

Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes of January 15th, 2025

I. CALL TO ORDER at **12:06 PM**

II. [ROLL CALL](#)

Present: Nolan Calara, Erick Macias, Charan Reddy Doolam, Deepthi Bhimanapati

Absent: London Deguzman, Martin Castillo

III. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Agenda**

Motion to approve the agenda of January 15th, 2025 by **C. Reddy Doolam**, seconded by **D. Bhimanapati**, motion **CARRIED**.

IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of Nov 20, 2024**

Motion to approve minutes of November 20th, 2024 by **N. Calara**, seconded by **C. Reddy Doolam** 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.**

No public comment.

1:32

VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS:

No unfinished items.

1:37

VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. **DISCUSSION ITEM:** [Senator of CEAS Candidate](#)

The Personnel Committee will discuss the Candidate for Senator of CEAS.

E. Loredo reports interviewing Jay Jaalam (Jay) on Wednesday, November 20th, for the vacant CEAS Senator position in ASI. Jay, a kinesiology major and track and field athlete, works in operations alongside **K. Tripathi**, who informed him of the opportunity. He expresses strong interest in advocating for both the athletic and CEAS communities and aims



to increase student engagement and campus accessibility. Jay brings prior leadership experience from a high school business-oriented role requiring group coordination and idea facilitation. He aspires to become a physician assistant and is available for ASI Board of Directors meetings on Wednesdays, as well as Academic Senate sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays. **E. Loredo** considers Jay a strong candidate, noting his energy, public speaking skills, and enthusiasm for engaging with students. **N. Calara** questions about the academic year Jay is currently in. **E. Loredo** replies that he is a junior. **C. Reddy Doolam** states that he learned about the candidate through **K. Tripathi** and believes his involvement as a CEAS Senator in ASI would be a good idea. Based on his work with **K. Tripathi**, he observed that he is genuinely interested in the role and consider him a good fit for the position. **E. Loredo** confirms that there is no further discussion and announces the decision to recommend the candidate to the board at the next Board of Directors meeting.

5:02

B. DISCUSSION ITEM: [Remuneration Policy](#)

The Personnel Committee will discuss the updated changes on the Remuneration Policy.

J. Carroll discusses updates to policy and key decisions for the board, focusing on scholarship amounts and board appointment structures. The policy revisions reflect grammatical updates following the consolidation of the Senate into at-large senator roles, which took effect this fall. The board must review two significant issues. First, the scholarship amounts, historically tied to inflation and cost of attendance, have remained fixed for two years. Initially intended to ensure board members prioritize their roles, the board must now decide whether to increase these amounts for future terms to address inflation, with any changes requiring approval for subsequent boards. Second, the board's appointment structure is under review. Currently, members serve 12-month terms, but challenges such as summer commitments and hybrid/in-person meeting requirements have prompted consideration of reducing director and senator terms to 11 or 10.5 months while retaining the executive board's 12-month structure. This adjustment could provide flexibility for summer hardships and help offset scholarship increases. Regardless of changes, the board must maintain its ability to address organizational needs and emergencies throughout the year. **J. Carroll** invites questions and input from members to finalize these considerations. **E. Loredo** explains that he, along with **A. Depappa**, **J. Carroll**, and **N. Calara**, have been discussing these matters over the past month. He proposes raising scholarships by 5%, as shown in the provided incremental changes for each position. This increase is modest but significant and is open to further input. Regarding the 12-month and 11-month term structure, he suggests the ASI Executive Board start in June, while directors and senators begin in July, creating a potential distinction of four months for executives and 11 months



for directors and senators. **E. Loredo** invites additional opinions or comments on these proposals. **N. Calara** emphasizes that the requirement to hold in-person meetings is non-negotiable and should be communicated to the rest of the board. He supports the proposed 5% scholarship increase, citing inflation, rising tuition costs, and the increased workload and activities compared to earlier college experiences. **N. Calara** also advocates for the Executive Committee to begin its term before the rest of the Board of Directors, highlighting their higher expectations and responsibilities. Starting earlier would allow Executive Committee to handle emergencies and prepare training materials for the Board of Directors in July and August, ensuring a smoother transition and readiness for the academic year. **A. Depappa** inquires whether the board plans to vote on the specific scholarship increase amount for the upcoming year or if they intend to revert to a system where the scholarship amount increases annually based on a set percentage. **J. Carroll** explains that the current proposal is to maintain a stagnant scholarship rate, with any future increases requiring review and approval by the sitting board. This means the proposed 5% increase would apply only to the 2025-2026 board, and subsequent boards would decide annually whether to keep the rate steady or recommend another adjustment. **J. Carroll** supports this approach, suggesting it provides better financial oversight and allows each board to evaluate and manage scholarship adjustments based on the organization's circumstances. **N. Calara** brings up earlier discussions from the semester about shifting scholarship disbursements from monthly to semester-based payments. He asks how this adjustment would be implemented, including whether the total amounts would be consolidated into a single semester package and how that process would function. **J. Carroll** confirms that shifting scholarship disbursements from monthly to semester-based payments was a recommendation from financial aid. The proposed system would align with how athletes receive scholarships, distributing funds at the start of each semester (e.g., June, September, and January). If a board member resigned after receiving a semester payment, the unearned amount would be prorated and returned via financial aid, which could create administrative challenges. Financial aid has indicated they will honor ASI's preference, whether to keep monthly disbursements or adopt the semester-based system. **J. Carroll** notes that while the proposal was not included in the current changes, it could be revisited if the board believes semester payments are a better option. **A. Depappa** asks about board members' experiences with changes to their financial aid packages caused by receiving scholarships, noting that such changes could create stress. She expresses a preference for ASI addressing issues on a case-by-case basis—such as recovering funds if necessary—instead of placing the monthly administrative burden on members. **A. Depappa** seeks input on how frequently package changes occur and their impact on members. **E. Loredo** shares that they personally haven't experienced significant



issues with financial aid changes due to scholarships but acknowledges that other board members might have. **N. Calara** adds that they also haven't faced major problems but emphasizes a preference for monthly scholarships, as it feels more like a regular paycheck. However, they suggest this discussion should involve the entire Board of Directors (BOD) to gather broader input before deciding. **D. Bhimanapati** seeks clarification from **J. Carroll**, asking whether the proposed scholarship amount would remain fixed until a board chooses to review it or if it would be mandatory for the board to discuss the scholarship amount every year. **J. Carroll** clarifies that it is not mandatory for the scholarship amount to be reviewed every year. Like any ASI policy, it can be updated or renewed when the board decides it needs changes. The executive team of the board should ideally review policies annually and identify which ones, if any, require updates. While not every policy will need changes each year, the board retains the option to review and revise them as necessary. **J. Carroll** emphasizes that the process involves discussion and action whenever recommendations for changes arise. **J. Carroll** expresses interest in hearing perspectives from the group about the proposed scholarship rate increase and the flexibility of maintaining 12-month commitments for all members versus adjusting the terms. While the group is not required to vote, **J. Carroll** believes it would be helpful for the board to hear the Executive Committee's initial thoughts on the pros and cons of these options. This input could guide future discussions and decisions. **D. Bhimanapati** supports the rationale for increasing the scholarship amount, citing the cost of living and inflation as valid reasons. She also asks whether the in-person attendance mandate applies to directors and senators starting in July or if it is limited to the executive members. **J. Carroll** explains that whether directors and senators are on 12-month or 11-month schedules, the primary consideration is ensuring quorum, which depends on election outcomes and is unpredictable until the end of March. To address this, the suggestion is to hold only Executive Committee (ExCom) meetings in June and July, which could be conducted in-person while allowing directors and senators to remain hybrid or virtual until August when full Board of Directors (BOD) meetings resume. Training sessions during this period can also be hybrid, though hybrid formats have shown mixed success. For in-person attendance, ExCom members would need to attend campus meetings as necessary, possibly once a week, ensuring flexibility. For example, a member living two hours away could plan to attend weekly without needing daily commutes. While this flexibility is not explicitly codified in policy, it could be implemented as a practical approach for balancing in-person requirements with individual circumstances. **N. Calara** expressed agreement with a 5% monthly increase in scholarships and an 11-month term for directors and senators. **E. Loredo** also concurred, supporting the recommendation to the board while emphasizing the



importance of presenting all potential approaches to the board for their ultimate decision. After confirming no further comments from the group, the discussion was concluded.

27:55

C. DISCUSSION ITEM: Senator at Concord

The Personnel Committee will discuss the concerns pertaining to Gerardo Segovia, Senator at Concord.

Motion to move to closed session by N. Calara, seconded by D. Bhimanapati, motion **CARRIED.**

Closed session enters at 12:34 PM

Closed session return at 12:46 PM

E. Lored summarized the discussion, stating that the group had generally addressed concerns regarding **G. Segovia**. After deliberation, the decision was made to recommend removing him from the board.

29:13

VIII. SPECIAL REPORTS:

No special reports.

29:14

IX. ROUND TABLE REMARKS:

No round table remarks.

29:19

X. ADJOURNMENT at 12:47 PM

Minutes reviewed and approved by:

Chair/Executive VP/Chief of Staff

Name: Erick Macias

Minutes approved on:

1/28/2025

Date:

