



**Executive Committee**

**September 18th, 2024**

**2:00 pm - 4:00 pm**

**T-152**

**Zoom Call:**

**<https://sfsu.zoom.us/j/91666786157?pwd=YIEGZHYzbGoySThwT25aU3dVay9VQT09>**

**Meeting ID: 916 6678 6157**

**Passcode: Exec**

**Minutes**

**I. Call to order**

**Meeting called to order at 2:12pm.**

**II. Roll Call**

**Brandon Foley, President (chair) - Present**  
**Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice - Present**  
**Bella Martinez-Bernal, VP Internal Affairs - Present**  
**Andrea Soto, VP External Affairs - Present**  
**Lorena Mejia, VP Finance - Present**  
**Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs - Present**  
**Dr. Jamillah Moore, VP SAEM - Present (Dean Miguel)**  
**Alejandro Rios, Executive Director - Present**

**III. Approval of Agenda**

**Motion to approve the agenda for September 18th, 2024.**

**Moved by Lorena Mejia, VP Finance. Seconded by Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice.**

**Motion to table AS Logo Usage for Chicken Eating event, in discussion item (b) and action item (a). Add discussion and action item for AS Logo Usage for SF State Hall Of Fame Alumni.**

**Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs. Seconded by Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice.**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya, Dean Miguel (4)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

**Motion passes.**

**Motion to amend the agenda to add discussion item Chief of Staff Update.  
Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs. Seconded by Lorena Mejia, VP Finance.**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya, Dean Miguel (4)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

**Motion passes.**

**Motion to table the discussion item (d) Increasing Student Engagement with AS Social Media.**

**Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs. Seconded by Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice.**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya, Dean Miguel (4)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

**Motion passes.**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya, Dean Miguel (4)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

**Motion passes.**

#### IV. Approval of Minutes

**Motion to approve the minutes from September 4th, 2024.**

**Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs. Seconded by Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice.**

**No discussion**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya, Dean Miguel (4)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

#### V. Open Forum

**Vincent Andrew Lee, the Content Creation Specialist**, opened by addressing logistical aspects of the upcoming "Chicken Eating Challenge" event. He clarified that the event date had not been finalized yet as they were still in the process of securing space, likely in Malcolm X Plaza, and targeting the last week of September for the event—specifically the last Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. He emphasized that the event will use AS logos and branding, and since it is now considered a campus-wide event, they are aiming to involve the Board of Directors (BOD) members in outreach efforts. **Vincent** invited BOD members to participate as judges for the event, with **Brandon Foley, President** already committed to the role. **Jamal Howard, the Student Organization Representative**, agreed to be involved as a judge and

humorously asked what type of chicken it would be. Vincent confirmed that it would be a Costco rotisserie chicken.

## VI. Discussion Item

### a. Updates from the Chair (Brandon Foley - President)

*The committee will discuss any updates from the chair.*

**Brandon Foley - President**, began by informing the board about a new section of committee meetings (Updates from the Chair), which will hopefully be temporary, based on feedback from various board members. He mentioned that this would be included on everyone's agenda in the upcoming meetings, and it is already on the External Affairs agenda for tomorrow. The purpose is to allow the committee chairs to update their members on progress they've made outside of the regular meetings, ensuring transparency and forward momentum.

**Brandon Foley - President**, also shared an update on the Governor Gators internship program, mentioning that the charter was passed during the last Executive Committee meeting. An info session for the internship had been held, resulting in around a dozen people signing up. He and **Elsy Hernandez-Monroy - Dir. Social Justice & Equity** are currently working on assigning these interns to potential university committees. Emails will soon be sent out to those who have officially joined, beyond simply expressing interest. **Brandon** mentioned that they are targeting a total of about 18 seats to be filled across different university committees. **Jamal Howard - Student Org Rep**, also asked if there can be one more person added to the Ad Hoc committee to which **Brandon** replied by saying that he will work on it.

**Miguel Á. Hernández, the Dean of Students**, discussed the idea of creating a "Values Committee," which he envisions as a way to connect students with the rich traditions of the university. Since the institution is 126 years old, he wants to intentionally capture and share its legacy. He explained that some universities develop a set of values or a value statement crafted by the student body, which defines what it means to be a member of the university community. One potential project for the committee would be to develop a "Gator Creed" or something similar. Students from various parts of campus would collaborate to choose values that resonate with the essence of their university experience. These values would not just be words—they would be defined and explained by the students themselves. This could become a lasting part of the university's identity, passed on to incoming students at orientation, and highlighted throughout campus through branding and banners. **Brandon Foley - President**, raised the question of how these values would be used, leading to brainstorming about ways to incorporate them into student life. For example, the values could be introduced during admissions and orientation, printed on banners during Welcome Week, and perhaps be featured in other university communications. **Dean Miguel** emphasized that this initiative would be a legacy for the current student body, something that would endure and become part of the institution's core identity for years to come.

**Brandon Foley - President**, provided more details about the Governing Gators internship program, emphasizing that the in-person portion of the internship is meant to incentivize student involvement in university committees. He mentioned that a finance request would be submitted, likely by next Tuesday, to support an event planned for Thursday, the 26th, from 11:00 to 12:30. **Brandon** also noted that although **Elsy Hernandez-Monroy - Dir. Social Justice & Equity** has been working closely on the project, she has a scheduling conflict and will not be able to attend the in-person meetings. To address this, **Brandon** plans to invite a different board member to attend each meeting as a substitute for **Elsy**. He stated that he would be reaching out to the board to see who is available to attend on Thursdays from 11:00 to 12:30.

**b. Potential Downsizing of AS BOD Retreat (Brandon Foley - President)**

*The committee will discuss the AS BOD Retreat and potentially downsizing it in future years.*

**Brandon Foley - President** initiated the discussion by expressing his interest in reducing the costs of the board's yearly retreat, especially in light of the organization's anticipated budget deficit. He noted that the retreat in early June cost nearly \$39,000, covering hotel expenses, transportation, food, and activities for 18 board members, six staff, and two students. Although he acknowledged that the retreat was enjoyable, he questioned whether the funds could be allocated more responsibly, suggesting that money could be redirected toward scholarships or essential services like Gator Groceries. **Brandon** proposed several ways to cut costs, such as moving the retreat to a more affordable location and reducing it from two nights to one. He wanted to gauge the board's feedback on this idea. **Lorena Mejia, VP Finance** responded by sharing that this was her second retreat experience, emphasizing its importance for team building and learning about the organization's history and operations. She felt that cutting the retreat down to one night would not allow enough time to cover necessary information and foster connections between board members. While she acknowledged the need to cut some costs, she stressed that the overall experience was valuable. **Brandon** replied, stating that while the retreat is valuable, the organization spends an equal amount on scholarships for the entire year. He felt that a nonprofit's spending should reflect its priorities, and in his view, more funds should go toward direct programs like scholarships, rather than treating the retreat and scholarships as equally important.

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** provided feedback on the conversation about the retreat, emphasizing the need for clear direction from the board. He noted that the retreat serves as an investment in the development of the board itself and should not be directly compared to scholarships, as the retreat provides a space for planning the year's activities and fostering collaboration. According to Alejandro, it's important for the board to have time away from campus distractions, as this ensures everyone is fully focused. **Alejandro** stressed that the retreat's value lies in helping board members come together as a unified group, particularly since many may have run on different slates. The retreat activities, like the ropes course, promote teamwork, which is crucial for a successful year. While it's possible to hold the retreat in-house, **Alejandro** expressed doubt about the effectiveness of that option, based on previous experiences. He mentioned various past attempts to reduce costs by choosing alternative locations, such as cabins or staying within the city, but these had logistical issues, including lack of amenities or higher costs. Chaminade, where the retreat had been held previously, was highlighted as the location that offered the best value in terms of team-building activities, food, and accommodations. **Alejandro** expressed openness to cutting costs if the board directs him to do so but cautioned against eliminating the retreat entirely. He noted that it's important for future boards to have similar experiences and that redirecting the funds to scholarships might set a precedent that could cause future board members to feel shortchanged. He concluded by asking the board to provide feedback on the retreat, including whether they found it valuable, if it could be shortened, or if other locations should be considered. **Alejandro** also asked the board to clarify their priorities so he could move forward with planning accordingly.

**Maya Bal - VP Academic Affairs** expressed her belief that the retreat costs should be cut, especially considering the current economic situation and inflation. She pointed out that spending \$38,000 on a retreat might not reflect well on the organization and suggested reducing expenses, such as eliminating transportation costs, which she noted could save about \$1,600. **Maya** proposed carpooling as an alternative to help lower costs, emphasizing a more budget-conscious approach. **Christine Amador, AED Governance**, responded by highlighting the importance of the retreat's location, arguing that one of the main reasons for choosing a place far away is to create an environment where board members are "stuck" together, forcing them to bond and focus on the tasks at hand without distractions. This perspective suggests that the physical distance and the setting play a crucial role in fostering teamwork and

collaboration among board members.

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** emphasized that while the retreat costs might seem high, breaking down the expenses shows the value of group travel versus individual reimbursement. He pointed out that if each of the 20 participants were to drive to the retreat location (like Santa Cruz) and claim mileage reimbursement, the total costs could easily exceed the organized group transportation fees. He noted that the switch to bus transportation was made to ensure responsibility and unity among the group, as relying on individual vehicles could lead to logistical challenges and inconsistency in attendance. **Alejandro** also reflected on past experiences where one-day retreats resulted in poor attendance, as some members would leave for personal commitments. He stressed that being away from the usual environment fosters bonding and teamwork, which is essential for board development. He mentioned that the \$38,000 allocated for the retreat is a small fraction of the overall budget (approximately \$11 million) and underlined the importance of utilizing that investment to ensure board members gain meaningful experiences that enhance their engagement with students and the organization. **Alejandro's** aim was to encourage thoughtful discussion about the balance between financial responsibility and the benefits derived from such retreats, stressing that the effectiveness of the retreat should be measurable by the board members' engagement and outcomes.

**Brandon Foley - President** expressed that while he supports the idea of bonding as a board, he believes there are alternative ways to achieve this beyond a traditional retreat. He suggested focusing on outreach initiatives where the board can interact with students, emphasizing the importance of representing student interests in their efforts. **Bella Martinez-Bernal - VP Internal Affairs** chimed in with her perspective, acknowledging the need for responsible budgeting while also highlighting the normalcy of some costs associated with such retreats. She pointed out that other Associated Students (AS) organizations across California State University (CSU) campuses often have larger budgets and provide more extravagant services and amenities, making it challenging to compare their expenses directly to those of their organization. **Bella** acknowledged that while they are operating under budget constraints, especially as a commuter campus, the board still requires adequate time to work effectively and transition into their new roles. She argued against significantly reducing the duration of the retreat, suggesting that the complexity of their discussions and the natural flow of questions necessitate more time. While she was open to exploring alternative locations for the retreat, she felt that maintaining an expense of under \$40,000 could be reasonable, given the context of their responsibilities and the value of the experience. **Bella's** comments aimed to balance the need for fiscal responsibility with the board's requirements for effective collaboration and engagement.

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** emphasized the need for feedback from board members to guide their planning moving forward. He clarified that while they are not asking programs to cut costs, they require direction on the board's priorities and aspirations. He encouraged members to provide insights that could help shape their goals and objectives for the upcoming year. **Christine Amador, AED Governance** contributed by mentioning that a survey had been sent out to board members immediately after the retreat to gather data on which sessions were perceived as valuable and what aspects could be improved.

Although the response rate was low, the feedback collected would aid in planning for the next retreat.

**Brandon Foley - President** added to the discussion by expressing a desire for bonding activities that might not involve a hotel setting. He highlighted a positive experience from the previous summer, where board members met more frequently than usual, suggesting that this could be integrated into their bylaws. He indicated that he would address this topic further in an upcoming Rules Committee meeting, aiming to formalize the practice of summer meetings for better engagement among board members.

**c. Staff Appreciation Ideas (Brandon Foley - President)**

*The committee will discuss possible ideas for AS staff appreciation events.*

**Brandon Foley - President** suggested enhancing interaction between the board and the various AS programs, aiming to create events that allow for better connection and appreciation of the staff who run the organization day to day. He emphasized the importance of having board members actively engage in these events, building stronger relationships with both students and staff. **Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice** then proposed an idea, inspired by how **Dean Miguel**'s office handles the Ali Awards, suggesting that AS could implement something similar internally to recognize and celebrate achievements within the organization. **Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** responded by noting that they used to hold these recognition events in conjunction with the scholarship awards, indicating a past tradition of internal appreciation.

**Maya Bal - VP Academic Affairs** asked if there was a "Staff Member of the Month" program for both student staff and full-time staff. Alejandro responded that they hadn't done something like that in a long time but confirmed they used to recognize full-time staff for their years of service. For student staff, given their shorter time at the organization (usually around three years), individual acknowledgments are less frequent, with more focus on recognizing programs. However, **Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** mentioned that he could start brainstorming ways to reintroduce monthly acknowledgments, provided there is direction on how to move forward with it. **Alejandro** also informed the board that they used to have birthday acknowledgments, but they stopped after receiving emails from HR indicating that people didn't like sharing their birthdays with everyone else in the office.

**Brandon Foley - President** shared that when he talks to student staff from different programs, said that they don't have opportunities to meet others. He suggested that acknowledging birthdays wouldn't address this issue and proposed organizing an in-person event, like a dinner, where everyone can gather, including board members and program student staff. **Miguel Á. Hernández, the Dean of Students**, then suggested sharing information about professional associations in higher education that offer regional, state, and national awards. He expressed his hope to have at least one recognition from SF State at each level. However, he noted that some individuals may not be comfortable with such acknowledgment. He also mentioned the possibility of nominating professional staff for recognition from other organizations and emphasized the importance of exploring university-level staff awards, including the nomination processes and how to recognize community members effectively.

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** mentioned that during his upcoming management meeting on Monday, he plans to bring up the idea of increased student engagement, which seems to be a key request from the students. He noted that Horace has resumed his monthly meetings with the programs, though those are more business-focused. **Alejandro** suggested that quarterly or once-a-semester meetings with student staff, possibly including food, could encourage more engagement. He assured that he would bring this topic to the staff during his meeting. **Brandon Foley - President** agreed, emphasizing the importance of events like retreats or enrichment opportunities for staff. He pointed out that it's beneficial to have everyone together, allowing staff to connect by putting faces to names they usually only see in emails.

**d. AS Logo Usage for SF State Hall of Fame Alumni (Brandon Foley - President)**

*The committee will discuss AS Logo usage for SF State Hall of Fame Alumni.*

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** informed the committee about the upcoming SF State Hall of Fame Alumni event scheduled for November 1st. He mentioned that the event would require Executive approval to use the Associated Students (AS) logo, in accordance with their new social media policy. This step is necessary for sending materials to Alumni Relations. **Brandon Foley - President** also informed that, due to the time sensitivity of the matter, the request will only go through the Executive Committee and will not be presented to the Board of Directors. This approach aligns with **Alejandro's** direction to expedite the process, ensuring that the AS logo can be utilized promptly for the event.

**e. Chief of Staff Update (Brandon Foley - President)**

*The committee will discuss updates on Chief of Staff*

**Brandon Foley - President** provided an update on the board application process after his check-in with **Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** and **Christine Amador, AED Governance**. He mentioned that they plan to open applications on Monday for a duration of two weeks, similar to the first round of applications. After the application period, interviews will be conducted approximately nine days later. Once the interviews are completed, nominees will be presented to the Executive Committee for confirmation before going to the Board for final approval. **Lorena Mejia - VP Finance** inquired whether the same interview questions would be used, to which **Brandon** responded that they have the flexibility to adjust the questions for this new round. He encouraged everyone to contribute any suggestions for new questions when the time comes, assuring them that they would receive an email with further details. It was also unanimously agreed that it is better to have a Chief Of Staff assigned before the end of October as the Audit Committee will be meeting during that time. **Brandon** clarified that the appointment process for certain positions, like the Chief of Staff, should ideally originate from a non-executive board member. He noted that while there have been exceptions in the past—such as **Iese - Former Chief of Staff**, who was not initially a board member at the start of the year—current bylaws specify that the appointment should come from someone officially on the board. He emphasized that members who are part of the committee cannot simultaneously hold roles as directors or college representatives to avoid conflicts of interest.

**Andrea Soto - VP External Affairs** emphasized the importance of transparency in the application process for upcoming appointments and asked **Brandon Foley - President** if it would be possible for the executive committee to have access to all applications submitted this time around, as they hadn't seen many applications previously. **Brandon** responded that while the chief of staff position is a presidential appointment, which follows a specific process, other board positions that become vacant will be open to all eligible candidates. He assured that if a board member applied for the chief of staff position, everyone would be informed about it, and they would participate in interviews, ensuring transparency throughout the process. He reiterated that the application process would be similar to last time, with opportunities for board members to be involved in interviews. **Lorena Mejia - VP Finance** pointed out that they did not have access to the applications in the previous round. **Brandon** reiterated the distinction between presidential appointments, such as the chief of staff and Chief Justice, and board member appointments. He clarified that once they identify a chief of staff, any resulting vacancies will be open for all eligible candidates at the same time. He assured that if any board member applied for the chief of staff position, they would receive an interview, emphasizing that he would be reviewing the applications himself as this position is just a presidential appointment. **Brandon** confirmed that the process would remain consistent with the previous round.

**Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice** asked about the process if no board members apply, inquiring if

applications would be filtered and presented to the board for interviews. **Brandon Foley - President** explained that during the previous rounds, they received a good number of applications, specifically mentioning 27 applicants in the first round for both the Chief of Staff and Chief Justice positions. He clarified that presidential appointments differ from general board member appointments. If a board member applies, they would be guaranteed an interview. He noted that if two board members applied, both would be interviewed first, and then they would move on to non-board members based on discretion. If only one board member applied, they would also receive an interview, while other candidates would be considered as well. **Dylan James Beck Gillespie - Education Rep** asked **Brandon** about his thought process regarding the filtering process for presidential interviews, specifically questioning why executive committee members are not included in that process. **Brandon** responded that it's straightforward; the process is defined as a presidential one, emphasizing that it's a responsibility designated specifically to him (President) for the Chief of Staff and Chief Justice roles. He mentioned that the process for appointing a board member is different. **Dylan** asked **Brandon** about the thought process behind not including executive committee members in the presidential interview process, emphasizing the importance of diverse opinions. **Brandon** clarified that while not all Executive Committee members were present for every interview, he was involved in all of them. He explained that interviews are part of a presidential appointment process, where he brings nominees for the committee to interview. He also mentioned that if the committee isn't satisfied with the nominees, he's open to reopening the search. **Lorena Mejia - VP Finance** then asked why the applications for board positions weren't shared from students at large, suggesting that involving everyone in the process would lead to better agreement in the end. **Brandon** explained that he prefers to bring up candidates for interviews without sharing applications broadly, indicating that this aligns with the presidential appointment definition they follow.

**Andrea Soto - VP External Affairs** asked **Brandon Foley - President** about his thought process in filtering applicants for the Chief of Staff position to avoid someone dropping out or bailing, expressing concern about filtering out students at large too quickly. She referenced a previous round where around 20 applications were cut off early and wanted to know how the process would differ this time to ensure a better outcome. **Dylan James Beck Gillespie - Education Rep** added that AS board members heard from students who felt cut out of the process without clear reasons, reinforcing the need for transparency in filtering applications. **Brandon** responded by emphasizing that it's a similar process to how job applications are filtered. He explained that some applicants may get cut during the initial screening, though he didn't provide further details on how this might be adjusted to address the concerns raised. **Brandon** responded to **Andrea's** question about how he plans to filter applicants for the Chief of Staff position by emphasizing that the key factor will be whether the applicant's statement demonstrates an understanding of the job. He noted that during the previous round, some applications were filtered out because applicants didn't explain how their experience was relevant to the role or why they were well-suited for the position. **Brandon** stated that if an applicant's response to the question "Why do you want the job?" does not fit or show an understanding of the position, they will not be granted an interview. He added that there were many applications in the past, but only those with well-put-together submissions that clearly aligned with the role received interviews. He acknowledged that there is a need to filter applicants, as it's not feasible to interview everyone, especially if there is a large pool of applicants. He also mentioned that some applicants questioned why they didn't get the job, and while he did respond, he didn't go into detail, simply informing them that they were moving forward with other candidates.

*Dean Miguel Left at 3:28pm*

**Alejandro Rios - Executive Director** provided clarification on the process of presidential appointments. He explained that for positions like Chief of Staff, the president (in this case, **Brandon Foley - President**) is responsible for selecting candidates and bringing them forward for interviews. The concern, as **Alejandro** noted, has been around why the board cannot see all the applications, especially if only a few candidates are being selected for interviews. **Alejandro** pointed out that while **Brandon** is filtering



through the applications to choose the candidates he wants to bring forward, the ultimate decision lies with the board. In this scenario, **Brandon's** role is to present his selected candidates, but the board retains the final say in whether they approve or reject those candidates. **Alejandro** suggested that allowing the board to see all the applications without making them part of the selection process might ease concerns. This would give the board visibility into the pool of applicants while still respecting **Brandon's** authority to determine who gets interviewed. **Lorena Mejia - VP Finance** agreed with this, emphasizing that while the president has the right to make the final selections, the board should at least have access to the applications for transparency. She acknowledged the presidential nomination process but underscored the importance of the board's role in voting on the candidates who will ultimately be brought forward to the Executive Committee then Board of Directors. **Alejandro** sought a solution to address concerns about transparency in the presidential appointment process, specifically regarding whether candidates' applications should be shared with the board. He asked **Brandon** if he would be willing to share the list of applicants, with the understanding that the president still has the final say in who gets nominated. **Brandon** responded by stating that, based on discussions from earlier in the year, he plans to keep the process the same. He reiterated that any non-executive board member (including student or group issue directors) who applies will receive an invitation for an interview. He emphasized that this process was clear before, but acknowledged that it may not have been fully understood, especially since Grishma, the previous Chief of Staff, only served for 16 days. **Brandon** expressed confidence that if more board members apply this time, it will help resolve the issue. He indicated that he plans to encourage board members to apply in the next board meeting once the applications open. He maintained his stance on keeping the current process, pointing out that opening up the entire applicant pool for review could blur the distinction between a presidential appointment and a more general selection process. The crux of his argument is that if the process is to remain a presidential appointment, the president should retain the authority to select candidates for interviews, rather than opening the entire applicant pool for wider review. **Alejandro** clarified that the request from the group is not to guarantee board interviews for every applicant, but rather to allow the executive committee to see the applications, even if the final selection of nominees remains with the president. He proposed a compromise where **Brandon** could share the applications with the understanding that it doesn't alter the president's responsibility to make the nomination. **Lorena** added that by having access to the applications from the start, the entire process would be more transparent. She emphasized that this would make it easier for the group to come together as a unified team when presenting a nominee to the board. By reviewing the applications, the executive committee could better understand how candidates are being filtered, which would help them feel more confident and aligned in recommending a candidate. This transparency, she argued, would lead to a more cohesive decision-making process. **Karina Zamora - Governance Assistant** offered insight based on her experience as a previous AS president, suggesting that allowing the committee to see all of the applications helps them make more informed decisions. This would enable committee members to confidently vote yes or no, rather than having tunnel vision based on only the candidates presented by the president. When **Brandon** questioned the difference between a presidential appointment and a normal board appointment in this context, **Karina** clarified that sharing the applications does not undermine the presidential nature of the appointment. Instead, it simply equips the committee with a broader perspective, which strengthens their ability to make a thoughtful decision. Since the president still has the final say, this transparency should not present a problem.

**Lorena Mejia - VP Finance** proposed taking a straw poll to record which members would like access to the applications, and she asked to ensure this is noted in the minutes for transparency. It appears that this is a procedural step to gauge the committee's interest in having access to certain applications or decisions, which is important for keeping the process transparent and inclusive for future discussions. **Brandon** acknowledged **Lorena's** request for the straw poll, stating that while he understands her perspective, he prefers to keep the current process in place, citing the importance of adhering to the "presidential appointment" process. He explained that his proposed method is better for the timeline and emphasized that, ideally, the position should be filled internally by a non-executive board member. However, he also

indicated that past discussions about the Chief of Staff and Chief Justice positions have influenced his decision to maintain the current approach. The straw poll was conducted and had a total of “5 yays” and 0 “nays”.

VII. Action Items

**a. AS Logo Usage for SF State Hall of Fame Alumni(Brandon Foley - President)**

*The committee will discuss AS Logo usage for SF State Hall of Fame Alumni.*

**Motion to approve AS Logo Usage for SF State Hall of Fame Alumni.**

**Moved by Fayeeza Shaikh - Chief Justice. Seconded By Lorena Mejia - VP Finance.**

**No discussion**

**Yes: Fayeeza, Bella, Andrea, Lorena, Maya (3)**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0.**

VIII. Announcements

**None.**


IX. Adjournment

**Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.**

Approved by: **Brandon Foley - President**

Signed by:  
  
32D71EA3458E432...

Respectfully submitted by: **Tushin Kulshreshtha, Head VP Assistant**

DocuSigned by:  
  
5A4350498EA34A6...