I. Call to order
   A. Meeting called to order at 7:06 PM

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

III. Approval of the agenda
   A. Senator Donahue moves to add CDO Restructuring under New Business
   B. Senator Anderson seconds
   C. Voting
      1. Approval of adding CDO Amendments under New Business passes unanimously (9-0-0)

IV. Open Forum
   A. Noah-- Hello everyone! I am a student government elect from Occidental College. I wanted to come here today to present the great opportunity of partnership between our student governments. I have been meeting with Trenton and a few of your student government officers and we believe that working together can help all of us by sharing and learning the best practices for student government through each other. We can start coalition-building by learning more about what is happening at USC. This will help us learn how to help USC and how yall can help us back. We can learn from the sexual harassment case and many others. I just see this as a great opportunity to learn from each other.

V. Reports of officers and directors
   A. Inter-semester Logo Committee
      1. Senator Donahue-- We are changing the USG logo for marketing and ethical reasons. In order to fit the timeline for ordering USG merch, we are proposing an Inter-semester Logo Committee. The Chairman of the Committee will be Emily Donahue. Members will be as follows and the active secretary will be Emily Johnson. We will use video chat, phone call, and Google Docs to communicate. Minutes will be recorded via screen and/or audio recording. Additionally, minutes will be typed by the acting
secretary. Since this is not a standing committee, this will be dissolved by the first Senate meeting in the fall.

2. Senator Donahue-- Just wanted to add that this will help with the USG timeline and we are acting under the bylaws.


1. Trenton-- Part of the bylaws and my job is to make the office policies and resources manual; it is a 24-page document that everyone will have to sign at Fall Retreat. There are general expectations and office policies and procedures.

2. Parliamentarian Mohen-- Decorum is just the basics of how to be a good Senator. No technology, eating trying to pay attention to the speaker as much as possible

3. Trenton-- Many of this comes from past years. We also have some new sustainability policies. There are also new amendments and new organizational resources and documents for each branch so each person knows how to function, as an organization. Many of these come from the bylaws. There are also notes on working with general managers, culture, and university policy. There are also technical policies like office hours which are dependent on your stipends, strikes, and more. I will read the specifics for sustainability policies. We should avoid using styrofoam, plastics, and other sustainable products, avoid unnecessary photocopying and waste of office materials, maintain strict estimated attendance figures in order to avoid over-purchasing food, ensure availability of recycling and composting services at events, and recycle and reuse event and office materials where possible. For attendance: keeping the Chief of Staff informed. There is also the resignation policy, appeal policy which I added: you can appeal punishments, such as that of the Chief of Staff which requires a ¾ vote from the executive body.

VI. Presentations

A. None

B. Suspension of Robert’s Rules

1. Senator Chuang moves to suspend Robert’s Rules

2. Senator Khoshniyati seconds

3. Voting

   a) Suspension of Robert’s Rules passes unanimously (10-0-0)

C. Moving Support of Assembly Bill 1510 Resolution from New Business to Old Business

1. Senator Chuang moves to move Support of Assembly Bill 1510 Resolution from New Business to Unfinished Business

2. Senator Johnson seconds

3. Debate

   a) Senator Rosenthal-- Where are we moving it to Unfinished Business?

   ○ Mahin-- You would hear the presentation after Unfinished Business.

   b) Senator Donahue-- Don’t we just go into New Business now?
c) Senator Rosenthal-- There are no rules right now. I will be abstaining because of the lack of research and we’ve only had a day and a half to read this. We did not have sufficient time to review this and may set a precedent for future meetings. This can be seen in last week’s meeting. I am uncertain on whether this should be voted on now and whether Robert’s Rules needs to be broken. I am concerned what this resolution will set up. The timeframe concern is something many people will have. The executive statement could accomplish the same thing.

* Senator Chuang-- According to the new bylaws, this has to be approved by us and there are no new meetings after this week.
* Senator Rosenthal-- I’m leaning towards it, but I am uncertain and am therefore, abstaining.

d) Senator Johnson-- Point of Inquiry: shouldn’t we vote now?

e) Senator Khoshniyati-- I have to leave and that’s why I’m leaving right now. I came here just to suspend Robert’s Rules.

* Mahin-- Please do not come in and out of Senate meetings.
* Senator Garcia-- I thought the resolution needs a ½ vote.
* Mahin-- To break Robert’s Rules, we need ¾.

f) Senator Garcia-- Can Senator Khoshniyati vote by proxy?

* Mahin-- Since we suspended the rules, we can have discussion as long as you want. Quick clarification: this will not be in New Business if we are putting it in Old Business.
* Senator Johnson-- I would prefer to move it.
* Senator Rosenthal-- My issue is not about the vote itself, I just want another week to vote on this.
* Parliamentarian Moten-- If y’all are talking about voting by proxy that would require a written note.
* Mahin-- You cannot vote by proxy when Robert’s Rules are broken.
* Matthew-- Are you saying we can have a vote?
* Mahin-- I think the question is whether Senator Khoshniyati can vote on the ¾ to move the New Business to Old Business.
* Parliamentarian Moten-- I am going to say we will be working from precedent and since the proxy wasn’t submitted beforehand, she will not be able to do so.

g) Senator Rosenthal-- I will vote now.

h) Voting

* Amendment to move Support of Assembly Bill 1510 Resolution from New Business to Old Business fails to pass (9-0-1)

4. Reinstatement of Robert’s Rules

a) Senator Donahue moves to reinstate Robert’s Rules
b) Senator Robertson seconds
c) Senator Garcia-- Point of Inquiry: We need ¾ to reinstate Robert’s Rules
d) Voting  
   ○ Reinstatement of Robert’s Rules passes unanimously (10-0-0)

e) Mahin-- Robert’s Rules is now in place.
f) Trenton-- As individuals, you all can put up anything you would like.
g) Parliamentarian Moten-- You need a convened meeting in order to make a statement.
h) Senator Chuang-- Is there any way to amend the Inter-semester Logo Committee to also discuss the resolution?
i) Parliamentarian Moten-- A strict proposal must be made in order to have another inter-semester committee to discuss the resolution.
j) Senator Johnson- Point of Inquiry: if the Senate wanted to, would this have to be approved at another meeting?
k) Parliamentarian Moten-- We will have to review the bylaw language another time to see if we can have another meeting.
l) Mahin-- Point of Inquiry: do we go back to presentations now?

VII. Unfinished business and general orders

A. Bystander Intervention Training Resolution
   1. Senator Johnson moves to approve Item (A)
   2. Senator Donahue seconds
   3. Debate
      a) Senator Johnson moves to amend page 5 by striking Naveen Dasari and inserting Jill Lin
      b) Senator Donahue seconds
      c) Mahin-- Vote to open up debate on the amendment
         ○ Vote starting with Senator Rosenthal
      d) Vote to open up debate on the amendment approved unanimously (10-0-0)

   4. Voting
      a) Senator Donahue moves to approve the amendment
      b) Senator Ritch seconds
      c) Amendment to strike Naveen Dasari and insert Jill Lin on page 5 approved unanimously (10-0-0)

B. Endowment Funding Resolution
   1. Senator Donahue moves to approve Item (B)
   2. Senator Garland seconds
   3. Debate
      a) Senator Rosenthal moves to amend page 2 by striking Naveen Dasari and inserting Jill Lin
      b) Senator Johnson seconds
      c) Mahin-- Vote to open for debate
      d) Senator Garcia moves to open up debate on the amendment
      e) Senator Garland seconds
f) Vote to open up debate on the amendment approved unanimously (10-0-0)

4. Voting
   a) Senator Garland moves to approve the amendment
   b) Senator Garcia seconds
   c) Mahin-- Vote to approve the amendment
      ○ Vote start with Senator Rosenthal
   d) Amendment to strike Naveen Dasari and insert Jill Lin on page 2 is approved unanimously (10-0-0)
   e) Mahin-- Point of Inquiry: CDO Restructuring should not be in Unfinished Business. It should be under New Business

C. Support of Assembly Bill 1510 Resolution
   1. Matthew-Point of Inquiry: If there is another meeting, can this be regarded as Old Business?
      a) Rachel- It would be at the chair’s digression to instate another meeting.
   2. Garcia- Can we break Robert’s Rules again?
      a) Rachel- You can break Robert’s Rules any time, but you need 10 people to move the resolution from New to Old Business.

