

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, November 26, 2024
2:30pm - 4:30pm

Building 19, Room 121
1700 W. Hillsdale Boulevard, San Mateo,
CA 94402

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85134096982>

Meeting ID: 851 3409 6982

Phone: +1 669 444 9171

Officers	
President	Todd Windisch
Vice President	Daniel Keller
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Stephen Heath (absent)

Standing Senate Committee Chairs	
Curriculum Committee	Jeremy Wallace
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Matt Montgomery
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Wesley Hingano (absent)
Business/Technology	Hellen Pacheco
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Leighton Armitage
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (3:01)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Sarah Artha Negara (2:38)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer (absent)
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (absent)
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Brandon Williams (Zoom)
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Makiko Ueda

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:32)</p> <p><i>Senate meetings shall require a quorum of the membership to vote on action items. A quorum for a meeting of the Senate and all Senate committees shall consist of 50% plus 1 of the committee's voting faculty members.</i></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	<p>Adoption of Today's Agenda (Leighton Armitage Motion & Emily Cotla 2nd. Roll Call Vote was unanimous with 14 yes, including student advisor vote.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Jennifer Howze-Owens Motion & Kim Salido 2nd. Roll Call Vote with 1 abstention and 14 yes including the student advisor.)</p> <p><i>All items on the consent agenda may, by unanimous vote of the Academic Senate members present, be approved by one motion after allowing for Senate member questions about a particular item. Prior to a motion for approval of the consent agenda, any Senate member, interested student, citizen, or member of the staff may request that an item be removed from consent to be discussed in the order listed, after approval of remaining items on the consent agenda.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approval of faculty appointment(s) ● Draft minutes from previous meeting(s)... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 22, 2024 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Sarah Artha Negara inquired about the spring adjunct budget since we had previously indicated the need for a larger budget to cover all adjunct faculty currently serving on Senate committees. Jennifer Howze-Owens had a follow-up relating to the pay for delay for adjunct faculty. President, Todd Windisch said to let him know of any delays or let the committee chair in charge of the Senate subcommittee for any delayed pay know. Todd does know of one delay due to a misguided time sheet.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questions/comments on non-agenda items ● If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone 	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

2. Standing Agenda

No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report (DAS: The last meeting was Mon., 11/25. Details from the Agenda. Goals, didn't vote, formed, vote next meeting. Interview processes for tenure track full time, gray area, HR changed process, Chancellor Moreno voiced her opinion of keeping interviews multi-modal, however, she wants EOCA input. It currently looks like the District plan will be moving toward multi-modal, but the DAS wants to weigh in. In order for DAS to give their feedback Todd Windisch will bring the proposal to our AS meeting for a position to take to Chancellor Moreno. The current outlook shows things are going the way of CSM prefers, but the discussion continues. Daniel Keller added that there might be Bias training based on diverse modality. Jeremy Wallace asked about funding for flying people to interviews. Todd said that Natalie Alagaza found one district that flies people and that eventuality will likely be discussed later. Jeremy would like to see funding and have other funding, like AI center, funneled toward that. The District has entered a memo of understanding with the State Chancellor's office to sign on founder partner in the State Digital center. We don't really know what that is yet, but it is supposed to be a consortium of colleges across the state being forward thinking in their use of technology and AI. DeAnza is the other sign on founder. It seems that we have signed on because we want to be a part of the new initiative and benefit from the outcomes. We can pull out from MOU at any time There is a memo on last BOT agenda from the last meeting and learn more about this digital center. Jeremy said that this is unfunded and doesn't discuss how much funding would be needed. The district strategic planning process is continuing, individual college goals and district goals are being aligned so they can find consensus to help inform district goals. A final point brought up was that the AI District Flex Day will not occur because there were only seven proposals. Daniel Keller brought up another discussion in DAS, concerning not dropping any student drop who owes less than \$200. Todd said he would be discussing the details in a meeting with Alex and Steven Trihn since he knows that we have questions as brought up previously by Emily Cotla and Brandon William.</p>	Todd Windisch & Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 10 min	Information

IPC: There was not a lot to report from IPC. The Nueventive contract was approved since no one had problems with the contract and software. At the next meeting, prioritization of new hires will be up for discussion. The next meeting is December 4th, where a town hall will be held for Q&A about prioritizations of Resource Requests.

BOT: Todd Windisch said this was an interesting meeting where they approved the board policy on class cancellation. There was a lot of discussion about the board policy and administrative procedure since they are tied. Todd Windisch, the other AS Presidents, as well as the Curriculum Chairs, and some other faculty showed up to express support for the board policy on class cancellations, since all think it is a good compromise. Recall that the administrative procedure was sent to the board with two numbers, 15 for in-person and 20 for asynchronous courses, so the group felt this was a good package. One board member and the student trustee didn't like the one policy that had to do with equity, the one that puts priority on classes which have a focus on equity or social justice, but it did pass regardless of the objections. The board only approves the board policy and the academic procedure is awaiting official implementation by the Chancellor. Todd believes the new policy will go into effect in Spring.

DPGC has no updates.

We already discussed the first-round interview modality. There are some calls for participation, but not further information is needed beyond what is written below.)

- District Academic Senate (DAS)
- Institutional Planning Committee (IPC)
- Board of Trustees (BOT)
- District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC)
- Update on first-round interview modalities
- Calls for Participation:
 - Institutional Planning Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate)
 - Safety Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate)
 - Technology Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate)

2.2	<p>Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Completed common course numbering and have changed political science PLSC to POLS as the state requested. Some course numbering contain 3 numbers, but eventually 4 numbers will be adopted. Local AA Area 7, Kinesiology, Activity and Self Development, was changed and the committee is in the process of discussing the courses that stay and go; they still have about 5 to 6 courses to discuss in the coming meeting. The committee decided to maintain the American History and Institutions GE requirements and that will be Area 8 of the new Local AA. The most important take-away is that the Local AA is going to remain pretty much unchanged, it will simply be rearranged and re-numbered. One big change will be needed to move math education to its own area rather than as a competency requirement which will add a couple of units to the Local AA (math added 3, but because of the combination of Self Development into one area there was a 1 unit reduction), making the new Local AA 27 units as opposed to 25. The Information Competency requirement will be kept at this time, but Librarians across the district are still in conversation about this competency. The committee will be finishing Area 7 courses in the coming week. Another upcoming conversation is whether Ethnic Studies will stay in the American History and Institutions area or if there should be an Ethnic Studies area. Another task will be to finalize the curriculum handbook. Lastly, work to finalize Area 1B, Oral Communications, Critical Thinking, and Area 2 which is the Mathematical Concepts area means some movement will be necessary.</p> <p>Todd Windisch asked Jeramy to briefly discuss, how or Local AA will compare to Canada and Skyline. Jeramy said that both are keeping the self development and physiology requirement, so we will all have an Area 7. We are only to have an American History and Institutions (AHI) requirement in the Local AA. Skyline has AHI as a graduation requirement but are currently trying to decide if they should keep that requirement, turn it into an area in the Local AA or eliminate it altogether. Canada doesn't have AHI at all. It is currently the American History and Institutions requirement that will differentiate the Local AAs at our three colleges.)</p>	Jeramy Wallace	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (The committee has not met since 11/8.	Jennifer Howze-	~2:58pm	Information

	They have been finalizing the on-line handbook. An upcoming topic of import concerns accreditation and the ACCJC rubric which will be used for evaluation of distance ed courses. That conversation will happen in a future Senate meeting. A collaboration call-out was requested for an evaluation work group that will be formed to discuss how the on-line DE rubric will be used. The 12/6 DEAC, 12/10 Senate, and work group will have discussions concerning the rubric.)	Owens	3 min	
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (The committee met Monday, 11/25. They reviewed feedback from the 10/9 Flex Day. They also got approval on session proposals for 1/10 Flex Day. They also started working on one of their goals of taking professional development needs that kept coming up in Program Review and deciding how to leverage or meet the needs exhibited. In their next meeting they will be evaluating their existing Institutional Learning Outcomes process and getting suggestions on how to improve. Todd Windisch also brought up the SLO work group due to its relationship to CLT and the ILO process. The work group is meeting bi-weekly (Todd Windisch, Daniel Keller, Susan Khan, Madeline Murphy, and a couple of people from PRE) and others are still welcome to join.)	Susan Khan	~3:01pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (The student representative said that they have nothing for the remainder of the semester, but they are starting to plan for the next semester.)	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet	~3:04pm 3 min	Information

2.6	<p>Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Leo Cruz will be joining us in our next meeting for an update on Dual Enrollment. Maggie de Vera asked about how to bring the information that she received from her listserv. Todd Windisch asked that she decide what is important and to feel free to forward the information to him for dispersment and/or inclusion in the Senate newsletter. Maggie said that most refers to part-time faculty and Todd said he will help her filter appropriately.)</p> <p>No further reports)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Christy Baird & Beth LaRochelle ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Jennifer Howze-Owens ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liason: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera 	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:07pm 3 min	Information
3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?

3.1	<p>Resolution to Support Students Affected by Ongoing Conflict in the Middle East (Note: The title of the resolution on the agenda is different from the final title on the document. In the paper copy distributed in the meeting there was a spelling error in the result statement, but in the on-line version the correction had been made.</p> <p>Before giving the floor to Elinor Westfold and Robbie Baden, Todd Windisch reminded the Senate that we had previously discussed this item, it was brought back to committee where all feedback was considered and some was implemented while some was not with consideration to the spirit of the resolution. He reminded the Senate that the resolution being presented is a final draft and that the hope is that the discussion today will be less about individual words and wordsmithing and more about the acceptance of the resolution as we bring it to a vote. He reminded Senators that if the resolution contained language which was unsatisfactory, then it should be brought up and a motion could be made to adjust it, but the goal is to keep discussion to a minimum and to voice opinions about unsatisfactorily stated ideals by voting no on the resolution. Todd also noted that the printed version has one issue with a line that wasn't correctly converted to PDF, but the on-line version through the agenda is fine. Elinor read the portion so everyone would know where the issue was so everyone would be aware of the intended wording.</p> <p>Elinor felt there were some specific adjustments that we had discussions about the resolution, though it was hard to tell exactly where there were issues because there was no vote and a lot of discussion. The following were some of the points Elinor felt needed to be addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “affirmed” was kept in the resolution, despite objections from the Senate ● In the 3rd resolved is where the PDF conversion issue was, and Elinor read that from her copy so everyone was aware of the wording, “...the College San Mateo Academic Senate recognizes the value of diverse perspectives and experiences in enriching our campus community and affirms...” the “like all our students” was added based on feedback from the Senate. ● In the 2nd resolved, a Senator had requested the addition of Iran, and that was added. ● In the 2nd to last resolved, “trauma informed conversations” was added in addition to anti-racism and anti-semitism based on the discussion in Senate. ● Removed the reference to Susan Khan’s office from the 2nd to last resolve 	Elinor Westfold & Robbie Baden	~3:10pm 20 min	Action
-----	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	--------

<p>Wendy Whyte asked if the students polled the student body when writing the resolution. Simon Htet was asked if they polled before writing and developing the resolution. He said that they did not, but are planning to poll now. Wendy continued to have issue with student resolution, especially around Hamas and Hezbollah and clarity on blame for the Gazans not getting their aid. She also seemed concerned as to whether any of the elected students in the Student Senate had campaigned on this information, and Todd said he doubted it since it was drafted by the previous administration. She noted that there is a lot of hard work in the resolution, but she is just having a hard time accepting the resolution because of the Student Resolution. Todd validated that we do reference the student resolution and if that is contentious for Wendy, then that is fair. Wendy and Todd further clarified the contention is whether we wish to actually “affirm” the student resolution, or just stay on our own. Wendy’s main objection is with affirming the student resolution because it is unpolled</p> <p>Susan Khan is curious about SWANA (Southwest Asian and North African) disaggregation. Elinor clarified that is a US census category addition. It is added to get more info about this population. Skyline is adding to their disaggregation and have already started talks with their PRE department, so the committee thought that it should be added in our resolution as well.</p> <p>Robbie Baden Motion & Kim de Vera 2nd. Roll call vote with student representative and two voting members of Senate abstaining and 13 votes in favor. The resolution was passed.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Draft Resolution			
---	--	--	--

3.2	<p>Program Review Subcommittee Update: Staggered Timeline (Daniel Keller explained that this will be a two part process for reconfiguring and improving Program Review. They are attempting to have staggered reviews, not trying to do all at once. The reviews being done in IPC are getting a lot of feedback about not being done correctly, but he feels it is the job of the Division deans to let their faculty know that the reviews haven't been done correctly. In addition, with the change to the Nuventive software, having to train fewer people initially to use the new program will be easier. The information shared today is in draft form put together by Natalie Alizaga. When Daniel saw it, he agreed and wanted to bring it to the Senate for review. They know there may be omissions and would like this kind of feedback. There has already been feedback from Matt Montgomery about some omissions with regards to Library Studies.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera asked if this is all programs are represented. They are and they are grouped by the Deans who have purview.</p> <p>KAD is kinesiology, athletics, and dance clarified for WendyWhyte.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens wondered about Distance Education. Todd was aware that it is missing, Matt had noticed and informed and Todd changed digital copy. Daniel will make sure that he will check again to make sure that everyone that submitted a program review this year is included before the final draft is created. Jennifer also wanted to clarify if the process will this still be called the Great Read. Would this be an opportunity for the DE to get the information they need as in an aggregated form? Todd and Daniel feel it will be up to PRIE. Todd feels that this will help because PRIE's load will be lightened due to having less programs under review at one time. Jennifer also wants to know if the new software, Nueventive, will have an impact on program review, but it shouldn't says Todd because it is just changing where you type in the information.</p> <p>Daniel added that the forms will more tailored to the programs. In addition, there will hopefully be more options for how to assess the SLOs. English has tried to assess the SLOs by using TrakDat to track the assessment of the SLOs, but it didn't seem to be effective. They hope to have a workshop in the Fall and make changes to improve the process.</p>	Daniel Keller & Natalie Alizaga	~3:30pm 15 min	Discussion
-----	--	---------------------------------	-------------------	------------

Todd reminded the Senate that we are looking for feedback today and the final version will be brought back at some point to the Senate for a vote. The programs on specific cycles are still changeable, but eventually that will be voted on. At some point we will need to decide if we vote on the schedule and the forms together or do each separately, but that is for a later discussion.

Brandon asked a question about how new programs would be put into the existing schedule as they arise. The assumption made by Todd is that they would be put into the cycle with other programs in their division, even if that meant that they wouldn't do a program review for three years because they'd just missed their review window upon inception. Likewise, if a program didn't have enough information to do a program review, they may just skip their first review. Todd added that there is also a discussion at the Administrative level of starting to require administrative program review. Those aren't listed either, so they'd have to be able to be added since the process will be improving and growing over time.

Natalie Aligaza arrived and Jennifer re-asked her question about the aggregated data needed for Distance Education. DE issue needs aggregated data instead of disaggregated, but could the DE ask for the data in the way that they need it. Natalie believes that Monique would be able to adjust her code to handle the DE request as long as the request was made far enough in advance. The other issue might be if data is needed for the term in progress or just ending.

Makiko Ueda pointed out some outdated names. Todd took notes and will make changes. On the agenda some of the changes Makiko pointed out had already been made. Natalie explained how they'd changed it, and Makiko said that still didn't accurately describe the services. Since the Dean had requested there will be follow-up. Email Todd, Daniel, or Natalie if there are further changes needed.

Skyline model instead of having all programs in one go, they scatter them. The current VPI doesn't favor that model because she feels that the scatter would allow less robust discussions in the Division meetings. There may be conversations surrounding combination of program services reviews. Todd likes the idea of keeping the divisions

together, and the deans don't feel it would be a problem. Wendy Whyte thinks maybe it would burden the deans by having them all together. Natalie said that Dean Walker said it wouldn't be different than it is currently and it should be fine. The dean counsel will be consulted. The deans were consulted about check off on completion correctly and they were behind that. Matt Montgomery questioned, about the cost curves and if there would be different forms based on the report needed, and whether student services would be different in different context. Natalie feels that the learning communities should decide whether the program reviews should do these as instructional, but conversations will need to be initiated to figure out details for some specialized programs. Jennifer circling back to standardization of the forms and how they don't apply to some people. Daniel said that they are hoping to have different forms for different people and hopefully Skyline and Canada will have forms that can be adapted. Todd added that timelines will be tight now that Nueventive was adopted and will need those forms earlier than originally thought. Susan Khan asked about approval of forms from Senate and we will since in is 10+1. Natalie discussed the timelines for CTE programs which have a 2-year cycle of check-ins which are accommodated in our current model. The 4-year cycle will be the comprehensive version like we are currently doing with the 2-year check-in being a short one-page summary of major changes, impacts of resource requests, how the program is doing, and what might be needed. This will help with program review and accreditation. Todd mentioned admin review. Natalie said it has gone to Cabinet, but isn't sure when they will official decide. With all college goals and EMPs it makes sense for the offices to state goals and how they are working to meet those goals. Natalie is working on the ICER and it asks about these type of goals, and this is why there is interest in creating admin review. Todd says it also helps in times of turnover and transition.

There is not formal vote, but the temperature of the room was taken. The room seemed to feel OK with the draft. Natalie welcomes any updates or changes, but she said that they have staggered things like EOPS and CARES with ONTRACK, and Math Resource Center and math department reviews, and Communication Study Center and Communication Studies, so that no one is burdened, but nothing is set in stone yet. Todd invited feedback until we see it as an action item.)

- [Draft Staggered Timeline](#)

3.3	<p>Approval of Faculty Resource Request Prioritization (A quick check of the numbers showed that voter 106 may have additional feedback.</p> <p>What is the feedback on the process? Maggie de Vera was concerned that the process was imbalanced because the Communications did a presentation, and when you look at the numbers it is obvious that it made an impact. Maggie couldn't be at the last meeting and would have had a different opinion on how we did the process. Todd heard Maggie's concern and would like to discuss more for the next Fall. Kim Salido thought that maybe a video presentation might be a good idea. Daniel Keller said they had discussed that, and Todd added that we thought it might add too much work. Robbie Baden felt that adding the videos might add too much additional work load or that some people might have greater skills than others in making presentations to sway the vote. Matt Montgomery said that the link Maggie provided was really nice to see the details more easily. Jeramy Wallace would like to see more discussion in Senate so everyone can discuss and hear the concerns present. Todd said that the Senate may be biased because some people on Senate might have more input than others that couldn't come and present. Emily Cotla agrees with Jeramy. Emily wonders if there is a disproportional representation in Senate, and if that would effect the Senate prioritization. Todd said that Skyline has a representation committee and deans present to them and there are complaints. Robbie liked the anonymity of the process. Jeramy wondered if there should be a prioritization of a program that is thriving, but is asking to replace a faculty member so that we aren't forced to fight over who gets the new hires in a random way. Todd responded to Jeramy and said that he could potentially set up a meeting with Manuel where Jeramy could present this case. Jennifer Howze-Owens felt that ranking was confusing since we don't know how many will be granted. There is a focus on certain divisions, and so how should ranking be prioritized. Todd said that we really don't know what ranking is good or bad, and that may be better than knowing. Todd addressed the prioritization using our list, and we tried not to be as prescriptive to differentiate our voice from the administration; we shouldn't have to have the same focus. Sarah Artha Negara asked Kajari Burns if their division had only classified because she didn't see anything from their Kinesiology and wanted to know why they weren't included. Todd said we didn't do classified prioritization because there were so many in addition to what we did. Susan Khan asked about full time to part time ratio and our compliance. Robbie Baden noted that the ratios are important and as we jockey for hires, this is important. Maggie added</p>	Todd Windisch	~3:45pm 40 min	Action
-----	--	---------------	-------------------	--------

<p>that we are on the wrong side of the required numbers; overall we are more part time than full time. Sarah said that it must be challenging to run a program without a full-time faculty member and that added context.</p> <p>We will now begin the discussion of the rankings. Two members of Senate had some updates to their ranking that needed to be dealt with and Todd needed to reopen the Spreadsheet so we took a break.</p> <p>We then experienced another slight delay in our meeting due to Zoom bombers posting inappropriate content and loud noise. We took a longer break to attempt to deal with the issue.</p> <p>From the spreadsheet the top 5 are: Communications, General Counselor, CIS, and Nursing. Then there is Addiction Studies, Film Faculty, Art, Photography, Learning Disabilities Specialist, and Coastside Academic Counselor. There was some confusion between Coastside Counselor and Position 2 which was the Undocumented Community Center/Coastside Counselor.</p> <p>Then there are:</p> <p>There is one tie between nursing and addiction studies so there needs to be some discussion and then a tie breaker.</p> <p>Jeremy Wallace added that we shouldn't have to add in anything that we MUST have. Maggie de Vera said that as the director of the Addiction Studies program, she is working 30-50 hours a week and getting paid for only 1.5 hours per week. She says it isn't sustainable; the urgency to get a full-time hire is grave, she doesn't feel that she will be able to stay. There is an urgency for her position because she is not sure she can continue. No one seems to be sure about whether the nursing hire is required to meet accreditation or just a want item.</p> <p>Jeremy Wallace Motions & Emily Cotla 2nd to prioritize the Addiction Studies over Nursing. Roll call vote with 11 votes in favor and 2 abstentions. That puts Addiction Studies in 4th place.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>One more vote will be needed to send our vote. Do we want to say anything else when we send this?</p> <p>Matt Montgomery asked where people will sit in the Coastside facility. Todd said that there will be a pod added to help house the faculty. Jeremy feels it is premature to staff the Coastside facility because we don't know how many students are over there. Todd feels this is a reason that we should discuss this before voting. Jeremy would like the feedback about the need for a full-time Coastside faculty member needed with the current unknown. We will also add that we shouldn't have to vote for prioritization of any positions that are required for accreditation or for any other mandated reason.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte Motion & Jennifer Howze-Owens 2nd. Roll call vote passed with 13 affirmed.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss rankings and/or questions for the group • Add language to contextualize prioritizations for Cabinet • Vote to approve Academic Senate prioritizations to forward to Cabinet 			
--	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures

No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (Maggie de Vera added that her ice cream shop is open.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President / Faciliator	~4:25pm 5 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:28)	President / Facilitator	N/A	Procedure