Associated STUDENTS
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Posted: 6/21/2024 | 12:48 PM PDT

Signature: *Christine Amador*
5E93B8D18C534FA...

Executive Committee

June 26th, 2024
2:00 pm - 4:00 pm
T-152
Zoom Call:https://sfsu.zoom.us/j/91666786157?pwd=YlFGZHYzbGoySThwT25aU3dVay9VQT09
Meeting ID: 916 6678 6157
Passcode: Exec

Agenda

I.   Call to order
II.   Roll Call
III.   Approval of Agenda
IV.   Approval of Minutes (06.03.2024)
V.   Open Forum
VI.   Discussion Item

    a. Chief of Staff Appointment (Brandon Foley - President)
    The Committee will discuss selecting a Chief of Staff nominee.

    b. Chief Justice Appointment (Brandon Foley - President)
    The Committee will discuss selecting a Chief Justice nominee.

VII.   Action Items

    a. Chief of Staff Appointment (Brandon Foley - President)
    The Committee will take action on selecting a Chief of Staff nominee.

    b. Chief Justice Appointment (Brandon Foley - President)
    The Committee will take action on selecting a Chief Justice nominee.

VIII.   Announcements
IX.   Adjournment

To request accessibility accommodations, please email christine@asi.sfsu.edu.
Members shall be teleconferencing in from the following locations: 1600 Holloway Ave, San Francisco, CA 94132, 6827 Embarcadero Ln, Carlsbad, CA, 92011

Executive Committee

June 3rd, 2024
1:00 pm - 2:00 pm
T-152
Zoom Call:https://sfsu.zoom.us/j/91666786157?pwd=YlFGZHYzbGoySThwT25aU3dVay9VQT09
Meeting ID: 916 6678 6157
Passcode: Exec

Minutes

I.   Call to order

       Meeting called to order at 1:11 pm.

II.   Roll Call

       Brandon Foley, President (chair) - Present
       Bella Martinez-Bernal, VP Internal Affairs - Present
       Andrea Soto, VP External Affairs - Excused (Zoom)
       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 June 3rd, 2024.
       Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs.
       Seconded by Lorena Mejia, VP Finance.
       No discussion.

       Yes: 4, No: 0, Abstain: 0.
       Motion passes.

IV.   Approval of Minutes

       Motion to approve the minutes from April 17th, 2024.
       Moved by Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs.
       Seconded by Lorena Mejia, VP Finance.
       No discussion.

       Yes: 4, No: 0, Abstain: 0.
       Motion passes.

V.   Open Forum

Jamal Howard, Student Org Rep, briefly greeted the committee.

VI.   Discussion Item

   a. Chief Justice and Chief of Staff Appointment Process (Brandon Foley - President)
    The Committee will discuss updates on the process to appoint a Chief of Staff and Chief Justice
    for the 24/25 BOD term.

Brandon Foley, President (chair), opened the discussion by asking the committee to establish a timeline for the interview process and discuss how to move forward with filling the roles of Chief of Staff and Chief Justice. He explained that a record number of 28 applications had been received. Because not all 28 candidates will be interviewed, he suggested that the committee members discuss what qualities they would like to see in a Chief Justice and Chief of Staff, before the interview process begins. **Lorena Mejia, VP Finance,** highlighted that prior experience is essential for these roles. **Maya Bal, VP Academic Affairs,** asked what questions were asked on the application. **Brandon** replied that questions were open-ended and applicants were able to fill in what they wanted. He added that interviews will be conducted by him and asked the committee how many interviews they wish to be conducted. **Bella Martinez-Bernal, VP Internal Affairs,** noted that prior student government experience is not necessary, but can be replaced by comparable experience or involvement on campus. **Brandon** then asked how the committee feels about candidates who applied after losing the recent student government elections. **Maya** replied that it would be problematic to hire someone who was rejected by the student body. **Brandon** suggested rejecting every candidate who had participated and lost in the elections. However, he would like to make an exception for two candidates, who might be eligible for an interview nonetheless. He added that eight or nine candidates could be rejected this way. **Lorena** asked if the committee members could get access to the submitted applications. **Brandon** answered that they would receive access to those of candidates who are chosen for an interview. **Bella** then asked what percentage of student votes must have rejected a candidate to not be considered for an interview. **Brandon** replied that a candidate with more than 50% of the vote against them would be rejected. **Bella** answered that she would like to qualify between those candidates and others who reached a considerable share of the vote, for example those who reached second place. She added that their campaign, slate, or platform could have impacted their share of votes. She added that certain candidates might have lost because they were not part of a slate and should be considered as long as they prove to be motivated and qualified. Generally, considerations should be made on a case by case basis. **Maya** then asked what would be considered a strong application. **Brandon** answered that some people only submitted one sentence to answer why they want the position, for example. In his opinion, this disqualified them immediately. **Lorena** added that whether a candidate lost the election does not give insight into how well they fit the position. She added that a significant number of candidates would be dismissed based on this qualification. Even though this fact should be considered, it should not be given priority. She added that some applicants might know the student government very well, which is essential for the position. Others might have won elections and held positions previously, which should also be considered. **Maya** asked whether the Chief of Staff will be a voting member and serve on committees. **Christine Amador, Assistant Executive Director of Governance,** replied that they will chair the Board and Audit committee and will be a voting member of any other committees. They will be a full Board member, holding office hours, etc., but won't be voting in Board meetings as long as they are Chair. **Maya** replied that these privileges should not be given to someone who lost the elections by a large margin. **Christine** replied that these roles are appointed positions because they are meant to be separate from the election process. She added that the previous Chief of Staff, **Iese Esera,** had lost the election the first time he ran, but was then made Chief of Staff. Even though she understands the premise, losing the election should not automatically disqualify a candidate and appointment decisions should be made based on their application. Furthermore, some people might be able to express themselves better in speaking than writing, so they might still be considered for an interview. **Brandon** explained that during summer, not everyone might be able to get an in-person interview. **Bella** advocated for in-person

interviews, especially for candidates unknown to Board members. She explained that this would set the expectation to be physically present in meetings, which is a standard the Board is trying to achieve. She explained that candidates who are able to meet in person should be prioritized. She added that the committee should discuss its capacity for interviews and decide how many it can realistically conduct. **Brandon** agreed and asked how many interviews would be feasible on one day. **Lorena** asked who else had looked at the list of applicants. **Christine** replied that she has seen all applications because she has run application checks. **Maya** then asked what the interview questions will look like. **Christine** replied that there will be technical questions, such as how many hours a week they are available, and other questions, which the Board members will determine. **Christine** added that she has samples from previous years that they can use. **Lorena** asked what this process previously looked like and what questions had been asked. **Alejandro** explained that these positions are presidential appointments. The President of the Board reviews applications internally and then brings them before the Executive Committee and the Board. If a committee member asks to see the applications, it is up to the President to grant or deny that request. He then addressed the discussion about whether to consider candidates who have lost the election or not. **Alejandro** also supported considering all applicants based on their qualification, regardless of the election results. **Brandon** added that the Chief of Staff will be Chair of the Board, which is a very impactful position and elevating someone who lost an election recently is not something he is likely to do. He then asked how the committee feels about members of the new Board who also applied for one of these positions and submitted strong applications. **Lorena** asked whether it is possible to hold both positions. **Christine** explained that nothing prevents somebody who won the election to also run for the appointed positions. However, if they get selected, they have to vacate the position they were elected for. Then, the position they have vacated would normally be filled by appointment. If this process fell within a certain time frame, however, the position would go to the previous election's runner-up. **Maya** asked what this time frame is. **Christine** answered that she believes it to be 30 days. **Maya** replied that she likes the idea of granting the position to the runner-up instead of appointing someone. **Brandon** mentioned that the time frame is unclear because the policy mentions both a time frame of 30 and 60 days. **Dean Miguel** added that this approach would be contradictory to what was discussed before. Brandon had mentioned that he would not like to consider anyone who had lost the election for appointment, but is now suggesting that the runner-ups would be given a position in case of a vacancy. Then, people who lost the election would be on the Board either way. **Lorena** added that last year, there were many vacancies. This year, they have a full Board, ready to go. Creating vacancies would make things more complicated. **Christine** then explained that the runner-up can be appointed if someone resigns from a position within 60 days of the election according to the ByLaws. **Maya** asked what would happen if a runner-up rejects the position and whether the position would then go to the third person in line. **Christine** replied that she has never experienced this before. In addition, the ByLaws don't specify what constitutes a runner-up so this could be interpreted differently. She suggested only considering the applicants' qualifications and then discussing how to fill any vacant Board positions if they arise. She highlighted how important it is that someone qualified assumes these positions, regardless of them already holding a Board seat or not. **Andrea Soto, VP External Affairs** then added to the previous discussion that it would be unfair to bypass everyone who had lost in the election, without even considering their applications. **Brandon** explained that their applications wouldn't be outright rejected but that a lost election would be considered a negative feature of an application. He added that he is currently considering interviewing two out of nine candidates who lost the election. He then asked how many interviews should be conducted in one day. **Bella** suggested interviewing people on consecutive days. Furthermore, even candidates who were elected to the Board should be considered. Furthermore, only people who genuinely want to be involved and contribute to the campus community should be considered and asked about their passion for this position. **Maya** asked whether Bella had any specific interview questions in mind. **Bella** replied that she doesn't, but would like to explore the candidates' rationale for applying to one of the two positions, even after winning the election and a seat on the Board. **Brandon** added that possibly, the candidates wanted to be on the Executive Committee, but their current positions don't allow for it. He added that new members might have not known about the Chief of Staff and Chief Justice roles before the positions' openings were

announced. **Bella** answered that she had not considered this point before and that it is possible to be passionate about two things at once. She re-emphasized the importance of examining a qualified candidate's intentions for applying for the position. **Lorena** agreed, but added that only after qualified candidates have been determined, these questions should be considered. **Maya** suggested beginning to interview all candidates whose applications stood out to Brandon. **Brandon** replied that he would like to interview all candidates at the same time. **Maya** suggested scheduling interviews with the considered candidates as soon as possible. **Lorena** then asked what criteria Brandon had used to narrow down the candidate pool. **Brandon** replied that he mainly considered the quality of the submitted applications. **Lorena** asked what criteria or qualifications Brandon specifically liked that helped him narrow the pool down to only four candidates. **Brandon** replied that, for example, there were candidates with prior student government experience, who still wrote very weak statements, so he didn't consider them. **Lorena** then asked what constituted a strong statement to Brandon. **Brandon** replied that he considered whether candidates seemed to understand what the job entails. He added that about half of the applications were automatically rejected after he had examined the statement and prior experience. Furthermore, an application which was obviously written by ChatGPT was automatically rejected, too. **Lorena** explained that this is why face-to-face interviews are important for getting to know a candidate, their qualifications, and their personality. **Maya** added that even without prior experience, but extensive research and training, a candidate could still be a good fit for the role. **Lorena** specified that having executed a comparable role before would give a candidate an advantage. **Dean Miguel** explained that when the organization hires full-time staff, applicants who did not fill out the original application questions are not considered. Therefore, he appreciates this conversation. **Brandon** thanked him and added that candidates who seemed qualified but their statement did not match the job description were not considered. **Lorena** then asked how to schedule the interviews and reminded the committee to be mindful of the candidates' time, too. **Maya** added that some candidates have jobs. **Bella** suggested sending out emails by the end of the week, suggesting possible times for the following Thursday and Friday afternoon. **Brandon** agreed. **Christine** added that a list of time frames for 30-minute interviews should be suggested. If a candidate is not available for any of them, then something else can be worked out. She suggested that depending on the number of candidates, about 10 time frames should be selected and suggested. **Brandon** explained that he would like to interview four people, but would consider more if the committee would like him to. **Lorena** replied that he should do what he thinks is appropriate. **Christine** asked whether he is considering four people for each position or four people in total. **Brandon** replied that he would like to interview four people for each position. **Alejandro** suggested interviewing this selection of candidates. If no one fits the role, then these considerations can be brought up again. **Lorena** asked whether committee members should be present for the interviews. **Brandon** replied that it would be beneficial, but that there will also be a zoom recording. **Christine** explained that recordings of the interviews will be retained, so the committee can watch them before voting on an appointment within the Executive committee. **Brandon** suggested calling another meeting two Wednesdays from the current meeting. **Bella** asked when the next Board meeting is scheduled. **Brandon** replied that it is not scheduled yet, but will be held some time in July.

VII.   Action Items
VIII.   Announcements
IX.   Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Approved by: Brandon Foley, President

_____

Respectfully submitted by: Tushin Kulshreshta, Head VP Assistant

_____