

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, March 24, 2:30pm - 4:30pm

Building 10-468
 1700 W. Hillsdale Boulevard, San Mateo,
 CA 94402
 Zoom
<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85146915715>

Meeting ID: 851 4691 5715

<i>Officers</i>	
President	Daniel Keller
Vice President	Rene Anderson
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Makiko Ueda

<i>Standing Senate Committee Chairs</i>	
Curriculum Committee	Malathi Iyengar
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Rene Anderson

<i>Division & Student Representatives</i>	
Student Representative	Nicholas Costello
ASLT / Library	Matt Montgomery
ASLT / Library	Susan Khan
Business/Technology	Vacant
Busin/Technology	Kimberly Salido (Zoom)
Creative Arts/Social Science	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera (Zoom/In-person)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mike Marcial
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte (Zoom)
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (absent)
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Jennifer De La Cruz
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Daniel Rhyne (Zoom)

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:35)</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 (President Keller announced the following revisions to today's agenda: The letter to CSM leadership, which was updated after discussion with faculty, remains an action item and will be considered for approval using Robert's Rules. The revised draft of the letter to district leadership (Melissa Moreno) will not be an action item, since it was not discussed with faculty. Accordingly, Item 3.2 will be an action item addressing the letter to Manuel, while Item 3.3 will be changed from an action item to a discussion item. The discussion under Item 3.3 will focus on identifying questions to ask Melissa rather than approving the letter. A motion was made to approve today's agenda by Tim Maxwell and it was seconded by Susan Khan. 12 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (A motion was made to approve today's consent agenda by Lee Miller and it was seconded by Matt Montgomery . 12 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.)</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"> Screening committee for dean of KAD 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Lee Miller expressed his dismay about the requirement that the faculty enter a last day of attendance for students who drop their course. He finds it a waste of time since the district already has the information of when the student drops the course.</p> <p>Tim Maxwell, speaking on behalf of Teeka James, raised a non-agenda question about the upcoming assessment forms and asked what qualifies as a program or service for</p>	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information

	<p>assessment purposes. It was explained that anything subject to program review would be considered a program or service, meaning the Writing Center would qualify, while creative writing would not be a separate program or service but rather part of English. It was acknowledged that the timeline may feel short, but this information has already been presented at Flex Day and Opening Day, and having an assessment plan in place is important for the college. President Keller added that the process should be relatively easy, noting that significant work has already been done to make the steps clear and straightforward.)</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 			
1.5	<p>Highlights and Recognition (Robbie Baden highlighted Writer’s Ruckus which is coming up April 29 at 1:30 p.m. in the Bay View Dining Room (Building 10). It is hosted each semester by the English department to celebrate outstanding student writing. Students are invited to read their work on stage for up to five minutes, including short stories, poetry, academic writing, and other creative or uncategorized work, with past events also featuring performances such as singing. Submissions and faculty nominations are currently open and are due Friday, April 10, the Friday after spring break. Faculty are strongly encouraged to nominate students. Nominations are meaningful to students even if their work is not selected. Nominees are not limited to creative writing. Attendance is flexible, and refreshments along with free books and magazines will be available. Additional information will be shared in the President’s Report.</p> <p>Lee Miller announced that the CSM Democrats are playing a major role in the next No Kings Rally on Saturday, 3/28. He noted that there is expected to be strong support and turnout and encouraged participation.</p> <p>Mike Marcial reported positive updates on college athletics, noting that the softball team remains undefeated at 26–0 and is currently ranked number one in the state after a recent win against West Valley in San Jose, highlighting the continued success of Coach Nicole Borg. He added that the softball team is playing at Monterey Peninsula today. Mike also shared that the baseball team is performing strongly, standing at 6–0 in Coast North conference play, and is playing Skyline on campus today. He encouraged attendees to stop by, enjoy the weather, and support the teams, emphasizing the overall success of both the softball and baseball programs.</p>	Public	~2:45pm 5 min	Information

	<p>Tim Maxwell shared two announcements. First, he reported that the Honors Program will be sending nine students to participate in the Bay Honors Research Symposium on May 2, which will be held at Stanford this year, and expressed pride in their achievement. Second, he announced that creative writing student Mazie Seja has published her first book, a self-published collection of poems, and will be selling it, noting the significance of this accomplishment and offering public recognition for her work.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share positive news about great things happening with our students, faculty, staff, and programs 			
2. Standing Agenda				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report</p> <p>(DAS didn't meet. Look to DAS for the DAS Resolution under the President's report. The Undocumented Students that has been passed in some form at all 3 colleges is now a resolution at the District level. It is different and we should look at it and give feedback.</p> <p>President Keller also announced that AFT is working on a workload survey specifically concerning AI and technology. More will be forth-coming after break.</p> <p>Last week's IPC meeting was very brief because many administrators and staff were pulled away to a last minute vendor meeting. As a result, only one agenda item was covered: a presentation on the social and economic mobility framework. This framework focuses on better connecting students who use services such as SparkPoint, including food support and financial advising, with employment opportunities through the Work for Others program. The framework will also help connect students with resources in their transfer pathways, with the goal of improving the overall continuum of student services. While the concept was well received, there was limited discussion on implementation, and there may be a request for a future Senate presentation. Program reviews were not discussed at the meeting. However, feedback previously shared will be compiled into a document for the divisions that submitted reviews after further IPC discussion, which will occur after spring break. The compiled feedback will be brought back to Senate for review before being distributed to the Board of Trustees.</p>	Daniel Keller	~2:50pm 5 min	Information

<p>Plenary April 9-11 in Sonoma. We won't have any opportunity to discuss this prior to Plenary, but it is linked on the Senate Website, though it is still in draft form, with another revision round expected before March 27. Faculty are encouraged to review the resolutions and share any comments or positions they would like the speaker to advocate for or against at plenary. Several notable topics were highlighted, including protecting the integrity of student course information, systemwide academic integrity in distance education with particular attention to agentic AI, proposals related to requiring in-person finals to limit AI use in online courses, and mathematics pedagogy. Additional items, such as the personal counseling center discipline list, may also be of interest. Anyone wanting more information or wishing to raise concerns is encouraged to contact President Keller. VPI forums to take place after Spring Break. Please send questions to President Keller that you feel might be important by Friday, 3/27.</p> <p>President Keller will be sending an email today regarding the upcoming VPI forums connected to the search for a new Vice President of Instruction. The forums are scheduled to take place shortly after spring break, and questions are being solicited from Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Student Senate members. Senators are invited to submit any questions they would like the VPI candidates to address by this Friday, 3/27; the deadline for collecting questions. Additional details will be included in President Keller's email.</p> <p>President Keller and Treasurer Ueda met with President Manuel to review the budget for part-time representatives serving on Academic Senate. Manuel emphasized that he fully supports having a budget for part-time Senate participation and that this is not a concern about eliminating the funding. However, it was noted that there is not a clear or well-documented process for reporting or authorization, including the fact that Manuel had not formally signed off as required. When the budget was first proposed in 2018, there was only one part-time representative, making the process simple, but participation has since grown significantly, which is positive and encouraged. As a result, the budget has increased more than originally anticipated and now needs to be revisited and clarified. Follow-up work will be done to review and formalize the process, with the understanding that funding for part-time representatives will continue and that the President Manuel is committed to addressing this.)</p>			
---	--	--	--

2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Malathi Iyengar, Curriculum Committee Chair, again discussed ongoing alignment issues related to residency policies for ADTs and certificates. She explained that because ADTs are statewide transfer pathways, the Curriculum Committee voted to change the residency policy to align with district and state practices, allowing required units to be completed anywhere in the district rather than solely at CSM. Residency requirements for certificates, however, remain under debate, and no vote has yet been taken. Malathi encouraged faculty to share their concerns through public comment, particularly at the District Curriculum Committee level. Lee Miller clarified the residency policy issue for the student representative, explaining how coursework taken across the district may apply to CSM-awarded degrees or certificates. Robbie Baden asked about district-level curriculum discussions, and Malathi responded that certificates vary widely in purpose and structure, making it important to hear a range of perspectives at the district level before determining appropriate policy.)	Malathi Iyengar	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (Jennifer Howze-Owens was absent so there was no update.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (René Anderson reported on behalf of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). CTL met recently and discussed the assessment forms required from all programs; faculty should have received an email regarding these forms, which are due in late April. The meeting also included two guest presentations. Susan Kahn visited to discuss the upcoming Flex Day session focused on celebrating improvement and building a culture of assessment, and she solicited questions and input from CTL members. In the second half of the meeting, Jennifer Howze Owens presented on behalf of the District Teaching and Learning Committee and requested feedback on the Circle of Redesign workshop series, which took up the remainder of the meeting.)	Natalie Alizaga, Rene Anderson	~3:01pm 3 min	Information
2.5	Student Representative Report (Nicholas Costello, our new student representative, introduced himself. He introduced himself as a 2 nd year Engineering student, the Advocacy Board vice chair, President of Y2K, and a Promise and Honors student. The Senate members introduced themselves to Nicholas. Nicholas didn't have anything to share because he hadn't met with the advisors Aaron and Fauzi, so he didn't yet know what to discuss. As the vice chair of the Advocacy Board, he and some other representatives will be going to Washington DC on April 18 th	Nicholas Costello	~3:04pm 3 min	Information

<p>to meet with with legislators. Lee clarified something that had come up with the CSM Democrats club concerning the Chancellor meeting with the athletes. Nicholas confirmed that this was true and it is the first time this will have happened. It is his understanding that this is a Q&A session to help the students understand what is happening in the District. Nicholas added that this meeting will be open to the public as well.</p> <p>Robbie Baden asked the representative if they are hearing about the class cuts and budget cuts and if the students feel like they are being informed. Robbie wondered if anyone had visited Student Senate and if they feel informed. Nicholas said that teachers have come to Student Senate, but that Aaron told the Senate that they were not to be the “mouthpiece of the of the teachers,” that the issues are more of a teachers and district level problem. The purpose of being informed was supposed to be for the Student Senate to help inform the student body and be able to answer questions that the students have about the issues. Nicholas said that students have indicated that class cancellations are an issue, in fact the math class Nicholas needs is not being offered this summer.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera sought clarification about whether the issue of class cuts is considered primarily a faculty-administration matter rather than a student issue, noting that while class reductions significantly affect students, she was unsure how student advocacy fits into the process. Student Representative Nicholas Costello responded that Student Senate’s role is to support and inform students on campus rather than directly engaging the district or mobilizing students without complete information. He emphasized that students do bring concerns forward, but Student Senate does not actively “rile up” students or speculate about potential class cuts until accurate information is available from faculty or administration.</p> <p>Maggie de Vera followed up by asking whether students are, in fact, concerned and receiving information about the issue. Nicholas confirmed that students are greatly concerned and that Student Senate communicates about the issue through weekly Bulldog Announcements, Senate meetings, the Advocacy Board, and his role as PTK president, encouraging students to discuss concerns with their instructors. Maggie reiterated that the shared goal is supporting students and ensuring they feel informed and heard.</p> <p>Lee Miller then asked whether students are advocating with administration against class cuts, to which Nicholas responded that they are and that this message is communicated</p>			
--	--	--	--

	clearly. President Keller added that student voices are often the most impactful when heard by administration and thanked Nicholas for serving in the student representative role. Nicholas concluded by noting that students frequently approach him with questions about budget cuts and related issues, such as housing and state building projects, and expressed a desire to have clear information so he can respond accurately rather than redirecting students elsewhere.)			
2.6	Other Officer & Liaison Reports (None)) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Beth LaRoche ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Mohammed Akhoirshida ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liaison: 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	Update on commencement attendance policies (The new Commencement Attendance policy was discussed at the end of last Spring. The discussion concerned how every other school in the district requires Commencement participation based on hire date and then faculty is required to participate every two years, so it ends up being even and odd years. Most faculty at CSM didn't know when their date was due to the every 3 rd year schedule, so it seems to make more sense to have a system that makes it really obvious when your year will be. Maggie de Vera asked about why the adjunct faculty is not included in the agreement. She really wanted to know why they aren't included and pay offered. The Friday, May 22 9am to 11am commencement is off-contract this year, so faculty can't be required to come. Tim Maxwell asked about the plan and if the administration believes that changing the dates will increase participation. The item will be made as an agenda item for the next meeting said President Keller. Makiko Ueda asked about how the 3 year list was created. Tim asked about coming even if it isn't a faculty member's "year." He wanted to know about the deadline for planned	Danni Redding-Lapuz	~3:10pm 20 min	Information

	<p>attendance. Danni said that she didn't know the deadline for planned attendance, and she didn't feel there was a problem to have more people to come. Maggie asked if adjunct faculty could volunteer, even without pay. Danni said that she was not sure and she would confer with Alex Guiriba before she makes a statement encouraging people to volunteer without pay and that is misconstrued. Rene Anderson was a little confused about this exchange since she thought volunteers were always welcome. Danni and President Keller emphasized that the need for further clarification about Adjunct volunteers was really about the fear of taking advantage of Adjunct's time without fair compensation. Wendy Whyte brought up a concern about insurance liability due to adjuncts being on campus when they are not teaching; Danni will make inquiries.)</p>			
3.2	<p>Revised draft of letter to CSM leadership (President Keller explained that the preamble of the letter remains unchanged from the previous meeting because there was consensus not to revise it. After meeting with a smaller group, the letter was significantly shortened and limited to four key questions, which reflect recurring concerns identified in faculty feedback on the CSM budget. While additional questions may arise during discussion, these four were seen as the most consistent and pressing issues. It was also noted that Manuel is fully aware of the conversation, has reviewed the draft letter, and has read the faculty's feedback, including strong comments about the budget. The process for considering the letter under Robert's Rules was outlined: a motion and second are required to bring the letter forward for debate, and amendments—such as adding an additional question—may be proposed, seconded, and voted on individually before final adoption.</p> <p>Some discussion about the voting. Someone asked about debate before voting. Jennifer de la Cruz raised her objections about lack of consultation from all faculty constituencies. She called out that ASLT and Counseling didn't even know about it and didn't have input. She doesn't feel it is appropriate to vote on something that didn't involve voice from all faculty. President Keller did respond that he hasn't been able to acquire an invite to the Counseling meetings until after Spring Break and that he has asked to be invited to ASLT multiple times but has heard nothing from the Division.</p> <p>Robbie Baden moved to approve the letter and Lee Miller 2nd the motion. This opened the discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer de la Cruz doesn't want to even discuss this because her division and ASLT were not consulted. She wants to be in solidarity on this topic. 	President Keller	~3:30 pm 20 min	Action

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robbie agreed with Jennifer. He wants to see all faculty in solidarity. He is willing to be of assistance in this process. • Maggie de Vera wants a clarification on timeline. President Keller said that we could make a motion to pause before. • René Anderson thanked Emily for her thoughtful contributions during the letter discussion, noting that Emily’s perspective as a counselor provided valuable insights that instructional faculty might not otherwise have. She expressed appreciation for the education and clarity Emily brought to the conversation and reaffirmed her respect for counselors as faculty. • Emily Cotla said that counselors are faculty and there doesn’t seem to be awareness. There won’t be counselors on campus during the summer. Counselors will be forced to be on campus 10 days for free this summer per their contract. They don’t feel they are being heard. Emily wants to continue the discussion about faculty verses non-instructional faculty. • Matt Montgomery invited President Keller to the next ASLT meeting on April 6 at 10am. President Keller said that they have reached out multiple times asking to come and have not been invited. • Tim Maxwell apologized for any feelings of non-inclusion due to his discussion of the 50% Law which is defined as only classroom faculty. • Makiko Ueda also said that the personal counselors have moved around to different divisions. She doesn’t feel they are being represented either. She will try to get their input. • Robbie wants to include all people’s opinion, but he feels that there is an urgency. He has a concern about the inclusion conflicting with the inclusion. He reminded us that the Senate is a representative body and the representatives are tasked to return to their constituents and solicit their feedback. • Tim wanted to point out that we need to get more feedback. President Keller said that there is the opportunity to meet with Counseling and ASLT and then add any additional feedback and then approve the letter in the meeting after Spring Break. We could make an amendment to the letter through motion, or we could fail the motion to accept the letter and wait to bring it back with more feedback. • Maggie feels that there is an urgency and feels that it might be better to amend and send now. She doesn’t feel she is sure about what others are also 			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>feeling left out. Rene said that there are many voices and classified is forming a similar letter, and we are looking at the commonality. Matt feels it is really about the two divisions that were left out, and that is why there is a problem with hard feelings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malathi Iyengar feels that there is a misconception of timelines in the concerns being expressed about the ASLT and Counseling being left out. • Emily wanted to clarify the reasoning for the letter being sent. President Keller said that we could invite him without the letter, but it is stronger to have the letter and more grounding in our upcoming conversation with the President of CSM. • Maggie asked if maybe we can ask for amendments. Emily said she wanted to wait on this letter because it isn't detrimental to wait. She doesn't want to make an amendment; she wants to wait until the feedback. • Mike Marcial said that in terms of meeting in the middle. There seems to be that a date for the final date for the input. President Keller and Lee both agreed that a date is good and the date is after the two meetings, so April 14th is a date. • President Keller will amend the language to be more inclusive. • Makiko volunteered to get feedback from personal counselors by the deadline as well. <p>Emily Cotla motioned to delay the letter for discussion until April 14th and Jennifer de la Cruz seconded the motion. 13 Yes. 0 No. 0 Abstain.</p> <p>Maggie closed with appreciation for the inclusiveness of this process.)</p>			
3.3	<p>Revised draft of letter to District leadership (</p> <p>A concise summary of the discussion:</p> <p>This item was discussed as a discussion-only item, with consensus that the letter is not yet ready for action. Senators emphasized the need to significantly narrow the draft letter to four or five focused questions, similar to the approach used in the letter to Manuel, in order to better direct attention and improve clarity. It was suggested that further discussion wait until after the letter to Manuel is finalized and any response is received.</p> <p>Several substantive concerns were raised as potential questions for a revised letter. These included the need for a more thorough and transparent accounting of district</p>	President Keller	~3:50 pm 40 min	Action

