

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 b 0 612(nd)DC 1 gndler-h.g whether

aim is to provide the best guidance to those working closely with students and student leaders to help move forward. **M. Huynh**

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**.

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

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 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 ageesr0/y cg the

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

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-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

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 MCID ted that senators

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

with his removal from the position, similar to how one would be removed from a course if GroupMe, further closing off any potential communication channels. Despite efforts from 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 wh

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-

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 d that advertising d that adtheF2 12 29 466.75 Tm0 g0 G()JTJET@.0



associated_students@csueastbay.edu
www.csueastbay.edu/asi



35900 Cedar Row Blvd



- 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,

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: