

## Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of September 11th, 2024

- I. CALL TO ORDER at **12:05 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 the agenda of September 11th, 2024, by **L. Deguzman** and seconded by **N. Calara**, motion **CARRIED**.
  - IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of January 11, 2023**  
**Motion** to approve the minutes of January 11th, 2023, by **D. Bhimanapati** and seconded by **L. Deguzman**, 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.
  - VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS:  
No unfinished item.
- 3:20**
- VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:
    - A. DISCUSSION ITEM: [24-2025 ASI Budget](#)

The Executive Committee will be discussing the tentative budget for the 2024-25 year. **J. Carroll** starts by giving kudos to his co-budget partner, **Doris Lagasca**, who helps make the magic work. He acknowledges that, while enrollment decline impacts the budget, they are not in a gloom-and-doom scenario. They still need to make course corrections in the coming years, but ASI remains a solid functioning organization. He notes that, while ASI is not operating in the best scenario based on the operating budget and revenue, it is doing fine. They have continued to save, be good stewards of money, and have hefty and solid reserves that ASI has maintained over the years.

He shares a couple of points to ensure everyone is aware. All matriculated students pay \$129.00 a year, which is \$64.50 per semester. This fee has been \$129.00 for an academic

510.885.4843



associated.students@csueastbay.edu  
www.csueastbay.edu/asi



1000 Bee Boulevard

Hayward, CA 94620

year since 2008, making it year 16 with the same fee. **J. Carroll** points out that this is not a sustainable model, so they need to consider a fee referendum in the coming years. It is not feasible to hold a fee steady for 20 years. Nonetheless, ASI is expected to continue doing well over the next few years. The budget process is based on enrollment projections. East Bay was trending up a few years before the pandemic, reaching a high of about 14,500 and moving closer to 15. However, since the pandemic, the campus has faced enrollment challenges, and they are currently at about 10,961 students.

**J. Carroll** explains that they are doing the budget a bit later because they had to make adjustments. Initially, they anticipated about a 5% decrease in enrollment from the previous year. A couple of weeks ago, this number was about 7%, and now, with the semester underway, the real numbers show they are about 7.5% lower than last year. He sees opportunities for ASI to discuss and gauge what this means for the university and where the 7.5% impacts most. Transfer student numbers, which have always been strong, are about 4% up from last year, indicating that the transfer student population is doing well. However, first-time freshman numbers are lower, and there has been some stopping out and attrition from seniors. He suggests having the ADP of enrollment come in to share these numbers in real time. The 7.5% figure provides a broad perspective, which does not put them in the best scenario. With fewer students paying \$129.00, there is less revenue for the operating budget.

**J. Carroll** notes that it indicates 11,329 for the fall and 10,261 for the spring. There is a formula that most universities use, where spring enrollment numbers are always a bit lower, despite new students coming in and some students finishing their degrees in December or transferring out. The university uses a formula to account for this. They add the fall and spring numbers together and multiply by \$64.50 to get a more accurate account of anticipated revenue.

**J. Carroll**

**J. Carroll** mentions that increases to the operating budget reflect the reality of doing business. Minimum wage for student assistants in California has been rising, and the California law now requires a \$20 minimum wage for certain food service companies. The broad minimum wage in California is \$16 and is anticipated to increase again in January. The California legislature has not yet voted, leaving some uncertainty. To remain

goes toward direct student services. Although a 75-25 split in favor of student services would be ideal, achieving this is difficult. However, ASI aims to maintain or improve the current model, where more than 50% of student fees go directly back to student services.

**J. Carroll** begins by pausing for questions after sharing information from the previous slides. **N. Calara** raises a concern about the budget cuts, particularly highlighting his distress over reducing funds for the Hope and Emergency Housing program. He explains that the budget cut is \$16,500, approximately 66%, and emphasizes the importance of this project, as it helps current students who are unsure of their next meal or shelter. **N. Calara** hopes that, despite the financial reduction, there will be a collective ASI effort to find

**J. Carroll** also mentions that about \$3.2 million of the reserves must stay untouched for potential emergencies, such as a major catastrophe or closing as a 501C3, which would require payouts for retirements and severance

**J. Carroll** mentions that another argument would be a deep dive into their services. He suggests looking at what they are currently providing, what they want to stabilize, and what they could do differently or more of. He emphasizes the need to get input from students on what they are willing to pay for. He continues by breaking down the three main components of the plan: the fee increase itself, how they would implement it, and the conversation about student input. He mentions that auxiliaries that have received referendums in the past five years have built in a cost that allows for nominal fee increases based on cost of living and consumer price indexes. He explains that if a 2% increase is needed, they could implement that as long as they are transparent about what it is for, noting that they cannot raise fees without justification.

**J. Carroll** expresses that if they have a one-time fee increase, it would likely prevent the need for another referendum, barring any major circumstances. He believes that in most cases, after such an increase, they may never need to hold another referendum. He goes on to explain that the current challenge is the double burden of declining enrollment and rising operating costs. If they were only facing one of these factors, it would be more manageable. However, he anticipates that things will eventually level off, and they will find a new stable amount for their budget, which is something the university is currently working on. He concludes by emphasizing the importance of either delivering those services or building that information into the longer-term conversation.

**M. Castillo** addresses **L.**

