

**Board of Directors Meeting Minutes January 22, 2025**

- I. CALL TO ORDER at **12:09 PM**
  
- II. ROLL CALL  
**Present:** Nolan Calara, Erick Loreda, Charan Reddy Doolam, London Deguzman, Deepthi Bhimanapati, Kartik Tripathi, Jana Ramos, Akeem Brown, Sophia Dela Cruz, Venkata Anirudh, Yashica Avhad, Ashley Depappa, MyLan Huynh, Maureen Scharberg, Steve Spencer, Dessiree Cuevas, Martin Castillo  
**Absent:** Germione Villegas, Nidhi Sharma, Gerardo Segovia, Joe Trujillo, Sai Lokesh Gayam, James Carroll, Stephanie Ann Lustina
  
- III. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Agenda**  
**Motion** to approve the agenda of January 22<sup>nd</sup>,2025 by **D. Bhimanapati**, seconded by **V. Anirudh**, motion **CARRIED**.
  
- IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of December 4th, 2024**  
**Motion** to approve the minutes of December 4<sup>th</sup>,2024 by **S. Dela Cruz**, seconded by **E. Loreda**, motion **CARRIED**.
  
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT – **Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the public to address the committee on any issues affecting ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.**  
**Jaalam Jones** introduces himself, stating that he is running for Senator for CEAS. He expresses his appreciation for the opportunity  
**2:55**
  
- VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS:  
No unfinished items.  
**3:00**
  
- VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS  
  
**A. INFORMATIONAL ITEM - [External Food Guidance for CSUEB Groups](#)**  
The ASI Board of Directors will be informed about External Food Guidance for CSUEB Groups.



**M. Huynh** introduces a draft food policy framework, emphasizing its ongoing revision and collaborative development. She explains that the goal is to ensure food safety and risk management for events organized by student leaders and departments. The framework distinguishes between internal, closed events and external, open ones. For events serving large, diverse audiences, food handler training is recommended to promote safe practices. **M. Huynh** highlights that sourcing food from recognized vendors like Costco or Safeway is simpler, but using small, independent vendors requires collecting business licenses and permits for accountability. She discourages potlucks due to the safety risks associated with homemade food but mentions that risk management can assist with special exceptions for closed events with appropriate disclosures. The proposal has already gained traction with SLIC, the Hope Pantry, and other campus departments. **M. Huynh** emphasizes the importance of adopting these guidelines to maintain food safety and risk compliance while supporting student leaders in planning successful events. **N. Calara** raises a concern about the food handler card requirement, pointing out that obtaining the card involves a financial cost. He questions whether departments like the R.A.W. or Housing would cover the expense for student leaders or if individuals would be responsible for paying for it themselves. **M. Huynh** responds by clarifying that some departments cover the cost of the food handler card. She notes that the R.A.W. pays for their staff to obtain the card, and Housing also covers the cost for their staff. For SLIC, she mentions that the professional staff's card expenses are paid for, but clubs and organizations are expected to cover the cost themselves. **J. Carroll** explains that ASI is still deciding whether to cover the cost of food handler cards. He notes that the certification typically costs between \$10 and \$14 and is valid for four years. They plan to assess how many Pro staff and board members would need the certification, with the initial focus on ensuring at least one person is certified to oversee food safety. The current idea is to start by covering the Pro staff. **M. Huynh** discusses a conversation with SLIC housing about the importance of having someone with knowledge for specific tasks. She mentions that while they don't have expertise on certain topics (like the safety temperature of milk), it's important to have a designated person who can guide conversations, especially for programmatic leads. The focus is on having someone responsible for outward-facing roles, while also ensuring food handling considerations are properly managed. **M. Castillo** questions if the cost mentioned is nominal. **M. Huynh** mentions regarding the one HOPE is using which is from Premier food safety where the pricing starts at \$1695 with the lowest price of \$695 guaranteed according to the sticker. **N. Calara** asks whether it's up to the departments' discretion to ensure that the designated person has a food handler card and if this information will be stored in their database. **M. Huynh** is presenting the information as a work in progress, highlighting the need to develop it further on the department side. The



aim is to provide the best guidance to those working closely with students and student leaders to help move forward. **M. Huynh** mentions that R.A.W was the first to lead in this effort, and they have continued to lead with it, bringing it up to SLIC, who agreed and felt valued by these initiatives. The focus is on establishing best practices for providing food to students and the campus community safely. While the department is still working on the required components, there is a reservation process that may vary, depending on the department. For example, SLIC handles the collection for clubs and organizations, so it doesn't go through the rental process but through the success channels instead. **M. Huynh** mentions that SLIC should take the lead for student groups since they oversee clubs and organizations. She mentions presenting this idea multiple times on the dining advisory and anticipate that once the reservation process formalizes, it will be integrated into the 25Live system. For events under a \$250 threshold, Chartwells will be involved to ensure safety and proper components are in place. She clarifies that ASI doesn't need to handle the responsibilities of sending the information to East Bay groups directly.

**J. Carroll** provides a follow-up, advising that for the short term, when planning events with food, organizers should keep in mind the food safety practices discussed earlier. He will work with Ashley Depappa, Sneha Sharma, and others to clarify any additional steps, like ensuring gloves and proper serving practices. **J. Carroll** mentions that no immediate changes are needed, but the process will evolve, especially as they coordinate with their insurance company to clarify coverage for events. This might influence additional internal procedures. Event planning can continue as usual, but food-related events will need to adhere to the discussed practices. **N. Calara** expresses that while they're okay with departments paying for students to use the food handler card, they are concerned about student organizations. He believes students should not have to pay for the card, even though it's only \$7. He suggests discussing with SLIC to see if funding can be provided for a student representative from each club to have the food handler card.

19:48

B. **ACTION ITEM:** [Senator of CEAS Candidate](#)

The ASI Board of Directors will take action on appointing the Senator of CEAS Candidate. **Motion** to appoint **Jaalam Jones** as Senator of CEAS by **E. Loredo**, seconded by **K. Tripathi**.

**E. Loredo** shares that he interviewed Jay on November 20th, and Jay expressed a strong interest in being a Senator of CEAS. He is a kinesiology major, communicative, and brings many bright ideas to the board. Jay is also part of the athletics community, serving in track and field, and wants to advocate for that community. He aims to work closely with the board, using his connections, and represent all students on campus through initiatives,



programming, and advocacy like ASI. Jay is available on Wednesdays for the Board of Directors and Tuesdays for the Academic Senate, and he has a flexible schedule, looking forward to being part of the board.

Motion to appoint **Jaalam Jones** as Senator of CEAS by **11 YES, 1 ABSTAIN**, motion **CARRIED**.

22:10

C. **ACTION ITEM - Remuneration Policy**

The ASI Board of Directors will take action on the remuneration policy.

**Motion** to approve the remuneration policy by E. Loredo, seconded by D. Bhimanapati.

- D. **Loredo** explains that as part of the Remuneration policy, scholarships will be increased by 5% next year to address rising costs. This decision was made by the executive committee, and the new scholarship amounts include a raise for the President and CEO, who will receive \$15,120 instead of \$14,400, divided into monthly distributions of \$1,260 starting June 1st. The same increase applies to all Executive Committee members. A key change involves directors and senators, who will now have a level distribution period, meaning directors will start in June and the rest of the board in July. This allows Executive Committee to prepare in June for the academic year. Additionally, scholarships for student committee service will be awarded once per semester based on service, and the chair of the board position has been removed. **L. Deguzman** asks whether the reward for student committee members will remain the same at \$50 per semester or if it will increase, questioning why the amount is set at \$50. **J. Carroll** explains that committees currently receive \$25 per meeting, which depends on the number of meetings held each month. The recommendation to consolidate payments once a semester, rather than monthly, is to simplify the financial aid process, as processing smaller payments monthly is labor-intensive. There is no recommendation to increase what committee members receive, and, compared to other CSU systems, most students on committees don't receive any payment. So, even though it's not a large amount, it's still considered a benefit for student committee members. **L. Deguzman** clarifies his question, asking if student-at-large committee members will still receive \$25 per meeting, with the total amount being collected at the end of the semester. **A. Brown** asks for an updated version of the information, as what they're reading shows no increase for Section 4, indicating that the stipend or scholarship appears to be the same as it is currently. He also inquires about the status of the chair of the board position, asking if it's still active and, if so, who the current chair is. **N. Calara** explains that two years ago, all positions were adjusted, and the chair of the board position no longer exists. The responsibilities of the chair have now been taken on by the President. A. Brown question if the person who is chair and also the President is getting paid twice. N. Calara denies it. J. Carroll explains that there are



three main updates: first, some name changes and grammatical revisions to reflect the bylaw changes from last year, such as the removal of the chair position and updates to student financial services. Second, there is a recommendation to increase scholarships, which have been the same for the last two years. The outgoing board determines the scholarship amount for the incoming board, so the current board cannot make that decision, but it is being proposed to this board. The increase is considered appropriate due to rising costs and inflation, despite financial challenges. The third update is about moving directors and senators to an 11-month schedule, giving them June off. This change would help offset costs and provide flexibility, especially considering the Gloria Romero Act, which requires in-person meetings for voting members. Directors and senators starting in July would still have the option for hybrid or remote participation during training in July and early August. This approach aims to offer more flexibility, especially for those with summer plans. **J. Trujillo** clarifies that, throughout the summer, instead of having Board of Directors meetings in person, they would hold personnel and Executive committee meetings, which could be conducted via Zoom, allowing more flexibility and avoiding the need to be in person. **J. Carroll** confirms that the nonprofit still needs to conduct business in June and July, but it doesn't require full board meetings. Instead, they would hold Executive or personnel meetings, which could be done remotely. He acknowledges that if full board meetings are required, everyone would need to be in person starting in June. The goal is to figure out how to balance conducting business while allowing flexibility, especially considering that some CSU systems handle this by having early June Executive meetings. However, they can't decide on this in advance because the board members' positions and summer plans are still uncertain. **S. Dela Cruz** asks if the scholarship increase will be reflected in the budget for the next fiscal year, wondering whether the changes will be presented or if the adjustments will be made without altering the first budget significantly. **J. Carroll** responds that the scholarship increase will be discussed as a budget item in late summer. However, since enrollment and fees are not expected to increase, the overall budget is unlikely to grow. They will try to adjust where possible to cover the scholarship increase. Additionally, they are starting to recruit for funding through donations, particularly alumni donations, though that income is not yet available. **J. Carroll** mentions that there will be a \$7,800 increase to the Board scholarship budget. However, they will need to balance the numbers and may have to make cuts in some areas. They are also looking for savings and are collecting alumni donations or other forms of participation to help fund this increase. **A. Brown** raises a concern about what happens if a decision needs to be made by the full board during the summer, particularly if not all members are present. He asks about quorum, voting, and what the recourse would be if something urgent needs to happen in June, when some members



may not be available. He emphasizes the importance of ensuring access to everyone when needed, even if members aren't being paid during that time. **N. Calara** explains that during the summer, the main business will be handled by the executive and personnel meetings, ensuring quorum with their presence. The full Board of Directors will not be required until the school year starts. Thus, in the summer, only Executive will conduct business, and the full board will convene in person once the academic year begins. **A. Brown** acknowledges the logic behind the plan but expresses concern about the rules based on the bylaws. He suggests that the issue should be examined more closely, particularly regarding how many people make up a quorum. He also points out that Executive consists of everyone except those with "senator" in their title. **N. Calara** clarifies that Executive includes all Board of Directors members, and the quorum required is either 50 percent plus one or a two-thirds majority. **A. Brown** questions if they would have it in summer. **N. Calara** confirms that during the summer, Executive will consist of all the Vice Presidents and the President. **A. Brown** expresses a concern about ensuring that everyone is on the same page regarding fiscal responsibility and decision-making. He emphasizes the importance of giving senators full opportunities to be involved, even if they want to participate during the summer. **A. Brown** feels that limiting participation could hinder the experience of board members and that every senator should have the chance to be involved in every decision, regardless of timing. He wants to ensure that the full board is engaged in all decisions throughout the year. **N. Calara** explains that Executive is available during the summer due to varying summer plans, and not everyone may be able to be present in person. He mentions that the remuneration policy has been set for 12 months to ensure Executive's availability. However, if the board believes that every Board of Directors member should be present year-round, this could be reconsidered, and a policy change could be proposed for a vote. **A. Depappa** acknowledges the point made, agreeing that while all board members are there to run the organization, the Executive Board and Personnel Committee hold more responsibility or authority in decision-making. **A. Brown** expresses objection. He expresses concern that voting members should not be interrupted or stopped from discussing and voting on matters, emphasizing the importance of flexibility and participation from all board members. He highlights the need to review bylaws carefully, including who can talk, vote, and participate, stressing the importance of formal procedures and the integrity of the decision-making process. **A. Depappa**, as the Advisor, responds to concerns by explaining the rationale behind the Executive Board's early start. She emphasizes that the Executive Board needs time to establish a strong foundation for the organization before bringing the rest of the board into the process. This includes important tasks like developing the policy agenda, which the Executive Board can work on extensively before presenting it to the full board. **A. Depappa**



