Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes November 20th, 2024

I. CALL TO ORDER at **12:08 PM**

II. ROLL CALL
    Present: Erick Macias, Nolan Calara, Charan Reddy Doolam, London Deguzman, Deepthi Bhimanapati, Martin Castillo, James Carroll, Ashley Depappa

III. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Agenda**
    Motion to approve Personnel Committee Meeting Agenda of November 20th, 2024 by **N. Calara,** seconded by **C. Reddy Doolam**, motion **CARRIED.**

IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of Oct 09, 2024**
    Motion to approve Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes of October 9th, 2024 by **D. Bhimanapati**, 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 comments.
1:39

VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS:
    No unfinished items.
1:44

VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:

    A. **DISCUSSION ITEM: Elections Committee Members Appointment**
    The Personal Committee will discuss the appointment of Election Committee Members.
    A. Depappa reported meeting with three student candidates for the elections committee to fill two vacancies, with potential for co-chairing roles. The candidates, **Lulu Yang**, **Elia Varela**, and **Destiny Escatel** are SLIC office student leaders involved in orientation and transfer programs under Valerie Grace. They demonstrated strong interest in ASI roles, have prior experience serving on panels, and, as graduating students, do not plan to run for ASI next year. Each candidate expressed interest in different committee positions. **A. Depappa**

1

510.885.4843
associated.students@csueastbay.edu
www.csueastbay.edu/asi
25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard
Old Union #314, Hayward, CA 94542

invited questions about the candidates. **N. Calara** questions if this would be an action item for the upcoming Board of Directors meeting and **A. Depappa** confirmed it.

3:27

B. **DISCUSSION ITEM: Elections Codes**
The Personnel Committee will discuss adopting the revised Election Codes.
A. Depappa discussed proposed revisions to the election codes, as detailed in an email sent to the group. The revisions address grammatical corrections, updates to titles (e.g., replacing "intern/mentee" with "mentee" due to the discontinuation of the internship program), and changes related to the slate system. Key feedback is sought on the slate structure, particularly reducing the maximum slate size from 14 to half the board (7 members) to ensure a more equitable election process. Historically, slates were smaller and occasionally collaborated, though details on past practices remain unclear. **J. Carroll** clarified that slates are independent entities, and while some groups may align visions or collaborate informally, this is not encouraged. Each slate should represent its own distinct group and vision. Historically, when the board comprised 14 members, slates were limited to 2–7 members, which constituted half the board. With the board now expanded to 17 members, a proportional limit might suggest a slate size of up to 8 members as an example. **A. Depappa** noted that the previous change to increase the slate size from 7 to 14 was not clearly communicated during the meeting and was categorized as a grammatical adjustment rather than a policy change. For this reason, the matter is being revisited for discussion and clarification. **N. Calara** raised two questions regarding the slate system. First, noting that the board consists of 17 members, **N. Calara** inquired whether it would be possible to evenly divide the slate size, allowing for 2 to 8 members per slate, and sought clarification on whether this is the specific matter being voted on. Second, **N. Calara** asked if slates are permitted to endorse other slates. **J. Carroll** clarified that slates cannot run with or endorse other slates, just as individuals cannot endorse slates or other candidates if they are not part of them. Endorsement, which includes running or hosting events together and verbal endorsements, is not allowed. **J. Carroll** emphasized that this restriction aims to prevent unofficial affiliations, citing past grievances when a slate of 7 members was perceived to have an "unofficial" eighth member through mutual endorsements, which constituted a code violation. Language clarification on this rule may be needed. **M. Castillo** expressed appreciation for the revisions, emphasizing the importance of fostering diverse campus voices through the election process. While slates cannot officially endorse or run together, it was noted that such collaboration might happen informally, which is beyond the committee's control. **M. Castillo** highlighted the need to prioritize inclusivity and encourage

2

participation rather than enforce rigid restrictions, acknowledging that having more candidates is the primary goal. Drawing from past experiences, **M. Castillo** noted that when slates align too closely, it often results in internal conflicts, creating divisions within the board. This history reinforces the value of promoting diversity and balance to avoid such issues. **N. Calara** shared that in previous years, there was little interest in running for ASI positions, making it necessary for one slate to select members to fill vacant positions. However, with increased awareness of ASI and growing interest in running for positions, **N. Calara** sees the benefit of having multiple slates, as it allows for more diverse participation and representation. **J. Carroll** provided historical context on slates, explaining that slates primarily serve a visionary or marketing purpose, rather than guaranteeing automatic election outcomes. In their experience, slates rarely resulted in all members being elected; some slate members were not elected because their positions were more contested by individuals outside the slate. While slates allow for collaboration and synergy, they don't always guarantee a full slate victory, as some positions are more competitive. **J. Carroll** emphasized that slates are more about organizing a collective vision for marketing purposes rather than a unified voting block. **A. Depappa** mentioned that in addition to the revisions regarding slates, there are other ongoing updates to the election codes. These include clarifying the definitions of slates and refining information about runoff elections to ensure everything is thoroughly covered. **A. Depappa** also reviewed updates related to campus buildings no longer in use. Seeking feedback, **A. Depappa** asked if anyone noticed gaps or areas where the election codes could be clearer based on their own experiences with elections. The goal is to finalize the document for Board of Directors approval, and **A. Depappa** invited input to ensure all necessary revisions are made. **N. Calara** described slates as groups of people promoting each other for positions. Regarding grievances, **N. Calara** explained that they are for filing complaints against groups, slates, or individuals who fail to follow campaign rules or procedures. **N. Calara** suggested having a future discussion on how to define what constitutes a grievance and establishing measures to assess the severity of a grievance, as well as the potential penalties associated with it. **C. Reddy Doolam** asked whether candidates who have already won their positions can support candidates in the runoff elections. **A. Deppapa** shared that from her experience, when they ran as part of a slate and entered a runoff, their slate mates were still able to campaign and support them, even though they were running against non-slate members. However, non-slate members would not be allowed to campaign for candidates in the runoff. **J. Carroll** clarified that the election code already includes a section addressing grievances, which aligns with what **N. Calara** was suggesting. However, he cautioned that while the Elections Committee is responsible for reviewing grievances and determining violations, it is important not to make

3

the process too rigid. Each case should be considered individually, as the severity of violations can vary. **J. Carroll** pointed out that the code uses the term "reprimand," though this may not be the best language, and emphasized that there shouldn't be a strict "three strikes" rule. He encouraged reviewing the grievance section for potential clarity improvements, as the current language may not always be clear, and suggested supplementing candidate sessions with more concrete examples. **D. Bhimanapati** suggested that the election codes should be clearer regarding online campaigning, specifically in terms of the different channels used for promotion. **D. Bhimanapati** recommended being more specific about which channels candidates can use and outlining the different aspects of those channels to ensure clarity. **N. Calara** speaking, asked whether it would be allowed for two slates to have a group chat together, where they simply keep each other accountable and share important dates, without collaborating on campaigning or endorsements. **J. Carroll** expressed concern that having a shared group chat between two slates could blur the lines between collaboration and campaigning together. He recommended adhering to the rules for slates, specifically regarding the number of members and who is allowed to campaign, to avoid potential issues. **J. Carroll** emphasized that if slates are in a collective group chat and begin coordinating or setting direction together, it could be problematic and seen as a form of endorsement or collaboration. He cautioned against encouraging such behavior and suggested that slates should communicate only within their own teams unless sharing information publicly for all candidates.

20:56

C. **DISCUSSION ITEM: Government Officer Concern**
The Personal Committee will take action on concerns regarding the Senator at Large: Venkata Anirudh.
Motion to close the session by **N. Calara,** seconded by **D. Bhimanapati,** motion **CARRIED.**
Closed session returns at 1:00 PM
Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes by **L. Deguzman**, seconded by **N. Calara,** motion CARRIED.
Motion to close the session by **N. Calara**, seconded by **D. Bhimanapati**, motion **CARRIED.**
Closed session returns at **1:14 PM.**

23:04

VIII.   SPECIAL REPORTS:

4

No Special reports.

23:06

  IX.   ROUND TABLE REMARKS:

No round table remarks.

23:14

  X.   ADJOURNMENT at **1:15 PM**

Minutes reviewed and approved by:
<u>Chair/Executive VP/Chief of Staff</u>
Name: Erick Macias

Minutes approved on:
<u>01-25-2025</u>
Date: