-- My view is that the Senate was very uncomfortable with the logo and finding loopholes to approve. I feel uncomfortable saying that technically there shouldn’t be stipends but there is a reason that we should change the wording.
○ Senator Johnson-- We are still following the bylaws and interpretation is up to our discretion. The case of the USG logo is a different timeline, and the budget is more urgent.
○ Senator Khoshniyati-- The alternative is to vote no on this is to not have stipends and most of us want the possibility of stipends. If not, then it will go back to support the programs.
○ Trenton-- These line items will fall under administrative accounts. These aren’t accounts and it isn’t an account itself. RCC, Volunteer Center, LEAD Programs receive money and they do stipends. We can’t hold other groups accountable to what they do.
○ Matt-- What I pitched that USG would send money to RSVP and the money will go to their discretion.
○ Senator Anderson-- I love talking about where the money is supposed to go. The point of the program is great, whether or not the money is going to stipends or marketing. I don’t think it matters if it goes to either section. The point of the program is to make a change. We can keep talking in circles or nip this in the bud or make a difference.
○ Senator Donahue-- I echo what Senator Anderson says. So many other groups also have to pay for things that the University should be paying for. If we pass this we should go back and look at what we allocated for other groups. I agree we have been doing a circle thing.
○ Mahin-- Point of parliamentary inquiry. When can we take this to a vote and stop the yielding process?
○ Parliamentarian Moten-- per the rules of debate every senator is entitled to ten minutes of speaking time twice.
○ Senator Johnson-- Can we have a vote now?
○ Parliamentarian Moten: Yes, we can vote on this during anyone’s time.
Senator Khoshniyati-- The point of this is to give them an opportunity to give stipends to students. I move to take this amendment to a vote.

Mahin-- Point of clarification: you are voting to remove the contingency of no stipends?

Senator Johnson-- Do we have to do line item voting?

Mahin-- You go down the line and vote on that specific amendment.

Mahin-- Take this item to vote with Senator Rosenthal

Senator Donahue-- I second.

Senator Rosenthal-- Nay.

Amendment on Item (A) passes 6-2-2.

Mahin-- Take this item to a vote.

Senator Rosenthal-- Move to take this item to a vote.

4. Voting
   a) Amendment on Item (A) passes 6-2-2
   b) Item (A) approved unanimously (10-0-0)

B. Logo Exploratory Committee 10-0-0
   1. Senator moves to approve Item (B)
   2. Senator seconds
   3. Debate
      a) Senator Rosenthal-- What are we debating and voting on?
      b) Mahin-- To create the logo committee.
      c) Mahin-- Can we take this to a vote?
         o Vote starting with Senator Chuang
   4. Voting
      a) Item (B) approved unanimously (10-0-0)

C. USG 19-20 Chief of Staff Hiring 10-0-0
   1. Senator moves to approve Item (A)
   2. Senator seconds
   3. Debate
      a) Mahin-- Can we take this to a vote?
         o Vote starting with Senator Rosenthal
   4. Voting
      a) Item (C) approved unanimously (10-0-0)

VIII. New Business
   A. Bystander Intervention Training Resolution
      1. Mahin-- The first item under New Business is Bystander Intervention Training Resolution
      2. Senator Robertson-- Change Naveen
      3. Matt-- Will be amended
   B. Endowment Funding Resolution
1. Mahin—The second item under New Business is Endowment Funding Resolution
2. Matt—Dr. Carry changed the endowment

IX. Announcements
   A. None

X. Discussion
   A. None

XI. Adjournment
   A. Senator moves to adjourn the meeting
   B. Senator seconds
   C. VP Tahsin adjourns the meeting at 8:53 PM