stresses that the purpose of the early preparation is not to exclude others but to allow everyone to get settled in and be better prepared for their roles. She also notes that the shift from a 12-month to an 11-month term will result in a shorter pay period for certain positions, and this change should be considered. **K. Dhillon** provides context by explaining that the decision to have the entire board start in June was made in 2021 by themselves and Angelica de Leon. Previously, only the executive board started in June, while the rest of the board started in August. The purpose of having everyone start in June was to ensure that key priorities and policy agendas were set, allowing the rest of the board to start with everything already in motion. K. Dhillon, who served as an executive officer during the summer, emphasizes the amount of work required to get things rolling and the importance of having the entire board aligned when they join. He also mentions that in the past, under the old bylaws, the executive board handled things over the summer until the full board arrived in August, suggesting it could be useful to check the current bylaws for clarity. K. Tripathi adds further context, emphasizing that senators and directors often have no prior ASI experience when they join the board, so they require significant training to work effectively. They mention that for Executive Committee (ExCom) members, prior ASI experience is required, making it acceptable for them to start in June, as they already possess the knowledge to contribute. In contrast, senators and directors would need time over the summer to get up to speed. However, K. Tripathi suggests an alternative: if a senator or director has prior experience, they could be allowed to start in the summer and engage in advocacy or other work. Overall, they agree that limiting summer involvement to ExCom allows for training and planning for the full board's arrival. **M. Castillo** acknowledges **A. Brown's** perspective and reflects on the transition process between old and new bylaws. In the past, business during the summer would transfer to the ExCom, which allowed the board to function even without the full membership. However, they mention that the updated bylaws don't seem to clearly address this transition, possibly leaving out important details. They appreciate the need for proper training for new members as raised by **K. Tripathi** and believe that keeping ExCom in charge during the summer is still the right decision. But they also agree that the issue with the bylaws should be addressed for clarity. **M. Huynh** shares a perspective from their experience with orientations and outreach, highlighting the importance of involving and welcoming new students during the summer, especially as the board prepares for the upcoming year. She suggests that beyond policy decisions and preparations, there could be value in using the summer months to engage with the student community, possibly through orientations or other initiatives. She presents this as additional food for thought as the board considers its plans. **Y. Avhad** agrees with the idea that having the Executive Committee start working over the summer is beneficial. She emphasizes that it allows the board to move



more quickly, which in turn benefits students. **Y. Avhad** also points out that Executive Committee members have more experience than incoming senators and directors, which makes it important for Executive Committee to start early to ensure smoother transitions. She supports the idea of Executive Committee handling business during the summer and believe this helps the board function more efficiently. **A. Brown** emphasizes that their concern isn't about the money but rather the structure and way things are written in the bylaws. He believes that while having the Executive Committee start early for training and preparation is valuable, there should be more opportunities for others to join and participate without restrictions. **A. Brown** advocates for a bicameral government structure with a legislative, executive, and judicial branch all working together, much like a government. He wants to explore how to create a more structured and empowered student government that better mirrors traditional government models, ensuring everyone has a role, and policy can be pushed forward by all members. A. Brown calls for a deeper look at the bylaws to reflect this and believes it would help students understand the workings of government better. J. Carroll acknowledges the desire for a full board to be engaged year-round but highlights the practical challenges, particularly for those who don't live locally or can't afford summer housing in the Bay Area. While agreeing with the value of a 12-month, in-person board, they bring up the issue that some members struggle to meet this expectation due to financial or logistical reasons. Additionally, J. Carroll explains that during the pandemic, the California governor suspended the requirement for in-person meetings, allowing hybrid meetings, but this ended in 2023, and the board has since been operating in violation of the Gloria Romero Act, which restricts such arrangements. They suggest that while the idea of a full, in-person board year-round is great, it's important to consider transparency for potential board candidates, particularly those who live out of the area and may not be able to afford summer rent.

**Motion** for amendment to change the 12 months by A. Brown.

**Motion** dies

**E. Loredo** expresses support for both increasing the scholarships and extending the 11 to 12-month distribution. However, they also suggest adding a provision to the policy that would allow any board members outside of the Executive Committee who are interested in serving during June to have the option to do so. **G. Villegas** agrees with the idea of increasing the scholarships and extending the period, but asks for more details regarding how many hours or days the Executive Committee members are expected to be present during the summer. **S. Dela Cruz** shared their support for the 11-to-12-month policy, emphasizing the value of Executive Committee being present to support new board members after their training. As a new board member herself, she expressed appreciation for the guidance and





support Executive Committee could offer, especially during the transition period. She also highlighted that having Executive Committee trained and available would help newer board members acclimate more effectively to their roles. **J. Trujillo** shared their input, agreeing that going for 12 months makes sense but also acknowledging the value of the 11-month option. He emphasized that for newcomers, especially those who may be freshmen or sophomores, an acclimation period is important, which is why the 11-month model could work better to allow time to prepare for the coming year. He also suggested that senators should have the option to attend Executive Committee meetings during this time, as some may have prior experience and would want to get a head start on their work, such as presenting ideas or resolutions. **D. Bhimanapati** expressed their support for the 12-month period for Executive Committee and the 11-month period for the rest of the board, but raised a concern about whether they need to review the bylaws regarding the transition of business to Executive Committee before voting on this policy. **L. Deguzman** expressed support for the remuneration policy in its current state, recommending that Executive Committee remain on a 12-month term. He believes the rest of the board should not have a 12-month term, citing fiscal benefits. However, he mentioned that senators and directors should have the option to participate in business over the summer, even though they wouldn't be paid for it. He clarified that it shouldn't be mandatory for them to attend business hours in June. **K. Tripathi** agreed with London, emphasizing that it would be unfair to expect the entire board to show up in person during the summer. He highlighted that Executive Committee should be the only group required to be present since they already have the experience and can conduct business. Other board members can choose to show up if they want to learn, but it shouldn't be mandatory. **Y. Avhad** expressed concern about letting senators and directors vote during the summer without sufficient training. She believes it could lead to misinformed votes because not everyone would have the necessary experience with ASI at that point. **J. Carroll** clarified that while the board can recommend bylaw changes, those changes must go to a general student body vote for approval. This process would take some time. He suggested that the board start looking at potential bylaw changes early in the semester and plan for a vote either during the elections or separately. He also emphasized the importance of providing a clear explanation and transparency to the general student body, potentially through a fact sheet, to ensure understanding of the proposed changes. **A. Depappa** emphasized that while the Executive Committee will be required to be present year-round, there will still be opportunities for incoming members to transition and have time to think about their roles. She clarified that incoming members won't be required to attend meetings over the summer, but they will be able to participate if they wish. If the decision is made for the entire board to work 12 months, it will impact the eligibility and ability of people who



are out of the area to fully participate. **A. Depappa** also mentioned that the goal is to be flexible, offering accommodations such as hybrid or online participation, while still ensuring the process remains effective.

**Motion** to approve the remuneration policy, by 11 YES, motion **CARRIED**.

1:12:36

**E. ACTION ITEM - Senator of Concord position**

The ASI Board of Directors will take action on the removal of Gerardo Segovia from the Senator of Concord position.

Motion to remove Gerardo Segovia from the Senator of Concord Position by **E. Loredo** seconded by **J. Ramos**.

**E. Loredo** explained that the reason for considering removal was due to a lack of communication and responsibility from the Senator of Concord. He mentioned that despite multiple attempts to reach out to him through various means—email, calls, texts, and even through campus contacts—there was no response. He learned that he had completed his semester, but his lack of presence in meetings and failure to fulfill his duties as a Senator led to the recommendation for his removal from his position. **A. Brown** raised concerns about the next steps after removing the Senator of Concord. Specifically, they asked if anyone had made an effort to visit the Concord campus in person to reach out to the Senator. He also questioned whether the vacancy would be filled through the next election cycle or if someone would be appointed to the position immediately. **E. Loredo** clarified that the next agenda item will address the question of filling the vacancy. They also confirmed that all possible efforts to reach the Senator of Concord were made, and the Senator is aware that their situation is being discussed. **J. Trujillo** asked if any steps were taken to try to understand the Senator's absence and whether there was any communication from him explaining his lack of involvement, suggesting that it could have been a simple issue, like the challenges of being on a busy campus. He asked if there was any explanation given for his absence. **E. Loredo** emphasized that when someone takes an oath to serve the students in ASI, they are expected to fulfill their duties. The senator in question cut off communication with the Board of Directors and failed to meet their responsibilities, which is why the recommendation to remove him is being made. Since he's being paid by student fees, he is expected to act accordingly. **E. Loredo** clarified that the **G. Segovia** has not provided any explanation for their actions or absence. Despite multiple attempts to reach him via different communication methods, no response was received. **N. Calara** emphasized that **G. Segovia** has failed to attend multiple meetings and has not even taken the oath of office, despite repeated attempts to have him do so. There were several efforts made to reach out and involve him, but he continued to be absent and unresponsive. As a result, they feel it's necessary to move forward



with his removal from the position, similar to how one would be removed from a course if they failed to fulfill their responsibilities. **A. Depappa** noted that **G. Segovia** also left the GroupMe, further closing off any potential communication channels. Despite efforts from the team, he hasn't engaged, and it's important for the organization to move forward. She emphasized the need to focus on the current leadership and not dwell on this issue any longer. **N. Calara** reiterated that the discussion regarding this matter took place in the personnel committee, which is open to the public. He emphasized that the issue had been thoroughly discussed, and now the board is taking action on it.

**Motion** to remove G. Segovia from the Senator of Concord Position by 12 YES, 1 ABSTAIN, motion **CARRIED**.

1:18:24

**F. DISCUSSION ITEM - Future Senator of Concord position**

The ASI Board of Directors will discuss the future of the Senator of Concord position.

**E. Loredo** spoke about a prior discussion with James and Ashley regarding the Concord Senator position. The group is considering whether to appoint a new person to fill the position or to postpone it for now. The reasoning behind this is a lack of sufficient action at the Concord campus to justify the continuation of the paid position. One potential idea is to repurpose the position into a community-directed role, perhaps under the guidance of one of the SALs (Student Affairs Leaders), and use the funds that would have paid for the senator position to increase scholarships or allocate the money elsewhere. **J. Trujillo** expressed a strong belief in maintaining the Senator position for the Concord campus, citing concerns that placing it under someone else would lead to underrepresentation. He emphasized the importance of giving the position more time and seeing how things progress, especially after dealing with a year of poor communication from the current senator. He suggested that stricter rules could be put in place to ensure better communication and involvement from the Concord Senator. Ultimately, he felt that removing the position would do more harm than good. **L. Deguzman** spoke in favor of keeping the Concord position open, emphasizing the importance of having proper representation for the Concord Center. Even though the Concord Center isn't technically a full campus, with over 1,000 students attending each year, L. Deguzman argued that it still requires dedicated representation. They also mentioned the positive impact of past leadership, like Sharon Basi, and believed that leaving the position open would allow for future leaders to step up and do a good job representing Concord students. **N. Calara** shared concerns about declining enrollment both at the main campus and at the Concord center. He suggested that while advocacy for Concord students is still important, the position of a full senator might not be necessary. Instead, they proposed considering the Concord representation under a senator-at-large or community director



model. **N. Calara** pointed out that with declining enrollment and some spaces not even being used for academic purposes, it might not make sense to continue with a dedicated senator position for Concord. **A. Depappa** raised a point about the size of the Concord student community and how it compares to other communities already represented by senators-at-large or directors of communities. She suggested that with Concord's student body being relatively small, it might make sense to consider merging its representation with a broader category, like those already covered by senators-at-large or the Director of Communities. **A. Depappa** emphasized that if Concord still has its own dedicated position, resources should be allocated effectively to ensure it has sufficient support. She proposed that the Board could help supplement this support, potentially through the existing structure of senators-at-large or directors, and that this could be a good issue to workshop further for better representation. **Y. Avhad** suggested that for the remainder of the term, a Senator of Concord should not be appointed. She reasoned that if a new senator were appointed, there would be a short amount of time left for them to actually work after training. Instead, she proposed that the position should be filled during the next voting cycle. This would give potential candidates the opportunity to campaign and allow students to understand the role better. **Y. Avhad** emphasized that advertising the role and its responsibilities would provide clarity and encourage participation in the upcoming election cycle. **K. Tripathi** expressed agreement with the reasoning behind removing the Senator of Concord position but emphasized that regardless of the number of students at Concord, those students still need proper representation. He argued that someone on the Concord campus is essential to connect with the students directly and advocate for their needs. **K. Tripathi** highlighted that as a Director of Communities or Senator at Large based on the main campus, it would be challenging to effectively represent Concord students without being physically present there. He stressed that to truly advocate for Concord students, the representative must be on the ground and have access to them. **M. Castillo** agreed with **K. Tripathi**, emphasizing the importance of having a representative who is connected to the Concord campus. He mentioned that a provision was previously made requiring the individual in that role to take at least one course at the Concord campus to ensure they had some connection to the students there. **M. Castillo** suggested that defining the role with clearer provisions and concrete requirements might help in the future. He reiterated the need for Concord students to have representation, even though the current situation may present challenges, noting that there are still 247 students at Concord who deserve proper advocacy. **J. Ramos** expresses agreement on the importance of representation for the Concord campus, despite its smaller student body focused primarily on business and nursing majors. She suggests that while having a dedicated Senator for Concord is valuable, it may also be beneficial for Senators of the different colleges at the



Hayward campus to engage with Concord students. This would allow them to gather feedback and better represent those students' needs. **N. Calara** supports **J. Ramo's** idea, emphasizing that while Concord students are important, representing only about 200 students doesn't warrant a dedicated Senator position. Instead, existing Senators, whether academic or community-focused, should assume responsibility for Concord representation. Given the decline in enrollment and funding, **N. Calara** advocates for more strategic resource allocation. However, they stress the importance of keeping updated on Concord's developments and maintaining awareness of satellite campuses, as discussed in system-wide conversations with **L. Deguzman**. **J. Trujillo** acknowledges the value of having a dedicated Concord Senator but agrees with **Y. Avhad** and **J. Ramos** that it may not be the best use of resources this semester. Instead, they support attributing representation to existing academic Senators for Concord's majors as a practical approach to fund allocation. **J. Trujillo** stresses the need for proactive ASI promotion at Concord, suggesting efforts to raise awareness and demonstrate ASI's impact, rather than simply appointing someone with minimal engagement or progress at the campus. **J.O** expresses concerns about eliminating the Concord Senator position, emphasizing the importance of equity, inclusiveness, and fairness for marginalized groups. She cautions that such a decision may send a harmful message that Concord is less valued than the main Hayward campus, which could negatively impact the university's efforts to navigate challenges and support both campuses equally. **J.O** draws attention to potential parallels between this logic and broader issues of discrimination and marginalization, urging ASI to carefully consider these implications. **J. Carroll** acknowledges and supports previous statements, highlighting two distinct issues: the immediate need to address the vacant Concord Senator position and the longer-term conversation about potential bylaw changes. He emphasizes that while recruitment may be challenging given the semester's midpoint, it's crucial for the current board to consider how they will provide support and service to the Concord Center in the short term, even if the position remains vacant. **J. Carroll** encourages ongoing thought and planning to address this gap effectively. **A. Brown** expresses agreement with colleagues and emphasizes the importance of supporting the Concord Center while filling the vacant position. He suggests promoting ASI, advertising opportunities, and having representatives physically present at the campus. **A. Brown** volunteers to participate actively by being a voice of support and having boots on the ground, ensuring that Concord students are not neglected.

1:43:13

## VIII. SPECIAL REPORTS



- **Senator at Large Spring Plans**

**V. Anirudh** outlined a detailed action plan for the spring semester, focusing on enhancing student engagement, accessibility, and wellness initiatives. Key priorities include continuing leadership check-ins, fostering board bonding events, and partnering with RAW to organize intramural games. Accessibility efforts will feature social media campaigns to raise awareness of campus resources, address accessibility concerns for events like commencement, and encourage student feedback on unmet needs. Additionally, plans are underway to collaborate on a mental wellness campaign for World Health Day and organize tabling sessions to engage students alongside committee representatives. **E. Loredo** emphasized the importance of maintaining transparency and accountability through proper documentation and reporting. He reminded board members to bookmark and update the January task spreadsheet with ongoing work from the current and previous semesters. Additionally, **E. Loredo** introduced a new Google form for committee and subcommittee reports, which includes questions about discussions, unresolved issues, follow-up steps, and needed support. This form will be reviewed at the last Board of Directors meeting each month to ensure all committees have a voice and that their progress is effectively tracked and supported.

IX. **ROUND TABLE REMARKS**

**A. Depappa** warmly welcomed the group back and congratulated Jay on joining. She encouraged members interested in running for office next year to note that the filing opens Friday and remains open until February 14th, with a later deadline for slate filings. **A. Depappa** offered support for anyone seeking guidance or assistance in building a slate and highlighted that all election information is available on the website. They also invited members to attend the first elections committee meeting immediately following the current session to review timelines and details. Lastly, **A. Depappa** reminded everyone to stay briefly after the meeting to discuss a resolution related to scholarships. **K. Dhillon** encourages the seniors, acknowledging that the spring semester will fly by and they will soon be alumni. Regarding the Concord campus, they appreciate the great discussions and suggest tapping into specific majors like nursing, which has a strong presence at Concord. **K. Dhillon** also emphasizes the importance of maintaining respect during discussions, encouraging board members to be mindful of allowing everyone the opportunity to share their thoughts fully before others respond, as interruptions can be disrespectful. He encourages fostering a respectful and inclusive environment for all to be heard. **N. Calara** reiterates several announcements, mentioning that if anyone is interested in attending CHESS, they must reply to the email sent out last week with the requested criteria by January 28th. For those graduating this semester, an email has been sent out regarding commencement, so they should sign up for the ceremony. Regarding parking permits, they're still waiting for the Spring permits, and everyone

should be parking in the student parking lot for now. For any questions, they can talk with Sneha Sharma. The alumni breakfast is next Wednesday from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM, and N. Calara will follow up with those still interested. Additionally, there's a listening session with Dr. Brenda Amenson-Hill from student affairs on Wednesday from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM. **E. Loreda** announces that **S. Lokesh** has resigned for the semester, so applications for the College of Science position will be opening soon. He encourages everyone to inform any friends or people they know who might be interested in applying once the application is open. **Y. Avhad** asks whether it is necessary to fill the College of Science position for the remainder of the term or if they can wait until the next voting cycle. She questions whether the bylaws require the position to be filled immediately. **E. Loreda** responds, stating that the College of Science is one of the largest colleges, and believes it is important to have a representative for that specific college. Despite being in January with only a few months left in the term, they plan to open up applications for the position. **J. Trujillo** shares that there will be an event on Thursday from 12:15 to 1:15 at the Music Building, room 1505, where attendees can meet some CLASS faculty, administration, and the Dean, as well as enjoy some snacks. **J. Trujillo** mentions that they attended the one today, which is why they were late to the board meeting, but they won't be able to attend the Thursday event due to a class conflict. They encourage others to attend and show support for ASI and the CLASS faculty

X. ADJOURNMENT at **1:54 PM**

Minutes reviewed by:

**President/Chief of Staff Name:**

Nolan Calara

Minutes approved on:

**2/5/2025**

Date:

