Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes of August 3, 2021

I.   CALL TO ORDER at **2:01 PM**

II.   ROLL CALL
       Present: Kabir Dhillon, Angelica De Leon, Mirna Maamou, Martin Castillo, Erik Pinlac, Kristopher Disharoon

       Absent: Jose Simon Carmona, Zaira Perez

III.   ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Agenda**
       Motion to approve the agenda of August 3, 2021, by **A. De Leon,** second by **M. Maamou,** motion **CARRIED.**

IV.   ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of July 27, 2021**
       Motion to approve minutes of July 27, 2021, by **M. Maamou**, second by **A. De Leon**, 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
1:45

VI.   UNFINISHED ITEMS:
       No unfinished items
1:57

VII.   NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:

       A. DISCUSSION ITEM - **Stipend Policy**
           The Personnel Committee will discuss revisions to the Stipend Policy.
           K. Dhillon states that regarding this document, some edits have been done to update the policy. Eric suggested that the actual term for the Stipend Policy is a scholarship stipend rather than just calling it a Stipend. Some language grammars have been changed, making it

1

easier to read all of this, and then the main change that is being made is increasing the Executive Vice Presidents stipend by 5% from 65% to 70%. And then proposing changes to increase the academic senators by 5%, so from 25 to 30%, the reason being for these two positions is that the EVP role does a lot more than the other Vice Presidents, not to say that those positions aren't important, it's just that there's more responsibility for the EVP when to comes to appointments, interviews, handling personnel issues, and also being the next in line after the President. There is a lot that's been put into that position. The reason for the academic senators, those positions have become very valuable over the years, they are the main representatives for their colleges, and they've also done a lot of advocacies in the academic senate, and I believe those positions require a little bit of a race too.

E. Pinlac states that I was going to suggest that we take out stipend out of everything and even naming the policy. I think one of the former names was the renumeration policy. I'm still suggesting renumeration policy and then removing stipend anywhere, under article three, under disbursement of stipends, changing that to scholarship. I haven't gotten a chance to comment on this, so I'm going to have to put the comments in there before we go ahead and approve documents.

K. Dhillon states personally for me, I don't mind whatever the name is called. It is a habit for us to call it a stipend, it's always been known to be the stipend, so that's what we call it. I do see your point Erik, it's not a stipend, it is more like a renumeration, and just to clarify for the minutes, these suggested changes would not impact the current year, these changes will impact the following year. The other little, small edit that was done was the previous lines D and E, they say the same thing. I took all the other director positions that were in letter E and put them set point, so it's one sentence versus having it in two places. Previously, this document had everyone starting where there was X COM and some of the directors starting in summer and everybody else started later, that is why there are two different lines. Just added preferences to other policies that people could reference if they wanted to, that's all the bulk of the changes.

A. De Leon replies that I was able to look over this document as well, and I agree with all the revisions, and specifically with the senators. The senators are obviously on the board, they have senate, and they are also on academic senate. They do a lot of similar work as the directors, and they have a lot more work than we give them credit for. I agree with that increase.

M. Castillo states that I agree, I didn't realize that the senators got paid less and it was a little surprising. I appreciate you doing the changes. I can't remember if you made the changes to be equal to directors, the academic senators, and the directors, but we need to have a discussion around that if they're not going to be equal. The reason why I raised my

2

hand is that I thought I saw something in there where you were questioning whether we could withhold a stipend if they didn't do the work, or something along those lines. We went down this road before, and yes, Erik probably remembers this, legal counsel said we could not do that, which is frustrating. I think we would have found something different. Also, the spirit you are trying to get to in that section makes sense, we just have to get your legal to agree to whatever wording we come up with. If we do all these increases and people still are not doing their job, it's not fair to those people who are doing their job and oftentimes are pulling extra weight and are getting paid the exact same amount or similar to those people who are not working and not pulling that extra weight.

K. Dhillon states that that statement was a very good point. Just to clarify, this line in section four I did not add, this line was already in the document. Erik had mentioned that we can't withhold stipends weekly based on whether people missed meetings, but it is a good point to address if people are doing what they should be doing. Maybe we should just change some language around. The correct way of doing it would be, if it's a violation of a code of conduct, but also, we would have to go back to the code of conduct and checking if missing two unexcused meetings would be a sanction. Erik, could you clarify on this for historical context?

E. Pinlac answers that because it is a scholarship, there can't be any strings tied to it. That is basically it. If you are in the role and doing the job, even if it's one day or one day out of the month, then they are entitled to the full amount for the month. Which it is still an improvement compared to the other ASI's because they do the scholarship in the whole semester, so if someone serves for a day or two, and then they resign, there's no way to recover that scholarship back. We do the stipend a little bit differently, which gives us a little bit of control, but in my opinion, it is not enough. It becomes complicated if we decide to turn everyone into employees and then if we have recent folks who are undocumented and/or are international, then we face some challenges. In short, we can't change the scholarship.

K. Disharoon says that I want to add on to the conversation about the calling of the policy, just to reference that. In a recent conversation I had in the AOA HR committee, we discussed to terminology of stipend and the reason why I had spoken with Erik about striking it and removing that from the language. Even though we know it is not an employment, legally, withheld in court, if someone were to sue the organization, there could be a claim that the person is an employee, based on the language that was used and stipend implies employment. That's the reason why I had spoken to Erik about removing that from the way we speak and from the documentation that was done. I know that it will change but we also must watch out because it won't stand in court. That sums up the conversation we had within the HR group when we were talking about language.

K. Dhillon states that Kris has a good point. Would anyone prefer or recommend stipend to be changed to scholarship?

K. Disharoon states that we have started to do the language change on our end. Sneh has started to change the paperwork that everybody here signed to say scholarship and things of that nature. The reason why we also must change our language is because, for example, I can promise someone something in writing, which of course could be upheld in court, but there is also a verbal agreement. If someone implies that there is a contract between you verbally, and if that becomes into a they said and they said kind of thing, that could be legally binding or hold up in some sort of way, that is why we must move beyond the written word and learn how to change the way we speak.

K. Dhillon replies that there are very good points being made. On that note, we will be going ahead and changing the document to the new renumeration policy.

M. Castillo says I have a question for Kris, and to have the rest of the committee think about it, is it possible to break it up into weekly allotments, that way if somebody doesn't complete something during the week, you can just withhold that one week or is it still a legal issue? I'm trying to provide future board with enough power to ensure that people are doing what they're supposed to be doing and not just taking money freely.

K. Disharoon answers that one thing I am not sure of, if this is legally possible, but in my managerial economics class, I wrote my paper on game theory and how to apply game theory to the concept of student government officers and measuring the work in which they do and having that connected to the stipend that they receive. I have to go back and read my paper, the professor liked it, but it was something I had talked to Erik about and experimenting with the elections committee just to see it's something that would work. We have to set indicators and tasks that they should be able to accomplish in their positions, and that was then tied to the amount of scholarship they received They would all get a base scholarship of, for example, 25 dollars, but if they complete additional tasks then they would get 50 dollars. They would always get a base amount, but they would receive an additional amount should they perform or achieve specific additional tasks. This could be experimented on just about everybody, Kabir and Anjelica sent out those task lists. It's going to take a little work to measure everyone and make sure that they're doing what they're supposed to do, but they could be given a base amount and could be raised if they performed a certain number of tasks. In the past, people have been great in their positions and then a new person comes in that isn't so great in their position, it may not be their fault, but it is something to measure everybody against.

E. Pinlac states when Kris and I have talked about this, I thought that it was a great idea. It's going to take some work to implement. I think that we would have to consult with legal

because we may just have to make everyone employees and exploring to see what happens if we do that. Both scholarship and wage have its pros and cons, but we can work through that, but I do love the positive reinforcement. I do something similar with my kids, we have a little chore wheel and if they do this chore, they get a quarter, so at the end of the month, they do everything, and they'll have 10 dollars and to them it's a lot of money. It's a good concept.

K. Disharoon responds that there is another thing that could be done. If a conversation is wanted with other auxiliaries, ASI's, that employ their government officers. For example, I am close to Amy over at Stanislaus and all the government officers and the student center officers are all employees for them, you could certainly reach out to them to see how they like it or if they don't, and I know that there are other people within other ASI's who do the same thing. If that is something that you would like to investigate to get personal reactions from those people so you could see for suggestion.

K. Dhillon states that he liked the idea of having benchmarks instead of having a flat rate stipend. I think it's positive reinforcement, but it is also more equitable. Kris mentioned a good point where in some years there's someone who's very excellent in their role and that's great. And then sometimes there is someone who isn't so great at their role. When it comes to personnel, I think the argument always comes to disciplinary stuff and then it shows that this person is getting paid a stipend for X amount of dollars, this isn't fair for students because others aren't doing their job. The two just happened go hand in hand, and I think having those benchmarks will encourage people to do what they're supposed to be doing but also if they aren't doing what they are supposed to be doing then that reflects on the pay your supposed to receive.

A. De Leon replies that Kabir said everything she was about to say. I knew you were going to go off that idea. I agree with what everyone said. Kabir and I have been brainstorming ways for people to communicate what they're doing with they're task. We didn't want to sanction every single person that didn't update us. I talked to Erik about this that it can be almost like a competition between everyone, if this group does this well than they get an extra giveaway or something to reward them extra. We always talk about student fees and how we are being paid by students to do our work. I think that phrase always gets always gets pushed around and I feel that sometimes it is hard for students or ASI members to put that into perspective. I appreciate what Kris had mentioned, I know that having that baseline and going beyond expected expectations would increase that.

K. Disharoon adds just to let you know that I have experienced doing that when I started my first position at Chico, that's how I paid the program board. I gave them a base number of hours that they could work, and I set benchmarks for them, and we would meet and talk

about those tasks. The meeting would be every other week and I was able to conversate with them to determine whether they met those other accomplishments or tasks. As a pair, we decided together if they achieved those tasks and then they included that in their time sheets to get extra amount of money. It has been a while since I have done that, and they were also employees, so it was a bit different.

K. Dhillon asks Mirna did you have any thoughts?

M. Maamou states I am taking everything in, and I agree with everything that everyone said. You all covered just about everything. It is a lot, and it is confusing to me because I honestly believe that they deserve more. Specifically, senators deserve more because we don't see the number of meetings, they sit in. Academic Senators itself needs a raise because of how intense and how much of a role they play in. But there is also no way to determine who is doing their job or not. I struggled a lot with this last year, I ended up always being the only one there, so I had to do everything, for example, the ASI reports and other things. I don't think this would be the case this year so I wouldn't know how to determine a way to measure which senator is doing what they are supposed to be doing to get that raise. That part is what confuses me, so I am just taking in a lot of what is being said because I don't understand a lot of the legal stuff behind it.

K. Disharoon states for example, there could be a task that each academic senator is supposed to do. They would attend an academic meeting and if three of them are not doing what they are supposed to do because that was a task that was assigned to them, then that would affect the additional amount of scholarship they would receive. So, in your case, you would have gotten a higher scholarship than those other three would have because you did additional work than the other three and that only shows fairness to you. It also provides you an equitable piece of the pie because you did the work that was asked of you and not the others.

K. Dhillon asks are there any other discussion?

A. De Leon says now that I am thinking about it, I believe it is helpful for future boards because I feel that this is an issue that have been seen over the years, and people are underworking or trying to pull extra weight. Kris, I would love to hear experiences from other ASI's or from what others have said because I think it would be helpful to hear how to implement that because it is a lot of work to keep everybody accountable and to make sure they are doing task, it would be really nice to see if there's a specific system that they use so that future boards can implement that as well. We won't be able to do that this year, but it would be helpful for succession planning and thinking.

K. Dhillon says I wouldn't know what other ASI's do or if they even do that, but I would say that I look at it as, and this may be the wrong term to use, but employee performance

reviews theoretically, when you work with an employee, you set goals form them and they set goals for themselves also. When you work together on those, you shouldn't follow up with them on it annually because you don't measure anything, but as you move along you should have conversations with them about those goals that they have worked on to set for themselves. I look at it as that and that is how you kind of move along whether you do it on your one-on-one meetings with them or as a group meeting. Just as Erik commented to me, this is also something the government coordinator position could do. They could work with the EVP on everyone's case and then with the EVP's position, maybe the government coordinator works with the president when it comes to looking how this is structured. I think it could look a performance evaluation type of piece that has regularly done and or it should be done so.

K. Dhillon asks are there any other discussion? I think the next steps will be that we are going to look more into the model Kris talked about and we'll investigate that to see how that is going to work for us. In terms of timeline, the policy will be brought to the board once it has been completed. No matter how the new model is going to look like, it will be discussed and then we will vote on it before the end of the fall semester, which should be good timing. Going back to the agenda, up next we have discussion item B.

25:31

B. DISCUSSION ITEM – **First Year Mentorship Program Policy**

The Personnel Committee will discuss revisions to the First Year Mentorship Program Policy.

K. Dhillon states that going to the policy, there are a bulk of changes that I made last year but in overall editing, some language has been changed and separating program description and purpose. The purpose of this policy is based on the purpose of First Year Mentorship Program and the program is to provide first years with an opportunity to get involved in ASI and to get leadership experience along with professional experience. We cut a little bit from the program description and did some outlining. What we have done in the past is that we don't necessarily work with X Comm, we only work with plans. We've also expanded to other board members and other senators. Also including that flexibility that the President, the EVP, and the executive director have discretion over that. Also, it is outlined that there should be a program curriculum, the reason why I didn't put any specific one in here is because you need to complete X, Y and Z, from year to year it can change. Nonetheless, there needs to be something set in stone before someone can start the program. As far as policy, it is showing updates from the Beacon Positions Policy which has some similar language. Originally you would have to submit your unofficial high school transcripts along with two letters of recommendation. For the transcript, I thought it was irrelevant, it is not

measured as an application scoring item. We check eligibility with other positions, but for this, if we are not considering GPA then there is not point for unofficial high school transcripts. The two letters of recommendation are important. I believe that it gives insight to what someone has worked on in the past and gaining other insight on the applicant. Also adding, if someone requested a phone or video interview, that is allowed, especially now that we are virtual. We are in hybrid setting where it is personally in person or online. That option is included and including the chair on the interview committee. On another note, when asking for feedback, usually feedback comes from either the executive director or the EVP. I have given feedback in the past, Erik has also, and it's goes off a case-by-case bases. Also, adding questions and contact information on the application. The description would be added under the description of the FYM program, but what I want to draw attention to is the curriculum part of the application. We met a couple of weeks ago to talk about the direction of the program and we outlined the following outcomes. The way Anjelica and I thought of it was that was wanted plans to incorporate in ASI this year. We added them to our support team, they are part of ASI so there is no hard keep change, but we want to emphasize this. Time management and productivity, we have first years coming in, and they either have varying levels of how they organize themselves, for example, exposing them to google calendar, writing emails, creating their own task list, reminders, and using campus resources. That would be the first month or the first couple of weeks to get them started and organized and working. A lot of feedback that Simon had, which is good feedback. What the program neglects is that working and socializing aspect, it is also an area where plans can also grow, looking at clubs and organization, in meeting with other board members, that goes back to the succession planning and seeing what they're interested in. But also learning what each position does and learning about the person there so that way there is a personal connection. Event planning is another huge pillar of ASI, for example, FYI have planned events in the past, it is just like collaborating with someone, we are not expecting someone to plan their own event. We can support them with that but centering around programming. Another huge aspect is communications and marketing, in a digital age I am sure we know how important it is to self-market but also marketing for an organization so it's just like learning the skills of creating a quality social media posts, how do you set it up and using data analytics, for example, looking at what time is best to post, looking at engagement on a lot of things such as social media. My personal favorite, resolution policy writing, it gets them started on projects, overall, we want to incorporate them into ASI but also exposing them to pillar things that are more important, and these are things they can take with them outside of ASI or if they choose to return to ASI they can use the experiences they already have. Any thoughts and discussion?

A. De Leon replies I think Mirna had her hand up first, she can go first.

M. Maamou says I have a question. Are we going to have any FYM's this year? I am very excited about this idea on the networking aspect of talking to board members or senators. Obviously, this is not MED school, but in MED school, you would have to do rotations on each specialty, and it must be done whether you have a set specialty. I think it would be fun if we did something like that just like how we have out post week on social media, it could be a few days or a week with an intern or FYM, they would shadow the position and then there could be a week where the board member has an event or meetings where they can shadow the board member to see what it is like. I feel that it would be fun to do for those people who are shy and don't want to ask or go out of their way to connect with board members. It is already planned and set for them. I thought it would be cool and fun for them to do.

K. Dhillon responds that's a very good point Mirna. To add on to the rotational aspect as of right now, I think we are thinking two things, either they're in the same support team for the entire duration or they rotate, either option can work. I do like the idea of exposing them to other board members and interacting more. When you're coming into the university, it is an opportunity to grow and that is one aspect when they grow and networking, putting themselves out there, and developing soft skills, for example, interpersonal communication.

A. De Leon says Kabir and a couple of us had met about the FYM program, and this is what we came up with based on feedback that we got from people in the past. But going off what Kabir and Mirna said, our thought process is, what Kabir mentioned, implementing them into ASI and integrating them into the whole process rather than just having them separate. I know in the past that is the way the program worked. Like Kabir said, we want to put them into support groups and give them task list. The way we do the task list is that we have a policy agenda and then for the FYM, this is the learning outcome where the task is being pulled from. We made it into a way where each month is the way ASI progresses throughout the year, obviously in time management, what we all do, is google calendar with a resolution because typically that is the last thing you do after you have learned a lot about ASI. Mirna, I agree with you, I like the rotation idea. Our thought process was that we want them to have a support group that they stuck with throughout the year, but also, I like the idea of maybe having each week shadow a different board member. I like the idea of having them within the task list because it helps guide them more and it also gives them a little bit of an understanding of the freedom and autonomy that we have at ASI so that way they understand.

K. Dhillon says what I was going to mention to your appointment, and I almost forgot, but what each pillar emphasis on is time management and social media. Everyone is going to go

through that, for example, Anjelica FYM, my FYM, your FYM would be working together with that board member and whatever they are doing. Also, people in that support team would be emphasizing time management which is the consistent thing each of them would be learning.

M. Castillo says I love that you are all putting so much structure into this program because I love the program itself since we first brought it on, but I think there is more structure and Erik will address this because I'm sure he will have a better memory, but there used to be a rotation that worked with the FYI's at the point, but I can't remember what happened to that. I think of the things you may want to consider is adding as a bullet point is that they join ASI committee their second semester. I saw that there are clubs and organizations and that's great, but because they're trying to learn, I think it would be good for them to possibly join officially as part of the ASI committee in the second semester when they are eligible.

K. Dhillon responds that's a good point Martin, I know we have always tried to do that, but in terms of that becoming an issue is filling up those committee spots. Erik you can advise on this, we have a bullet point to each committee code saying that there must be an FYM on the committee. I think that's the easier way that it works in my head. Just because if a personnel committee fills up, it's filled up and that person can still be involved but I don't think there's that sense of obligation to go to these meetings

E. Pinlac states to address that first point, I wouldn't want to put the FYM explicitly on there because then that's going to count towards your core versus if we just leave a seat open and certain committees, I think ledge of affairs might be a point of interest, programming, internal affairs, resolution writing and so on, because they're in the past, we did have the rotation and we also it to the point where it didn't work perfectly. That's probably why we discontinued or haven't done it recently where, in the second semester, the FYM's, or FYIs at the time, would go onto a committee and would do work. Kabir and Desiree joined the committee after their first term because they were eligible to. The rotations were great, I thought it worked out well, it did take a lot of time from our student leaders. Every person was different, and Kabir, you probably can attest that some folks were very detailed, and some folks are more hands off and it didn't have any consistency in the program. The one person I would shout out who did, in my opinion, the ideal job would be Ryan Fernando, he helped the FYI's, at the time, understand club funding and quiz them. I thought it was amazing. But we didn't have the consistency, like him, and maybe someone else taught well and other fold just hung out while working. It wasn't a consistent experience for everyone, but the rotation helped a little bit to the point where students could shadow some people. I do like that aspect but right now, the challenge we are facing is the complexity of the program is time consuming, and therefore we are going to continue to keep pushing for like a

government coordinator. Someone who can help because it is me and Kris helping as much as possible and then it isn't anyone's main responsibility so then it becomes a challenge. It gets lower priority compared to other things; that has been the issue we are facing with this program. I do love this program and we gave Samantha honorary membership for life for creating this program.

A. De Leon responds I agree with Erik and obviously on pro staff, but also student leaders and ASI. When I was in it the year after Kabir, we had a little bit of rotation, but also you mentioned, there wasn't any consistency within the groups that I was part of. But there wasn't any consistency in terms of what we were learning which is why we were left feedback on the structure of the task list; that was probably why we were having that to have a little bit more consistency. I know within the support groups, there is a VP who is almost like a President, which is the lead of the support group, and I think that was our intended vision that they would be checking in on this specific task each week and making sure that they're following through with that and learning other parts of ASI but also thinking about the capacity of people, which would be needing another person to take care of and monitor them. I think we love feedback on that because we are trying to balance capacity and balance the program itself. I also love the program and I believe it is important.

K. Dhillon asks any other thoughts or discussion?

K. Disharoon replies I don't think there is, everything has been talked about.

K. Dhillon says sounds good; I think as far as this policy and the program goes, we are going to finalize some details and once that is done, we will also put up the application. Carrying on with our agenda, that brings us to special reports.

41:00

VIII.   SPECIAL REPORT

A. De Leon reports I wasn't able get the agenda on time, so the board meeting has been cancelled for this week. It is completely my fault, thank you Kabir for catching that. I was telling him that it was in my drafts on my schedule, and I didn't transfer it over. But we did want to consider what Martin had mentioned in an email about giving the board a break, which is something we are planning to do. Just as pro staff so that you all know, we are planning on giving the board two weeks and bringing more meetings and task-like path back up on August 23. This week will be a work week and then next week, which is obviously the first week of school, we are going to give everyone a rest. I need a rest too, and just for an understanding for everyone, in terms of students not emailing you on time or send messages, and so forth. Everyone's going to be on a bit of a break. That is my update for that and thank you.

11

E. Pinlac states I want to say this weekend's retreat was amazing. I think that the caliber of this group has been up there, again I'm going to say I am so sad to leave at this time, but I know that this year's board is on it, and I am super excited for what's to come. I also want to shout out Mirna because I am wearing A's hat and she does not like the A's.

M. Castillo states I just want to check in to make sure you all understand what's happening right now with COVID. Because I think it is confusing for our students and as everybody gets emails or questions, I want to make sure you understand a couple of things. Mask for anyone and everyone when you are indoors it is now required. Seven bay areas, including Alameda County, have said that as well, I am not sure if our campus has sent anything official, I haven't seen anything, but that is the intent. For them to send something out to students and then with the adaptation or the acknowledgement of where you stand regarding vaccine, there should be an email that goes out tomorrow and students will have four options when they go into myCSUEB, one, I'm vaccinated, and you upload your card showing that you're vaccinated. Two, I need a medical exemption card and you upload the letter from your medical provider that lets them know what it is, and it goes to student health. Third, I need a religious exemption and there's nothing that they upload for that, that is something we are just going to take. And four, I don't intend to come to campus, so all their classes are online. What we are struggling with, is there is no category from partially vaccinated, if they're in the middle of getting their first and their second vaccine. I don't know how they're going to handle that; they're still trying to work that out, but I know that people are aware that category does not exist, and this is all CSU's having the same four categories. Just know what's out there in case you get any questions on it feel free to reach out to me, I will try to provide with what I know but this is all going through student health.

K. Dhillon says Thank you martin for updating us.

M. Maamou states I have a question. I don't know if there is an answer to this, but I am seeing a trend or a pattern of the same thing that started about almost two academic years now. Is there that we will go back to fully online, is that something that has been brought up?

M. Castillo says I can speak to that unless someone else has more, no Mirna, at this point, to go fully online has not been discussed. I did run into Linda this morning and she said some of the professors that are supposed to teach in person are reaching out to her saying that they want to convert to online. They're having a conversation too, but certainly not all of them and of course there's labs that can't function online as well. So, I don't think that's going to happen. The good news to keep in the back of your heads, for Alameda County, 70% of people are vaccinated and so far from the adaptation process, the original process, it looked about the same 75% to 80%of the student are vaccinated. If they are not or need an exempt,

they are going to test every week so that is the incentive to get vaccinated. Or you submit a test every single week but that is how we are proving to people that it is still safe because we will catch the people that are exposed to COVID symptoms, that is how we are hoping to be keeping the campus safe. We do recognize, I don't know if you have seen the articles that came up today, education has dipped. Results have dipped over the pandemic and a lot of it has to do with the virtual world. We understand that some students rely on in-person education. We do not want to go back to fully online, if it becomes a safety thing, we will have to consider that, but right now the plan is to continue forward and do the best we can to make sure everybody stays safe.

K. Dhillon says any other round table remarks? My roundtable remark is the retreat was successful, in my opinion, I feel everyone enjoyed it for the most part. It's also the first in-person retreat we have had in over two years now, so I think it went well as far as the Chair position goes, I will be bringing a memo to the board for approval they're going to first obviously discuss that memo but it outlines everything we talked about in last week's meetings, just outlining the plan for how the chairman of the board is going to work because it is a lot for the President to assume those responsibilities on top of everything else she's currently doing. That's going to be brought up for approval and then based on that, will be continuing to look for a chair, if there is a qualified candidate.

48:35

IX.   ADJOURNMENT
    K. Dhillon I adjourn this meeting at 2:30pm

Minutes reviewed by:
Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff & Chair
Name: **Kabir Dhillon**

-- ASIExecVP (Sep 16, 2021 13:50 PDT)

Minutes approved by:
September 15, 2021
Date:

13