3. Presentation of Resolution
   a) Matthew-- We spoke with a variety of stakeholders and the Daily wrote about this 3 days ago. “WHEREAS, the University of Southern California has reached agreement for a settlement valued at $215 million for plaintiffs alleging sexual abuse on behalf of former USC gynecologist George Tyndall, though many claims by plaintiffs may be time-barred,”
   b) Senator Johnson---"WHEREAS, the State of California, prior to January 1st 2019, employed a statute of limitations regarding sexual assault of “within two years” and the California Legislature enacted a modification of the Code of Civil Procedure section 340.16 to the current language as follows:” 340.16. (a) In any civil action for recovery of damages suffered as a result of sexual assault, where the assault occurred on or after the plaintiff’s 18th birthday, the time for commencement of the action shall be the later of the following: (1) Within 10 years from the date of the last act, attempted act, or assault with the intent to commit an act, of sexual assault by the defendant against the plaintiff. (2) Within three years from the date the plaintiff discovers or reasonably should have discovered that an injury or illness resulted from an act, attempted act, or assault with the intent to commit an act, of sexual assault by the defendant against the plaintiff. (b) As used in this section, “sexual assault” means any of the crimes described in Section 243.4, 261, 262, 264.1, 286, 288a, or 289 of the Penal Code, assault with the intent to commit any of those crimes, or an attempt to commit any of those crimes. (c) This section applies to any
action described in subdivision (a) that is commenced on or after January 1, 2019.”

c) Senator Garland-- “WHEREAS, this alteration sought to provide additional agency and redress towards plaintiffs in cases of sexual assault received overwhelming bipartisan support and passed the California State Assembly on September 29, 2018; and was signed by California Governor Jerry Brown on September 30, 2018,”

d) Senator Chuang-- “WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 1510 Sexual assault and other sexual misconduct: statutes of limitations on civil actions has been introduced to the California State Assembly by Assembly Member Reyes, sponsored by the Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC), and seeks to amend the Code of Civil Procedure section 340.16 with the chiefly disputed alterations: “(2) Notwithstanding any other law, any claim for damages arising out of a sexual assault or other sexual misconduct by a physician occurring at a student health center, that would otherwise be barred prior to January 1, 2020, solely because the applicable statute of limitations has or had expired, is hereby revived and, a cause of action may proceed if already pending in court or, if not filed, may be commenced within one year of January 1, 2020. (3) This subdivision does not revive either of the following claims: (A) A claim that has been litigated to finality in a court of competent jurisdiction before January 1, 2020. (B) A claim that has been compromised by a written settlement agreement entered into before January 1, 2020, between the plaintiff and the defendant.”

e) Matthew-- “WHEREAS, the controversy of this legislative action with regards to the University of Southern California has been summarized in policy analysis from the Assembly Committee on Judiciary: “the bill clearly seeks to allow the USC victims, in particular, to revive claims barred by the statute of limitations in effect prior to AB 1619,” WHEREAS, the following entities are listed in support of this legislation: California Employment Lawyers Association; California Nurses Association; California Protective Parents Association; California Teamsters Public Affairs Council; California Women’s Law Center; Consumer Federation of California; Consumer Watchdog; Courage Campaign; Equal Rights Advocates; Faculty Association of California Community Colleges; National Nurses United; S.E.S.A.M.E; Student Senate for California Community Colleges,”

f) Senator Johnson-- “WHEREAS, the sole entity listed in opposition to this legislation, as accounted by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, is the University of Southern California, WHEREAS the Assembly Committee on Judiciary’s conducted policy analysis, introduced to address the proposed legislation, explains the rationale of the amendment as follows: “The author and sponsor ...
point in particular to the circumstances of Dr. Tyndall’s conduct, the long period of time over which the assaults took place, the youth and relative inexperience of the victims, and what the sponsor alleges is USC’s effort to “cover up” the doctor’s actions. In other words, if many of these young women had realized that their experience was not unique, and knew that Dr. Tyndall had done the same things to others, they might have come forward earlier. In short, the scope and egregiousness of the conduct, and USC’s efforts to shield it, justify allowing victims to revive their claims, rather than strictly adhering to an inevitably arbitrary statute of limitations.”

g) Senator Garland-- “WHEREAS this policy analysis offers that a statute of limitations is an arbitrary, and practically-necessary aspect of the law, rather than a core element of just governance; and this analysis further offers that revival of time-barred claims with a one-year window has been used in California state law precedence, citing previous legislative action relating to the Northridge Earthquake claims (SB 1899),”

h) Senator Chuang-- “WHEREAS, the University of Southern California hired the lobbying firm Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross and Leoni LLP to actively oppose this legislation, despite the firm’s morally concerning history of lobbying on behalf of USA Swimming to oppose laws that “aimed to protect swimmers from ‘predatory coaches’” through “[making] it easier for sexual abuse victims to sue their abusers and the organizations they worked for or represented,”

i) Matthew-- “WHEREAS a letter of opposition submitted by Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross and Leoni LLP, on behalf of the University of Southern California, proposes that these changes would be to the detriment of plaintiffs who may opt-out of an existing class-action suit in saying, “the most egregious consequence of this newly proposed language is the elimination of real choice for the women impacted,”; and, WHEREAS, the analysis of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary refutes the unique nature of these circumstances, as compared to other class-action suits, and implicitly offers opposition to the concept that the University of Southern California carries responsibility for ensuring plaintiffs make the proper choice whether or not to opt-out of a class-action suit in saying: “These are real and valid concerns about the potentially negative consequences of a person opting out of the certain monetary award in the settlement for an uncertain award in court. However, it is up to the attorneys who solicit plaintiffs to meet their professional and ethical obligations and honestly explain the risks and benefits of opting out of the federal settlement,” WHEREAS, concerns raised in the letter of
opposition submitted on behalf of the University of Southern California that “the bill’s language includes a broad and vague definition of sexual misconduct” have been fully addressed in mockup amendments provided by the Consumer Attorney of California, planned for implementation following formal review; and, WHEREAS, the newly proposed amendments follow suit with precedent cases to also include a specific time period of valid claims revival dating from January 1, 1988 and January 1, 2017,”

j) Senator Johnson-- “WHEREAS, precedent for legislation reviving potentially lapsed claims may be found in SB 872 of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, enacted largely in response to allegations that former Michigan State University doctor Larry Nassar was sexually abusing his patients for decades, with the bill including the following key revival clauses in recognition of the exceptionally vulnerable population impacted in the case: “(3) Regardless of any period of limitation under subsection (1) or sections 5805 or 5851, an individual who, while a minor, was the victim of criminal sexual conduct after December 31, 1996 but before 2 years before the effective date of the amendatory act that added this section may commence an action to recover damages sustained because of the criminal sexual conduct within 90 days after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this section if the person alleged to have committed the criminal sexual conduct was convicted of criminal sexual conduct against any person under section 520b of the Michigan penal code, 1931 PA 328, MCL 750.520b, and the defendant admitted either of the following: (a) That the defendant was in a position of authority over the victim as the victim’s physician and used that authority to coerce the victim to submit. (b) That the defendant engaged in purported medical treatment or examination of the victim in a manner that is, or for purposes that are, medically recognized as unethical or unacceptable.””

k) Senator Garland-- “WHEREAS, many plaintiffs who have come forward with complaint of sexual assault conducted by George Tyndall were extraordinarily vulnerable, similar to those in the case of Larry Nassar, owing to several aspects such as: the power dynamic of a physician and patient, the youth of typical undergraduate patients, and the alleged targeting of Chinese students who may not have prior experience with gynecological examination,”

l) Senator Chuang-- ”BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA fully endorses the
proposed legislation in seeking to empower and provide redress towards survivors of sexual assault conducted at University facilities by University-affiliated physicians through revival of time-barred claims,”

m) Matthew-- “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Student Government of the University of Southern California further recognizes that this legislation provides additional agency to survivors of sexual assault in determining their legal options; and, that this legislation follows legal and moral precedent with existing time-barred claim-related amendments to state law, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Student Government of the University of Southern California, representing ~20,000 undergraduate students, expresses formal disapproval with the current stance of the University of Southern California on this legislation, as well as the partnership with Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross and Leoni LLP,”

n) Senator Johnson-- “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Student Government of the University of Southern California calls upon senior leadership of the administration to reevaluate the current stance of the University of Southern California on this legislation with consideration towards the mandate of the University towards protecting students,”

o) Senator Garland-- “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that delivery of this resolution be attempted by any possible means within reason to the floor of the California State Assembly prior to the consideration of the proposed Assembly Bill 1510 for final vote, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that within 2 weeks of being passed by the Undergraduate Student Government Senate, this resolution be delivered by USG Secretary Jill Lin to: Dr. Carol Folt, President-Elect of the University of Southern California, Dr. Wanda Austin, Interim President of the University of Southern California, Dr. Michael Quick, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Monique Allard, Interim Vice President of Student Affairs, Dr. Sarah Van Orman, Associate Vice Provost for Student Affairs, Dr. Brenda Ingram, Director of Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention and Services, Stacy Rummel Bratcher, Vice President and Managing General Counsel, Gail Kaufman-Starks, Director of Risk Management and Insurance, Jaime Aquino, Senior Risk Analyst, Department of Risk Management and Insurance, Sarah Hong, Violence Prevention Specialist, Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention and Services, Gabriel Valenzuela, Director of Campus Activities, Roopali Malhotra, Senior Advisor to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Joycelyn Yip, President of Graduate Student
Government, **Trenton Stone**, President of Undergraduate Student Government, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a response from the Provost’s office be issued within 2 weeks of its delivery.”

4. Matthew-- Here is a summary: we can break Robert’s Rules and need 10 votes to move it. I am asking for all of you to at least vote to allow us to move it. Ask as many questions as you need. This will be heard on the California State Assembly Board.
   a) Senator Donahue-- When will the bill be voted on?
   b) Matthew-- We need a specific time; we have to have a definite start date for it. There is a hard limit for June 1st when it has to be absolutely voted by.

5. Suspension of Robert’s Rules
   a) Senator Chuang moves to suspend Robert’s Rules.
      ○ Donahue- Point of Inquiry: Don’t we have to make the motion to debate about whether we should suspend Robert’s Rules?
   b) Senator Chuang moves to suspend Robert’s Rules
   c) Senator Garland seconds
   d) Senator Rosenthal-- The reason why I am speaking now before we vote is because I don’t want it to be like last time, which was a mess: can we meet by Friday again?
      ○ Parliamentarian Moten-- That was a clarifying question; in the bylaws, there is a provision: the VP can call a provisionary meeting that is not already scheduled. We would appear to meeting with our placards and adhere to Robert’s Rules.
      ○ Senator Johnson-- Would that have to be done before Friday?
      ○ Mahin-- If it were a regular senate meeting, it would have to be done before Friday and it would be considered Old Business.
      ○ Senator Johnson-- How is the quorum affected by that?
   e) Senator Garland-- I yield my time to Matt.
      ○ Matt: I feel like if this is pushed off, this cannot be passed. I spent all night writing and feel very strongly. Even if you don’t know how you feel, please ask questions. If our own student body can’t vote in support of the sexual assault victims of our student health center, then what are we doing here as a student government? But if we can have a united voice on one thing, it is this. The current admin allowed this to happen. If we are anything of a student government, we have to voice this. This is necessary because someone who was raped 11 years ago cannot file
independently. This is a moral precedent. Anyone who
decides to opt out will still have to go through civil court.
This is us, as students, supporting students.

f) Voting
   ○ Senator Chuang moves to suspend Robert’s Rules
   ○ Senator Garcia seconds
   ○ Mahin-- Vote to suspend Robert’s Rules
     (a) Vote starting with Senator Donahue
   ○ Suspension of Robert’s Rules passes unanimously (10-0-0)

6. Mahin- Robert’s Rules is now suspended.
7. Moving Support of Bill 1510 Resolution from New Business to Unfinished Business
   a) Voting
      ○ Senator Garcia moves to move the resolution from New Business to Unfinished Business
      ○ Senator Ritch seconds
      ○ Senator Donahue-- Point of Inquiry-- Can’t we just vote on this now? If Robert’s Rules is suspended, can’t we just vote?
      ○ Amendment to move the resolution from New Business to Unfinished Business passes unanimously (10-0-0)

8. Mahin-- The resolution is moved from New Business to Old Business.
9. Reinstatement of Robert’s Rules
   a) Voting
      ○ Senator Garcia moves to reinstate Robert’s Rules
      ○ Senator Johnson seconds
      ○ Mahin-- Vote to reinstate Robert’s Rules
        (a) Vote starting with Senator Shiff
      ○ Reinstatement of Robert’s Rules passes unanimously (10-0-0)

10. Debate
    a) Mahin-- Robert’s Rules is now reinstated. We are now in debate for the resolution.
    b) Senator Donahue-- Point of Clarification: can you talk about the process to the California State Assembly? I yield my time.
       ○ Matt-- First, thank you for moving this. The sponsors of the bill will introduce this and it will be read before it’s voted on. I’m not sure of the formal process.
       ○ Mahin-- do you have anything else?
       ○ Senator Donahue-- I yield.
       ○ Matt- Someone please amend to correct the grammar and to add Khoshniyati because she added her name after 7 pm.
c) Senator Johnson moves to strike Senator Khoshniyati from the resolution.
d) Senator Garland seconds
e) Mahin- The amendment is open to debate.
   ○ Senator Rosenthal-- Shouldn’t we be adding Senator Khoshniyati, not striking her?
f) Senator Anderson moves to add Senator Khoshniyati to the resolution
g) Senator Garcia seconds
h) Voting
   ○ Senator Donahue moves to vote on the amendment to add Senator Khoshniyati to the resolution
   ○ Senator Anderson seconds
   ○ Mahin-- Vote to add Senator Khoshniyati to the resolution
     (a) Vote starting with Senator Donahue
   ○ Amendment to add Senator Khoshniyati to the resolution passes unanimously (10-o-0)

11. Mahin-- The amendment is now approved. The resolution is being scrolled.

12. Amendment to Fix Grammar
   a) Senator Shiff moves to fix grammar within the resolution.
   b) Senator Ritch seconds
c) Debate
   ○ Mahin-- We have moved to debate. Is there any?
d) Voting
   ○ Senator Garcia moves to vote on the amendment to fix grammar within the resolution
   ○ Senator Johnson seconds
   ○ Mahin-- Vote to amend grammar in the resolution
     (a) Vote starting with Senator Donahue
   ○ Amendment of grammar within the resolution passes unanimously (10-o-o)

13. Mahin-- The resolution is now amended. To approve, we are now back in debate on the entire resolution.

14. Voting
   a) Senator Anderson moves to approve Item (C)
   b) Senator Garcia seconds
c) Mahin-- Can we take this to a vote?
   ○ Vote starting with Senator Donahue
d) Item (C) is approved unanimously (10-o-o)

VIII. New Business
   A. CDO Restructuring
1. Jeffrey-- This is just an aesthetic change to make sure Chief Diversity Officer is an executive officer. “The President shall appoint the following Executive Officers of the Undergraduate Student Government with the advice of the Vice President, the respective outgoing officer, and the Advisor(s): the Chief of Staff, the Treasurer, the Senior Director of Communications, the Senior Director of Programming, and the Chief Diversity Officer. Two (2) votes shall be allocated to each assembly, one (1) for each of the Director and the Assistant Director. Co-Directors and Co-Assistant Directors shall be presented as one (1) unified vote, and, if the Assistant Director position is unfilled, the Director shall have two (2) votes. The Chief Diversity Officer is subject to a vote of confidence by the outgoing Programming Branch’s cultural assembly Directors, prior to confirmation by the Senate. The Chief Diversity Officer nominee must receive supporting votes from two-thirds (2/3) of the assembly directors in order to be confirmed. Two (2) votes shall be allocated to each assembly, one (1) for each of the Director and the Assistant Director. Co-Directors and Co-Assistant Directors shall be presented as one (1) unified vote, and, if the Assistant Director position is unfilled, the Director shall have two (2) votes. The selection requires a vote of confidence that is a majority of the votes cast before presentation to the Senate. During the interview process, so as to ensure the assembly directors receive the necessary information, the outgoing cultural assembly Directors will be allowed access to all applications for the Chief Diversity Officer position (with ample time to review before commencement of the interview process). They will additionally be invited to observe the candidate interviews, and are allowed to ask questions to interviewees as they see fit. Four (4) of these office hours shall overlap with the Chief Diversity Officer to ensure constant communication regarding advocacy projects. Section 8: Duties of the Chief Diversity Officer

II.8.A The Chief Diversity Officer is to be an active advisor throughout the duration of any legislative or advocacy project so as to ensure that the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion are maintained and strengthened throughout the projects, and will collaborate with the Chief of Staff with regard to overseeing the Advocacy Branch. The Chief Diversity Officer will meet with project teams from both the Legislative and Advocacy Branch on an ad hoc basis as determined by the Chief Diversity Officer to ensure the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion are upheld. II.8.A.1 The Chief Diversity Officer shall oversee the cultural assembly liaisons as well as the appointed Advocacy Directors and Advocacy Assistant Directors with the
Chief of Staff. II.8.A.1.a After the cultural assembly liaisons have been determined, the Advocacy Director(s) in charge of a project shall hold meetings as needed to update the liaisons on the projects that Advocacy Branch is working on. II.8.A.2 The Chief Diversity Officer will ensure a fair and impartial review of all applicants to USG positions through maintaining a presence, whether personally or through proxies approved by the Executive board, at all interviews for appointed positions. Either the Chief Diversity Officer or their proxy will ask a question about the candidate’s commitment to diversity on campus and their experience with ensuring a inclusive environment for all students. II.8.A.3 The Chief Diversity Officer will provide all members of USG with educational components relating to diversity, equity, inclusion, pertinent projects by USG and the cultural assemblies through the medium of including but not limited to workshops, seminars and presentations. II.8.A.4 The Chief Diversity Officer will be a principal advisor to the USG President and Vice President with regard to the appointment of student representatives on administrative committees, councils, and task forces, and shall commit to being an active participant in any administrative groups to which they are extended an invitation. II.8.A.5 The Chief Diversity Officer will oversee training and advisement of the Executive Officers regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion in order to provide them the ability to hold their respective branches accountable. II.8.A.6 The Chief Diversity Officer shall hold meetings on a monthly basis with liaisons from all USG cultural assemblies to provide updates on relevant USG projects, aid the liaisons in their own programming and projects, and receive advice from the liaisons with regard to issues specific to their communities. The Chief Diversity Officer is responsible for working in conjunction with cultural liaisons to identify issues of inclusion on campus and develop solutions. II.8.A.7 The Chief Diversity Officer shall lead and execute any personal advocacy initiatives deemed necessary that are inclusive in nature and contribute to the overarching goals of diversity and equity, and they shall engage directly with any University-wide concerns that involve diversity, equity, and inclusion. Engagement would include, but not be limited to, listening to student concerns, scheduling events as appropriate, responding to USC administration and other relevant actions as needed, in collaboration with the Executive Officers. II.8.A.8 The Chief Diversity Officer will work directly with the Senior Director of Communications, the Director of Elections and Recruitment, the Director of Marketing, and any other relevant USG members to ensure that opportunities to run for USG office
and apply for USG positions are available and articulated to members of all cultural assemblies associated with USG, as well as any marginalized group on campus. II.8.A.9 The Chief Diversity Officer will ensure that the Director of Elections and Recruitment provides all election and application materials to all USG assemblies, cultural resource centers, and any other marginalized group on campus as deemed necessary by the Director of Elections and Recruitment and the Chief Diversity Officer.

II.8.B Other Obligations II.8.B.1 The Chief Diversity Officer shall give a verbal report to the Senate at least once a month. II.8.B.2 The Chief Diversity Officer shall maintain sixteen (16) office hours per week during the academic year. II.8.B.2.a Four (4) office hours may be external to maintain a strong relationship with the student body. The Chief Diversity Officer is to make themselves available to the students who they represent. II.8.B.2.b Four (4) of these office hours shall overlap with the Chief of Staff to ensure constant communication regarding advocacy projects. II.8.B.2.c One (1) office hour shall be dedicated to an Executive Officers meeting, which the President will lead. “Essentially, make changes to add Chief Diversity Director to Executive Officers and strike repeated information in other places since Chief Diversity Officer will be considered an Executive Officer.

2. Mahin-- Some changes were already made in the last bylaws  
   a) Jeffrey-- This is just to add the Chief Diversity Officer Stipend

3. Mahin-- Are there any questions?  
   a) Rosenthal- Chief of Staff overlap?

4. Mahin-- Any other questions?

IX. Announcements
   A. None

X. Discussion
   A. Senator Garcia-- One more week! The last week of school; wow, it’s fire. That’s it.
   B. Senator Chuang- I just want to apologize for the confusion caused by the suspension of Robert’s Rules but thank you for putting up with it and passing the resolution.
   C. Senator Johnson- This is exactly what we are trying to avoid and I know it doesn’t feel good to not be prepared, but thank you for being communicative and I look forward to more communication in the future.
   D. Mahin-- Please look more into what y’all are working on in Senate; please look to see if this will become a trend. I’m not sure if breaking Robert’s Rules is the best way to do this, but please think about the timeframe and what y’all have to do.

XI. Adjournment
   A. Senator Rosenthal moves to adjourn the meeting
   B. Senator Garcia seconds
C. VP Tahsin adjourns the meeting at 8:25 PM