

Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes of December 6, 2023

I. CALL TO ORDER at **12:01 PM**

II. [ROLL CALL](#)

Present: Kushal Sheshadri, Nolan Calara, Sai Charan Attili, Erick Loreda, Carlos Martinez Aguilera, Danny Lopez, James Carroll

Absent: Martin Castillo

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

Motion to approve the agenda of December 6, 2023, by **N. Calara**, seconded by **S. Attili**, motion **CARRIED**.

IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of Oct 25, 2023**

Motion to approve the minutes of October 25, 2023, by **N. Calara**, seconded by **D. Lopez**, 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.

1:59

VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS:

No unfinished items.

2:08

VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. DISCUSSION ITEM: [Discussing Mentorship Applicants.](#)

The personal committee will discuss the candidates for the ASI mentorship program.

C. Martinez-Aguilera states in the last Personal Meeting, the Mentorship Program reopened applications, resulting in three new candidates. Two of them, Kavi Fernes, and Joe Trujillo, were interviewed, and the focus of the discussion was on Kavi. Carlos along with Eric, conducted an interview with Kavi, who is a three-year transfer student showing a keen



interest in ASI and a desire to build leadership skills. Kavi's interview was impressive, with thoughtful answers to questions and proactive engagement, including asking questions during and after the interview. Carlos believes that the Mentorship Program will provide a valuable experience for Kavi, helping him familiarize himself with ASI, campus activities, and enhance his leadership skills.

E. Loredo states as Carlos mentioned, Kavi displays a proactive approach by asking questions. He possesses leadership experience and expresses a desire to bring fresh ideas to ASI. Overall, it is believed that Kavi is a good fit for the Mentorship Program.

N. Calara asks where is Joe's evaluation? He sees the previous applicants, but there's no Joe.

C. Martinez-Aguilera states he will add it on there.

N. Calara asks can you reiterate Kavi and Joe's year and major?

C. Martinez-Aguilera states the discussion currently focuses on Kavi, a third-year transfer student from Ohlone. It's noted that this is his first semester at East Bay. After wrapping up the discussion on Kavi, the conversation shifts to Joe Trujillo. Joe is a first-year student majoring in criminal justice with aspirations in politics. In his interview, he expressed a desire to understand campus dynamics better and gain leadership experience through involvement in ASI. Carlos believes that Joe, as a freshman, would benefit from joining ASI early to foster leadership growth both within ASI and on campus.

N. Calara expresses enthusiasm about the potential approval of Kavita and Joe for the mentorship program. He emphasizes witnessing the strong work ethic and determination of both candidates, noting their involvement on campus. Nolan is excited about Joe, a first-year student, drawing parallels to their own experience of joining ASI as a mentee in their first year and eventually becoming President. The hope is that Kavi and Joe could become the future leaders of ASI.

C. Martinez-Aguilera asks can we go around to get the Committee opinions on the candidates?

N. Calara states he would like to move forward with recommending Joe and Kavi as first year mentee. They will be a great benefit to ASI.

D. Lopez states he trusts Nolan's judgement.

S. Attili states Joe and Kavi will be suitable for the position.

E. Loredo states he talked to them in person, and they seem like suitable candidates for the Mentorship Program.

N. Calara states in terms of recommendations, he advises the Committee to assess the candidates based on the information provided during the interview conducted by Carlos and Erick. While acknowledging that a complete understanding of the candidates' personalities



may not be feasible, Nolan encourages the Committee to evaluate them based on their demonstrated skills and the knowledge shared in the meeting.

K. Sheshadri states considering all the comments, the Personnel Committee recommend Kavi and Joe to be selected as first year mentee.

10:12

B. DISCUSSION ITEM: [Discussing Committee Applicants.](#)

The personal committee will discuss the candidates for the ASI committees.

K. Sheshadri states in the previous Personnel Meeting, votes were cast for candidates for four committees. The focus is on discussing candidates for two specific committees Programming and Sustainability. Three members— Hruthvik, Mahima, and Mehakpreet are recommended for the Programming Committee, while five members— Yashraj Shreyans Shah, Manu Biju, Isha Hitendra Kosambia, Michaela Fritzche, Vaishnavi Karingala —are recommended for the Sustainability Committee.

C. Martinez-Aguilera asks who conducted the interview?

K. Sheshadri states he believe Programming was London and Saira, and Sustainability was Hailey and Teresa.

N. Calara suggests that judgments about committee appointments can be made based on the answers provided by the Board Members who interviewed them. He brings up an experience where individuals who conducted interviews were also invited to the Personnel Meeting to discuss the candidates. Using the example of London and Saira, he questions whether the same approach should be taken for the current candidates or if there's a need to postpone the decision.

J. Carroll asks for clarification on how many are on the Programming and Sustainability Committee.

K. Sheshadri states there's 3 candidates for Programming and 5 candidates for Sustainability.

J. Carroll states the importance of gathering feedback or key points from interviews to make informed recommendations. He believes that those who conducted the interviews should provide reasons or explanations for their recommendations. This information is crucial for the group to feel confident and informed about making decisions regarding the next steps.

D. Lopez asks are these candidates from the same group that we interview or are these new candidates?

K. Sheshadri states he believe they are from the same group.

D. Lopez asks are we approving them?

K. Sheshadri states yes.



S. Attili asks are these the only candidates that got an interview for the Programming and Sustainability Committee?

K. Sheshadri states he believes there were more candidates, but these were the chosen candidates. He believes from the discussion they should move the voting and discussion to the next meeting.

N. Calara states the importance of gathering feedback or key points from interviews to make informed recommendations. He believes that those who conducted the interviews should provide reasons or explanations for their recommendations. This information is crucial for the group to feel confident and informed about making decisions regarding the next steps.

C. Martinez-Aguilera states it is crucial to have the interviewers present to provide additional context on the applicants. He proposes a motion to postpone the discussion item to the next personnel meeting.

Motion to postpone Discussion Item B: Discussing Committee Applicants, by **C. Martinez-Aguilera**, seconded by **D. Lopez**, motion **CARRIED**.

15:26

C. DISCUSSION ITEM: **Review of at Large Student Appointees to CFAC (Campus Fee Advisory Committee)**

The personal committee will discuss the Review of Large Student Appointees to CFAC.

J. Carroll provides context about the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (C-FAC), explaining that it is a Chancellor's Office Executive Order Appointed Committee overseeing fee-based programs across 23 campuses. The committee reviews current fees, including ASI fees and auxiliary fees like union and R.A.W fees, and makes recommendations or reviews proposals for fee increases. Three ASI designees Nolan, Sai Charan, and Erick sit on the committee, meeting the Chancellor's Office rule of having more student representatives than faculty and staff. James presents three recommendations from housing for additional student representatives: Jennifer Perfecto (senior RA with years of housing experience), Jocelyn Horta (involved in RHA advocacy with a leadership role), and Albert Perez (RA).

N. Calara states who is an RA, provides additional insight into the three nominated candidates for the Campus Fee Advisory Committee. He speaks highly of Jennifer Perfecto, highlighting her strong work ethic and organizational skills. For Jocelyn Horta, he notes their experience working together on RA and advocacy matters, emphasizing Jocelyn's passion for campus issues. Regarding Albert Perez, Nolan commends his ability to ask insightful questions essential for the campus's well-being. The speaker recommends moving forward with these candidates, describing them as excellent additions to amplify the student voice.



C. Martinez-Aguilera asks who is responsible for appointing the candidate into the committee?

J. Carroll states that ASI handles the official appointments for the Campus Fee Advisory Committee and proposes it as a discussion item for the upcoming Board Meeting. Unlike Internal Committees, there isn't a need for an interview process. The focus is on reaching out to housing, the R.A.W., and the health center to suggest candidates for the committee. ASI has three specific seats on the committee, and the goal is to identify three to four additional students with experience in fee-based programs.

N. Calara asks is there any representation from P.A.W. or the Union for student voice instead of housing and ASI?

J. Carroll states that he sent a follow-up email to Jennifer Luna after initially reaching out. James had initially emailed her and obtained names from housing. However, there hasn't been any follow-up from the R.A.W. He mentions that he has contacted Jennifer again and may receive additional names after that, but as of now, there hasn't been a response.

N. Calara asks can we have more than 3 students outside of ASI?

J. Carroll states yes, the rule is that the committee must have more students than staff and faculty. Currently, with three ASI members and three from housing, this requirement is not met. They express the benefit of obtaining one or two names from the R.A.W, which would strengthen the committee's structure. Additionally, James notes that the committee is chaired by Suzanne Espinosa, the Vice President of Student Affairs.

D. Lopez asks is it possible for Saira to take a position as she is affiliated with the R.A.W.?

J. Carroll states that would be up to the R.A.W. and Union to the decide. ASI has already identified its three internal appointees, leaving it to the Recreation and Union departments to choose candidates. The speaker emphasizes that if they wish to nominate Saira, it would be Jennifer's decision in this regard.

N. Calara states him and Kushal was responsible for assigning individuals to committees. Saira was placed in Wellness Committees based on her position, while C-FAC, which focuses on student fees, was considered more suitable for someone affiliated with the Union due to their direct involvement. The preference is for someone currently working at the Union, as opposed to someone affiliated but not actively working there. For ASI representatives, the emphasis is on selecting candidates best qualified for C-FAC.

K. Sheshadri states the Personnel Committee would like to recommend Nolan, Sai Charan, and Erick.

N. Calara states he would like to recommend Jennifer Perfecto, Jocelyn Horta, and Albert Perez for the C-FAC committee.

23:44



VIII. SPECIAL REPORTS:
No special reports.

23:56

IX. ROUND TABLE REMARKS

J. Carroll states this is the Board and the Executive Committee’s last official meeting of the semester. He acknowledges the busy time of finals and commends the Board Members for their great work. James encourages prioritizing self-care during the upcoming week and a half, emphasizing that there are no office hour requirements during finals. He advises taking time for personal well-being and relaxation, assuring that responding to critical emails is sufficient. The message concludes with positive wishes for a successful return in January.

N. Calara expresses gratitude for the successful year, noting this as the last official ASI meeting of the year. He expresses a hope for increased strength in the next semester. Nolan emphasizes the purpose of Personnel to hold the Board Member accountable and encourages Board Members to report any lapses in responsibilities, whether from Board Members outside or within the current meeting. The recommendation is to utilize personnel more effectively in the coming year to address any perceived shortcomings in board members' duties.

26:31

X. ADJOURNMENT at **12:28 PM**

Motion to adjourn the meeting by **N. Calara**, seconded by **E. Lored**, motion **CARRIED**.

Minutes reviewed by:

Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff

Name: Kushal Sheshadri

Kushal Sheshadri

Kushal Sheshadri (Jan 26, 2024 12:45 PST)

Minutes approved on:

January 24, 2024

Date:

