

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2021-2022

<p>Date: Friday, October 22, 2021 Time: 12:00 pm Location: Zoom</p>	<p>Members Present: Aimee Maclennan, Ākea Kiyuna, Alma Cremer, Anne Chung, Brenda Watanabe, Camille Hernandez, Caroline Naguwa, Carrie Butler, Carrie Mospens, Cheryl Pavel, Christine Quintana, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher, Debbie Weeks, Deseree Salvador, Donala Kawaauhau, Donna De Silva, Donna Madrid, Drew Kapp, Glenn-Dee Kuwaye, Gordon Ching, Grace Funai, Harold Fujii, Janet Smith, Jeanne Batallones, Jennifer Sims, Jesna Nissam, Kaleopono Quintana, Kanoe Lambert, Kapena Landgraf, Karen Crowell, Kate De Soto, Kenoalani Dela Cruz, Kristine Kotecki, Kuulei Kanahale, Larissa Leslie, Laurel Gregory, Leanne Urasaki, Lisa Fukumitsu, Lissandra Baldan Jenkins, Luria Namba, Luzviminda Miguel, Mari Giel, Meidor Hu, Michelle Phillips, Neva Supe-Roque, Noel Tagab-Cruz, Pamela Scheffler, Pele Kaio, Renee AK Dela Cruz, Reshela DuPuis, Robyn Kalauli, Sam Giordanengo, Sandra Claveria, Sharon Dansereau, Susie Dill, Tamera Loveday, Tanya Dean, , Toni Cravens Howell, Wailani Walker</p>
<p>Call to Order: 12:03 pm By: Toni Cravens Howell Mins: Aimee Maclennan</p>	<p>Guests: Tiffany Naea</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>1. Ascertain quorum</p>	<p>Meeting called to order by Vice Chair Toni Howell Cravens at 12:07 pm with 44 Senators (including least 3 Executive Committee members) in attendance.</p>		
<p>2. Roll Call and Introductions / Guest</p>	<p>No roll call taken due to sufficient number of members in attendance. Attendance recorded via Zoom enrollment.</p>		
<p>Announcements</p>			
<p>3. Approval of the Minutes</p>	<p>Approval of the September 24, 2021 Minutes (Att. 1) Motion to approve the September 24, 2021 Minutes (McDaniel/Urasaki)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comment: There is a correction required in the old business section under the DE Committee. The minutes currently say that 	<p>Motion to approve Sept 24, 2021 minutes with amendment to the</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>there is no representative from humanities for the DE committee. In the oral report, it was mentioned that the humanities representative for the DE committee is Akea Kiyuna.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve the minutes with the correction above (DuPuis/Cremer) • Vote: 34 Yay, 0 Nay, 2 Abstentions 	<p>old business section carried.</p> <p>Minutes approved with minor revisions.</p>	
<p>4. Senate Chair Report</p>	<p>1) Administrative response to request for support on Tenure P.I.G.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed last meeting that the Senate would reach out to the Administration and request support for the tenure process, responding to the P.I.G report. The Chancellor has responded to the request for support and a link to the Chancellor’s Report can be found in the agenda. • The Chancellor’s report mentions that they do accept tenure as a robust and important process within the college, but they are unable to testify at the BOR meeting. They do encourage the faculty to read the P.I.G report and to testify at the upcoming BOR meeting. • The BOR meeting was October 21 and there were 32 members of faculty and staff across System that stepped up to testify. There was also an interesting report from Jessica regarding the findings and recommendations from the tenure PIG committee. <p>2) QFE Committee and Budget Committees across the system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair Tsugawa was looking into what types of budget committees exist throughout the system in terms of Faculty Senate. • Comment –QFE is the quality focus essay on the institutional effectiveness and budget allocation process. The QFE committee are currently looking at making revisions and redesigning the process and will put forth the redesign to the campus next semester. The committee is looking at different budget issues that stem from the focus groups that we had earlier in the spring. They are looking at shared governance in 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>the budget process and are talking to sister campuses to see how they incorporate that into their budget processes. An email went out about a town hall meeting regarding this process so faculty are able to provide their opinions and feedback to the committee. If you are unable to attend the meeting, a Google document will also be sent out so that everyone's input can be collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The town hall meeting will be Thursday October 28 from 3-5. This is an opportunity to combine our thoughts and move this process forward. Ken will be offering workshops (please check your email) in order to educate faculty and staff on the budget: how the budget works and how you can request funding to purchase resources. Ken will also discuss individual program budgets. The first session is Friday Nov 5 from 1-3. The second session will be Friday Nov 12. <p>3) AP 9.4XX review requests due 11/4/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Policy regarding minors (under 18) on campus is currently being created. Discussions involving this policy include how to comply with State and Federal background checks when working with minors. This would impact those who teach early college courses. There is a rough draft of the policy linked in the agenda. There is a request for comments and feedback from the faculty on this policy, due 11/4/21. <p>4) Requests from Registrar's Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a request for feedback from the Registrar's office regarding the participation/verification survey. Within our department and Senate, a long list of thoughts and issues have already been discussed. Please take advantage of this survey and provide your input. <p>5) UH/UHCC Shared Governance Survey</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UH and UHCC have sent out a Google form survey regarding shared governance. Please submit input and feedback about your experiences with shared governance using the form. <p>6) ACCFSC “Statement Regarding Permitted Interaction Group Report on Tenure Resolution 21-06 – BOR Testimony</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BOR testimony regarding the tenure P.I.G is attached in the agenda. • There was a meeting with the ACCFCS today and there was a good discussion about the Tenure PIG resolution. Members of the Senate are being strongly encouraged to read the resolution. Everyone should be informed and be an active part of the faculty in this discussion. <p>7) From College Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chancellor’s Report at College Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ During College Council, the Chancellor reported that there is data available from three sources so that we can make informed decisions and objectives. The Chancellor’s report is linked in the agenda. • Other College Council Items for Senate Consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was discussion about policy HAW 5.202 to HAW 4.202; moving this policy from the purview of Academic Senate to that of College Council. • Proposal 1: Dissolve KAIAC • Proposal 2: Create CCSSE Task Force • Student Constitutional Convention – 13 students / 6 mentors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One of the goals of this convention is to write a charter for the student activities board and get it running. During the convention, the charters for student government and the publications board will also be reviewed. This is to ensure that they are both working charters that do not have problems with contradictions or misleading information/language. 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>8) ACCFSC REPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACCFC met this morning (10/22/21) • The PIG report was discussed at length • This morning an email came out from the Vice President’s office regarding the General Education Redesign proposal. This is a first reading, first draft. Make sure that you take a look at this draft and add your input and comments. • There was discussion about publishing courses on Laulima the week before classes start. System is trying to come up with a uniform date in which all courses are published in Laulima at the same time. Be looking for that survey (which should come out before our next senate meeting). <p>9) CCCFSC Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Report – concurrent meeting 10/22/21 <p>10) Vice Chair Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the charter, the Faculty Senate charter needs to be reviewed every 5 years. The Ad Hoc charter review committee consists of five faculty members and have met twice. • The committee is working through the Senate charter and has made some positive edits. They are hoping to have a first draft of the updated charter to put forward to Senate in January or February 2022. 		

<p>5. Old Business</p>	<p>1) CRC – Ku’ulei Kanahele / Grace Funai (Att. 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CRC has a sub-committee that will be looking at redesigning the proposal submission process for programs and courses in Kualii. The sub-committee is aiming to put forth a survey to Senate before the next senate meeting. They would like to bring a first reading of the proposed changes to Senate in the December meeting, this way it can be approved by January and in effect for spring. They are anticipating a Kualii migration for spring as well. The goal is for these changes to occur simultaneously. Kualii may be shut down in December to implement the changes. If you are anticipating to put forward a proposal for fall 2023, don’t submit it through Kualii, due to the migration.• Question – CRC is a two-year process? Answer – CRC is a 1-year process. Sometimes things take longer, like if you are proposing a new program and a code has to be created. It can often take a long time to make a new code. In the past years, the proposals wouldn’t be approved until April/may which would increase the time it would take to get approval.• The goal is to make this process go faster so that all courses will be able to go in April/May implemented in the fall semester.• System wants the course to be available a year in advance. With the rushed proposals, courses may be treated as a “soft -launch”.• At the last Senate meeting, there was a very good discussion about whether or not this process of submitting curriculum for change could double as the assessment for 20% review. We left that meeting not sure if the intent of that discussion was to form a sub-committee of CRC or an AdHoc Committee of Faculty. Where can we continue that discussion? Can we request for an AdHoc committee or a task force through academic Senate?• Comment – if CRC reviews a proposal just for the modifications, the assumption by anyone looking at the proposal later is that the proposal is as clean as can be. This is why CRC is asking if expectation upon them is if they (CRC) should look at the entire proposal, or just what’s being modified?		
------------------------	--	--	--

	<p>Motion to create a task force to discuss the scope of the CRC’s review of proposals. (Wilcox-Boucher/Miguel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Question: Is the 20% a goal in your rubric to consider that the curriculum proposal is reviewed? Answer – the 20% review is part of the course review policy that, every 5 years, the course is reviewed to confirm that it still covers the content listed in its description. This is usually done at the department level ○ Question – if we vote in favor of a task force being formed, who is going to comprise it? CRC members? Senate members? Answer – We are looking for Senate members and some CRC members, but a larger group beyond just the CRC. • Vote: 36 Yay, 2 nay, 5 abstentions <p>2) DE – Leanne Urasaki (Att. 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DE committee received policy HAW 5.200 (Distance Education) from EPC for review. The DE will review the policy and send it back to EPC (who will bring it to Senate for voting if there are changes to be made for that policy). • There was an issue brought to the committee about proctoring and discrepancies among the HawCC testing centers. They are going to take the discussion of this issue to the VCAA because she oversees one of the testing centers (Hale Kea). • The DE has split themselves into two working groups to discuss the best practices and the possible creation of an evaluation form for synchronous online classes, as well as reviewing and revision of the form that is currently used for asynchronous online classes. • The DE wants to provide some support to faculty and have started holding IE meetups. The meetups are watch parties facilitated by DE, where an innovative educator video is presented then discussion about the video is held. Eight faculty members attended the last meetup. 	<p>Motion to create a task force to discuss the scope of CRC’s review of proposals carried.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>3) EPC – Lisa Fukumitsu (Att. 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EPC met on Oct 5, 2021 with 6 members in attendance• They continue to review HAW 5.254 (curriculum review process) and have been requested by the VCAA to review HAW 5.200 (distance education). As mentioned, this was forwarded to the DE committee.• They reviewed policy HAW 5.650 (time limits on credits earned) and marked it as reviewed with no changes. Because it was not changed, we do not need to vote on this in new business.• Comment – I think the Senate still has to adopt that approval of the policy that was accepted without changes. <p>4) FPC - Alma Cremer / Neva Supe-Roque (Att. 5-8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FPC looked at policy HAW 9.204 (student’s course evaluations of instructional faculty and lecturers). The original policy had language regarding eCafe, which has since changed to CES. The updated policy also continued to state eCafe, so the policy needs some revision to include CES. FPC will be looking at this policy at their next meeting• Other policies that they are reviewing are 9.205, and 9.104. <p>5) GEC – Kenoalani Dela Cruz / Kapena Landgraf (Att. 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GEC met October 4 and 18. There are courses up for renewal that will need to be voted on in new business: ART 101, CHEM 100L, ENG 204, and ENG 255. ART 101 and CHEM 100L will be up for a tentative 1-year approval because they need to have a closing the loop assessment.• GEC would like to recommend changes to some of the in-person and online course syllabi guidelines. They think that in AY 2022-2023, they could implement some sort of change where syllabi require CLOs and course descriptions, but also foundations and diversification hallmarks. This way students are informed about what they will be learning in the class. It was noted that other committees already have committee-specific syllabi language that is provided to instructors in the syllabus		
--	---	--	--

	<p>template. GEC is determining how they would go about bringing up this discussion if changes to the syllabi language were to be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: This was approved by the DCs in 2017 and that came out of accreditation. There is a standard that talks about course information and, at that time, we thought it would be good to have the guidelines online. The DCs got together to post the content of the syllabus template online. It would be appropriate to go through the DCs to edit this document (the syllabus template).• Comment – Isn't the designation information already on the class availability lists and on STAR? Shouldn't the students already know what they are signing up for? Answer – The class availability lists the course and designation alpha, but it does not clarify what they should anticipate on learning.• Comment - I don't know if adding this information to my syllabus would make that much of a difference because this information can be found elsewhere.• Comment – The syllabus should be more of an executive summary. The bigger the syllabus is, the less likely that the students will be able to get all of the important information. I would shy away from adding more information to the syllabus. <p>6) HAP – No'el Tagab-Cruz (Att. 10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is one designated class up for renewal. HAP is hoping to present that in the November Academic senate meeting. They are still in support of HWST 101 and ART 111.• Starting next semester, they are starting to issue a HAP survey to students and faculty to see how they can make the HAP process better. <p>7) WI – Sharon Dansereau</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no items up for Senate Approval today• Committee is discussing college and system-level issues.• Comment – At a previous position, my labs were designated as WI. I was told this wouldn't work at the community college because there is an		
--	---	--	--

	<p>English requirement on top of the usual English requirement that may knock someone off track when taking the WI-designated lab alongside the English lecture. Reply – There’s no extra English requirement. The requirement is just English 100, which must be taken before taking the WI. Across the system, applying for the WI to the labs has been a popular place to attain a WI credit.</p> <p>8) Sustainability - Drew Kapp / Kristine Kotecki (Att. 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sustainability Committee approved a new class for sustainability designation: HWST 105 (Hawaiian plants). This will go up for vote in new business. The committee believes that, based on the application, this course meets the criteria of the sustainability designation. They recommend that senate approve the course for the sustainability designation. <p>9) UHPA BOD update – Sam Giordanengo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PIG report; there are still a lot of unknowns that are happening. Many people from our own Faculty wrote in and/or provided testimony to the BOR. It is disappointing that admin chose to state that they were unable to participate in testifying, as other colleges’ Admin did provide testimony on behalf of their college.• This is not yet over. There are forces with in legislature and the BOR that truly do not see the benefit of Tenure. Most of these members are from the business community and the idea of tenure goes against everything that they like about business.• Comment– I think this is a larger problem than it appears. We need to be a lot more aggressive in informing individuals what tenure is and why it is so important for our society to have. Reply - Christian wrote several very good editorials that actually made it into the newspaper. It wouldn’t hurt for us to create an informational document to supplement the work of Christian. Tenure does not allow an administrator to say “you may not teach this thing”. If you are the expert in the classroom, no one should be telling you how to teach your content.		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A memo was released on Monday that stated termination proceedings are to begin January 2022 if you have not been vaccinated. Then, System HR rebutted and said that this was still in discussion. Many individuals interpreted these events as UHPA either taking a stance a regarding vaccinations or becoming anti-mandate. This is untrue, and UHPA has not brought any lawsuits, nor do they intend on bringing forward any lawsuits against the Governor or anyone else. • UHPA is wanting to negotiate with UH and gain clarification regarding System’s intentions of the vaccination mandate. Christian Fern said he wants the union to be included in the vaccine mandate discussions. • Question – This does not apply to people with medical or religious exemptions, correct? Answer - As of right now, UH is not accepting these exemptions. Also, according to UH’s official form, they can accept the exemption and then decide to decline it. • Question: Is there a way for UHPA to come and talk about these two issues themselves? It would be invaluable to have them here to talk to us face to face. <p>10) GE Redesign Update – Sam Giordanengo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please read this report. Nothing is 100%. We are in the phase where we collect feedback and comments on the document. This is going to be a long process (3 years), as all of the colleges must agree with the implementation of this program. 		
<p>6. New Business</p>	<p>1) Committee Proposals for Senate Vote</p> <p>a) CRC Proposals Motion vote on the CRC proposals as one block for vote (DuPuis/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>none</i> • Vote: <i>31 yay, 0 nay, 6 abstain</i> 	<p>Motion to vote on the CRC proposals as a block carried.</p>	

	<p>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals (Weeks/Gregory)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Comment: As we consider doing block votes in the future there have been concerns that, at Academic Senate, things are rubber stamped and pushed through. The intention of bringing proposals through Senate is that there are an extra set of eyes on the proposals in order to ensure that it is holistically reviewed. For time-sake, it is nice to block vote on these proposals, but it may be nice to reconsider block voting for proposals to ensure that we are doing our due-diligence.○ Comment – Remember, we can always isolate specific portions of the block to vote on individually.○ Comment – Maybe the committees can consider making the blocks smaller and more manageable, as this current block is huge.○ Comment – We used to have a separate meeting toward the end of the Academic Senate calendar, where we could look more closely at the proposals to be voted on. Sometimes the proposals were split and sent out to departments for extra review. I believe that the CRC committee is doing a great job and that they put in a lot of time and effort into their committee meetings, and evaluate their proposals thoroughly.○ Comment: I want to support what was said above, but we need to recognize the volume of proposals coming through CRC for review (close to 100). Most of these proposals are organized and there has been a very logical organization and presentation to the Senate. I understand the problems with the blocking and that it is a difficult thing to go through this.○ Comment – As we review our Senate charter, a section discusses presence at meetings. In the past, the charter says that a Senator must be present in person or Polycom, so that a person whose document is included in the agenda must be present at the meeting. We may need to look at this moving forward.○ Comment – The CRC policy is currently being reviewed by the	<p>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals carried.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Ed-Policy committee. This may be a good thing to incorporate in the CRC policy. Do these proposals need to go to Academic Senate or can we treat this like WI where we trust the committee to do their due diligence and then bypass the Senate approval?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comment – I think these proposals should always come to Senate. I feel that Admin is always trying to take away our control over academics and I think that this should stay in Senate. The block voting began because, historically, the Senate would take an extremely long time to vote on a single proposal (upwards of 45 minutes). It is the expectation that Senators read these proposals before the Senate meeting. If someone has an issue with a particular proposal, we pull it and vote on it separately. The block voting was brought forth to move things along during the Senate meetings. ○ Comment (from chat) – CRC committee members are not elected so there should always be Senate approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote: 31 Yay, 1 nay, 10 abstentions <p><u>b) GEC Proposals</u> Motion to vote on the GEC proposals as a block vote (Weeks/Cremer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comment – GEC wants to reiterate that the CHEM 100L and ENG 255 course renewal proposals, are a 1-year acceptance so the courses can close assessment. ENG 204 and Eng 255 would be approval for 5 years. • Vote: 30 yay, 0 nay, 1 abstention 	<p>Motion to vote on the GEC proposals as a block carried.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Motion to approve the GEC proposals as a block (Weeks/McDaniel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>40 yay, 0 nay, 1 abstention</i> <p><u>c) Sustainability Proposal</u></p> <p>Motion to approve the sustainability proposal for HAW 105 (Weeks/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>38 yay, 0 nay, 2 abstentions</i> <p><u>d) EPC Proposal Review</u></p> <p>Motion to approve the EPC review of HAW 5.650 with no changes (Walker/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>30 yay, 0 nay, 7 abstentions</i> <p>2) First reading and discussion regarding the changing of policy 5.202 to 4.202 from the purview of Academic Senate to College Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senator Reshela Dupuis provided a thorough explanation of this policy as well as its history. • Comment – Please note that this is the first reading of this document. • Question - Is there a place where faculty can include their comments and opinions regarding this matter? Answer – Senate has the ability to ask for a deferment of this vote until faculty input can be collected. <p>Motion for Chair Tsugawa to request College Council’s deferment of this vote until Senate has more time to read and discuss Policy 5.202 and its change in housing from within Academic Senate to that of College Council. (Giordanengo/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>28 yay/1 nay/1 abstention</i> 	<p>Motion to approve the block of GEC proposals carried.</p> <p>Motion to approve HAW 105 for sustainability designation carried.</p> <p>Motion to approve EPC review of HAW 5.650 with no changes carried.</p> <p>Motion to request the deferment of College Council’s vote regarding policy 5.202 carried.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>3) Dissolution of KAIAC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment – KAIAC is currently a standing committee of the College Council, which means it has certain transparency and reporting requirements. What they have proposed instead of standing committee (CCSSEE) is the formation of a shorter-term task force of volunteers. <p>Motion for Chair Tsugawa to request College Council’s deferment of the vote for the dissolution of KAIAC. (Kawaahau/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>23 yay, 0 nay, 4 abstention</i> <p>4) Creation of CCSSEE Task Force within College Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Mary Washington was our institutional analysis and policy person for the college. Who takes over those duties and responsibilities? <p>Motion for Chair Tsugawa to request College Council’s deferment to vote for the creation of CCSSEE task force, on the grounds that the two proposals (formation of CCSSEE and dissolution of KAIAC) are very closely linked and should be decided together. (DuPuis/Supe-Roque)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>None</i> • Vote: <i>22 yay, 0 nay, 6 abstentions</i> <p>Motion to extend meeting until 2:30 (Walker/Wilcox Boucher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <i>none</i> • Vote: <i>19 yay, 0 nay, 3 abstentions</i> 	<p>Motion to request deferment of College Council’s vote regarding the dissolution of KAIAC carried.</p> <p>Motion to request deferment of College Council’s vote regarding creation of CCSSEE task force carried.</p> <p>Motion to extend the current meeting until 2:30 carried.</p>	
<p>7. For the good of the Order</p>	<p>1) CES Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neva Supe-Roque provided presentation on the CES system and all of its updates its updates to the Senate. <p>2) Food Distribution</p>		

Academic Senate Meeting
10-22-2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food Distribution at the Manono Campus front parking lot on Tuesday, 10/26/21 at 12noon. Volunteers, please come at 10:30am. Paper grocery bags needed. Call or text Claudia for kokua. Mahalo! 		
<p>8. Adjourn</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn (Giordanengo/ Wilcox-Boucher) Vote to adjourn: No formal vote taken. -Meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm by Vice Chair Cravens Howell -Next meeting: Friday Nov 19, 2021 12:00pm via Zoom.</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn carried. Meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm.</p>	