<p>finances, particularly reports that funds designated for construction may have been moved to cover other expenses. Concerns were also raised about Dual Enrollment, specifically the lack of clarity around how much CSM pays high school teachers to teach college courses when high schools may already have funds for this purpose.</p> <p>Significant discussion focused on student housing, including whether it is fully funded by the state, how much financial liability may fall on district funds, and how housing intended for students experiencing housing insecurity can be financially sustainable if funded largely through student fees. Senators questioned the lack of clear information about ongoing operating costs, bundled services, and how these expenses align with current cuts to classes and hiring.</p> <p>The issue of Free College generated extensive discussion. Some senators questioned whether offering free college to all students, including wealthy students, is fiscally responsible given current budget constraints, while others noted that free college is a “Student First” policy supported by the Chancellor and Board, that it was widely adopted during the pandemic, and that universal programs may be more cost-effective than means-testing. Concerns were raised about transparency, planning, and the impact of free college on instructional funding, especially when classes are being reduced.</p> <p>Additional concerns included the lack of transparency in how class cuts are determined, reports that deans were given percentage targets and discretion in deciding which classes to cut, and inconsistencies between stated enrollment-based criteria and actual cuts observed by faculty. Senators also expressed concern about a CSM-specific budget shortfall, questioning why CSM appears to be disproportionately impacted and noting that the issue began during a period of district oversight.</p> <p>Overall, senators emphasized that the purpose of a future letter would not be to challenge the integrity of district leadership or specific initiatives such as free college or student housing, but rather to seek clearer communication, better fiscal transparency, and meaningful faculty input into major budgetary decisions. A revised, shorter draft with targeted questions will be brought back at a future meeting.</p> <p>The back and forth recorded by the Secretary during the meeting to highlight individual contribution:</p> <p>Lee said that there needs to be a more thorough accounting because Stephen caught</p>			
--	--	--	--

something in his analysis and we should have a more thorough accounting to maybe find more. Lee was also concerned about the pay for the high school teachers in Dual Enrollment coming from CSM budget when the high schools have budget to pay for that. He wonders about these two topics. Lee also caught a discrepancy with the fully funded vs primarily funded by the State Grant. Maggie also agreed. Another problem is the discrepancy between the cost for the housing and the ability to pay for the housing for people can't afford housing in San Mateo County. Maggie asked about the accounting for the things that will be provided by the facility. She doesn't understand if we must cut back in the classes then how we are going to afford these additional costs. Lee is also concerned about the free college. He has concerns about the different student classes and if all students having free college is appropriate. Lee is also concerned about when this issue came into play. The District CFO was in charge when our problems began.

Malathi wondered if free college for all is more cost effective because it is cheaper to do than testing. President Keller clarified that we aren't questioning the integrity of the Chancellor. Lee followed up with a statement about FASFA and the ability to see who can and can't afford based on the information already provided. Maggie feels the free college issue is just about the inability to pay our bills and if we can't then we shouldn't be offering it. Tim added that the Chancellor said and it was backed up by Board member Pembrose, that the free college policy is a Student First policy and thus it is money well spent. Tim reminded us that the funding is tied. Maggie said yes, that 30% less classes for free. Susan reminded us that during the pandemic free college was adopted by many colleges. She feels that it is a big impact on people that truly can't pay for college. Susan doesn't feel that we should question free college. Nicholas asked about how the decisions are being made to cut classes. The Senate feels it is not transparent. President Keller said that the Dean Walker said it was systematic based on the enrollment patterns. There were still questions expressed by Robbie and Rene. Nicholas also feels that Free College is great because the people who are wealthy are getting benefits, but they are paying property taxes based on high property values too. Lee added... Tim added that the Chancellor said that the suspension of the hiring due to lowering property taxes and the money coming in based on that valuation and the Chancellor was off by quite several percent based on what the San Mateo County assessor said about the assessments. Tim added that there are concerns about cutbacks and what will happen when the economy is not doing well and students come

	back to take classes and there are no classes to offer.)			
--	--	--	--	--

4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (None.) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President /	~4:30pm 0 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:29)	President /	~4:30pm	Procedure