

Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium College Resource Leadership Council Business Meeting

Approved Minutes: February 20, 2020

Sheraton Cerritos, 12725 Center Court Dr. S, Cerritos, California 90703

8:30 a.m.-9:45 a.m.

Voting Members present:

- Nick Real, Cerritos Community College
- Michael Wangler, Citrus College
- Nancy Jones, Coastline Community College
- Lynell Wiggins (Alternate), Compton College
- Kathleen Reiland, Cypress College
- Kendra Madrid, East Los Angeles College
- Virginia Rapp, El Camino College
- Ken Starkman, Fullerton College
- Freddy Saucedo (Alternate), Glendale Community College
- Debbie Vanschoelandt, Irvine Valley College
- Armando Rivera-Figueroa, Los Angeles City College
- Priscilla Lopez, Los Angeles Harbor College
- Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College
- Mon Khat, Los Angeles Pierce College
- Marcia Wilson, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
- Laurie Nalepa, Los Angeles Valley College
- Jennifer Galbraith, Mt. San Antonio College
- Lisa Knuppel, Orange Coast College
- Salvatrice Cummo, Pasadena City College
- Mike Slavich, Rio Hondo College
- Anthony Teng, Saddleback College
- Kimberly Mathews (Alternate), Santa Ana College
- Patricia Ramos, Santa Monica College
- Elizabeth Arteaga, Santiago Canyon College
- Allison Tom-Miura (Alternate), West L.A. College

Voting Members absent:

- Christopher Whiteside, Golden West College
- Gene Carbonaro, Long Beach City College
- Lawrence Bradford, Los Angeles Pierce College

I. Meeting called to order at 8:39 a.m. by Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean Resource Associate Chair, LAOCCRC

II. Roll Call by Lupe Aramburo, LAOCCRC Administrative Secretary

III. **Minutes from the January 16, 2020 CRLC Business Meeting were Approved**

a. **Motion:** Salvatrice Cummo, Pasadena City College; **Second:** Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College; **Approved**

a. **Program Data Requests**

Program Title	Top Code	College
1. Automotive Drivetrain and Air Conditioning	0948	Cerritos College
2. Automotive Electrical and Engine Performance	0948	Cerritos College
3. Automotive Heavy Line and Chassis Technician	0948	Cerritos College
4. Geospatial Technology	2206	Citrus College
5. Product Design and Development Technology	0956	Citrus College
6. Cloud Computing	0702	Glendale Community

		College
7. Jewelry Entrepreneurship	1099	Long Beach City College
8. Child Development Administration	1305	Los Angeles Mission College
9. Advanced Materials Fabrication Technology	0956	Orange Coast College
10. Basic Drone Skills	0614	Orange Coast College
11. Coaching	0835.60	Orange Coast College
12. Drone Photography	1012	Orange Coast College
13. Drone Videography	0612	Orange Coast College

- i. Dr. Marcia Wilson raised a question about the Jewelry Entrepreneurship program data request, from Long Beach City College. She asked for clarification on whether this program is being created for retail, her concern is that this program could be for design. She will be reaching out to Dr. Gene Carbonaro to confirm. In addition, she added that if anyone sees an informational item that raises questions, all voting members should be responsible for contacting the college faculty involved in the program.

b. Amended Minutes – September 2017

Dr. Gustavo Chamorro, LAOCRC OC Director

Motion: Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College; **Second:** Kathleen Reiland, Cypress College;
 Recommended: **APPROVED**

- ii. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro shared that the consortia were notified by Monica at East Los Angeles College (ELAC), that their programs had been submitted for approval to the Chancellor’s Office; however, they were returned. Previously, in 2017, ELAC submitted three programs, one was a degree and two were certificates. These programs were submitted to the Chancellor’s Office as one program, instead of three. As a result, they were rejected and ELAC was asked to submit all three separately. Therefore, the consortia thought it would be a good idea to amend the minutes to reflect all three programs, and share this information with the group.
- iii. Ms. Marla Uliana asked for clarification that these were programs that already went through the program data request process; however, only one was approved and not all three, separately.
- iv. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro confirmed
- v. Ms. Kendra Madrid then added that they were programs which were already approved; however, the minutes did not reflect it.

II. Action Items

*Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean
 Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC*

- a. **Program Recommendation; Motion:** Mon Khat, Los Angeles Pierce College; **Second:** Mike Slavich, Rio Hondo College; Recommended: **APPROVED**

1. [Music Teacher Technology](#), Cypress College
2. [Sports Coaching](#), Glendale Community College
3. [Fixed Prosthodontics](#), Los Angeles City College
4. [Removable Prosthodontics](#), Los Angeles City College
5. [Financial Accounting Competency Certificate Of Specialization](#), Orange Coast College
6. [Governmental Accounting Competency Certificate of Specialization](#), Orange Coast College
7. [Network Administration - Windows Certificate of Specialization](#), Orange Coast College

8. [Network Professional Certificate of Specialization](#), Orange Coast College

b. Pre-Approved

1. [Cloud Computing](#), Glendale Community College
2. [Cloud Computing](#), Los Angeles Harbor College

III. Update, Discussion, and/or Action Items

- a. CRLC Sub-Committee
 Resource

Mike Slavich, CRLC Vice-Chair and Dean

Associate Vice-Chair, LAOCCRC

- vi. Mr. Mike Slavich opened up the conversation by sharing that a few voting members met with the intent to provide ideas regarding the program data requests, currently listed in the monthly business meeting agendas. In doing so, it was recommended that as a process, colleges who submit programs for data request LMI, provide a two-minute synopsis of the program of interest and the plan on the campus. For instance, a college can say that there are a few courses on their campus, and now they will be bundled. This is just an example of the information that can be provided during the synopsis. The purpose of this process is to inform the group, in the event another college is interested in submitting a request for a similar program, this will provide them with background on a previously requested program, which will avoid overlap and/or any future issues. He also added that this is a similar process from what was done before.
- vii. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro mentioned that Ms. Lisa Knuppel at Orange Coast College, who has a few items on the agenda, volunteered to provide a 1-2-minute sample synopsis.
- viii. Ms. Lisa Knuppel provided a sample synopsis of the five program data requests submitted by Orange Coast College (OCC). She noted that there were five programs requested for data LMI: Number nine listed above, "Advanced Materials Fabrication Technology", is a proposed new program as an extension of the existing Manufacturing Technology Program, to add in skills around advancing composite; furthermore, materials fabrication skills can be used in everything from furniture making, automotive interiors, airplane interiors, and creating rockets, etc. This program is expected to move forward for approval and be on the catalog for the fall of 2021. Number 11, "Coaching", is straight forward, a coaching certificate, youth coaching, sports, etc. Numbers 10, 12, and 13, "Basic Drone Skills", "Drone Photography", and "Drone Videography", are programs coming out of a regional project with basic drone skills. The fundamentals are piloting drone photography, taking the basic skills and applying them for photography primarily, and then drone photography.
- ix. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith followed by asking, as part of that sub-committee, if Mt. San Antonio College (Mt.SAC) is looking at revamping their drone piloting program, would she discuss that with Ms. Lisa Knuppel and see where she would go with that step. She continued by stating that it is not the case, as Mt. SAC has that program, but she wanted to ask as a form of dialogue, to show the group how that would sound.
- x. Dr. Marcia Wilson added that Ms. Jennifer Galbraith's example partially answered her question of, when there are as many program data requests as there are currently on the agenda today (11), two minutes works; however, sometimes, there are twenty or thirty program data requests. At that moment, it would be best to cut it down to one minute; but the question falls under what the group is looking at, and hoping to accomplish with this process, as well as, what should the rest of the group be listening to. She continued by expressing that it is a great idea, but, it is important to be intentional about what the purpose of this presentation is, and what to do with the information once it is shared.
- xi. Mr. Mike Slavich indicated that the second part was around the question, should exploratory LMI be listed on the business meeting agenda. It was the voting member's recommendation to approve that. He continued by mentioning that Rio Hondo College is not placing anything on the curriculum agenda that is new, unless LMI is requested. He added that he would like to know if there is anything that voting members should be looking at, because a lot of times faculty gets involved for the reason

that they enjoy teaching it, not necessarily because it is bringing good FTE's, and students are going to get jobs. Sometimes it comes down to how many literature courses the campus has, which is probably twenty, but only about four can transfer. The rest are just because faculty may like a specific author, but it boils down to the data, which are only about three or four courses that are the main ones. It goes off track sometimes; luckily CTE controls that better.

- xii. Dr. Marcia Wilson asked that when just the requestor informational data shows up, at what point in time does it go noticed beyond exploratory as a new project.
- xiii. Mr. Mike Slavich responded by stating that as a group it was recommended that the exploratory is not a discussion or voting item, it is an information item only.
- xiv. Dr. Jessie Crete added that exploratory is currently on the LMI, which will stay there; however, it will just go under informational on the agenda. If the college would like to have it considered for a program, it will have to be submitted again through the process, and specify that it is for a new program. Depending on the lap time between when it was sent as exploratory versus when it was sent for a new program request, it may or may not be the same report. Sometimes, COE receives exploratory, where the application changes when it comes in as a new program. Furthermore, there were colleges that wanted to have the ability to submit anonymously, and receive information similar to how exploratory is at the moment. Both her and Juan Madrigal, are working together to come up with a mechanism on how to process exploratory as requested. The point is to have a conversation on what is exploratory, and COE is trying to accommodate that.
- xv. Mr. Mike Slavich stated that the next item was, the LMI issued by COE addresses supply and demand only, and asked if there is significant, overall regional demand programs endorsed; however, there are other factors such as, potential programs with negatively impacted enrollment, and the scarcity of internships, and clinical rotations, etc. Other topics besides LMI should be considered, most of that should happen locally, and then at the CRLC meeting's discussions. If the LMI is bad, then the requesting college district should pull it; however, more should be discussed with the group. Other colleges have said, programs, yet they have been unable to fill classes and in addition, possibly destructive competition. If there is bad LMI, the college needs to see how it will move forward. The problem is, in new areas of technology, there is no dilemma. For example, when Rio Hondo started the GIS program, there was struggle in obtaining enough information to confirm that it would be a good program, one that would evolve; however, it took about seven or eight years before there was any data available to get a certificate of achievement from the state. Now there are four year degrees in GIS, there are some times where a program will have to be looked at, where it is going to be experimental. Realistically, if a request is sent and data does not look good, that needs to be expressed. These programs need to be revisited, some change, and some are unheard of, after the fact.
- xvi. Mr. Mike Slavich continued with the next item, which was a question of whether the vote of membership was really necessary for a program to be approved? He answered, yes and added that if the minutes are not there, a control number is not provided and it comes back. In the PCAH it is not clear; however, the college will not get through the Chancellor's Office and get a control number, without the minutes. Moreover, he recommended that everyone go to the 7th edition, page 79 of the PCAH, to go over it, as it is straight forward. Although there were no issues, it was a discussion item. The important peace was in having a discussion when introducing a new program, to inform the group of what is in the works, instead of just placing it on the agenda. The purpose is for more personal interaction on what the plans are with these programs, in addition to providing whoever is putting these programs and curriculum together, an enough, viable idea and not just adding unnecessary classes because those are preferred topics.
- xvii. Mr. Antony Teng mentioned that one of the conversations that he had was relevant, regarding this body, who was originally put together to have conversation about destructive competition. Now that the approval process has changed, everyone forgets about that conversation, especially in areas of healthcare, where there are clinicals. Everyone is looking for clinical positions for nursing programs, and others that are in that area. The problem is, one college starts hitting each other's service areas; therefore, the conversations need to happen. He continued by sharing that about a year and a half ago, one of the colleges was going into Saddleback College's service area and taking all their clinicals. When trying to have a conversation, there was none; Saddleback was told that the other college would do it anyway, and had to fight to get those back. This is why it is important, so that the body

- can have a dialogue.
- xviii. Dr. Marcia Wilson added that part of the reason that last month it was decided to have this workgroup convening, had to do with the fact that there was a program that Mt. SAC faculty was not advised about, involving Rio Hondo College. There was a conversation around what should be the structure to make sure there is dialogue between the colleges. In the old application, there was a grid included that had all the colleges that had the programs, and in that grid it was required to fill out the times and ways that colleges communicated with one another. She continued by stating that it was a form of accountability that there were conversations, the question now is; how can the group make sure those dialogues are taking place?
 - xix. Ms. Lisa Knuppel responded by stating that this was the purpose of sharing verbally, a brief summary about what the program is about, so that it can be brought up other than just having it listed on the agenda. This is a way of having everyone become aware of what is in development and have dialogue if needed. To make sure there is an opportunity that it comes when it is relevant, and know who is doing it, as well as to receive input.
 - xx. Dr. Marcia Wilson raised the question, supposing she had the drone program and she then hears that OCC describe their program of intent, then she takes this information back to her faculty, would she need to let OCC know that Los Angeles Trade-Tech College has a program already. Or, should she let her faculty know and they reach out to OCC. She added that it is important to know this, because faculty is who needs to be involved.
 - xxi. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith added that she believes it was the intent, to connect with the college, whoever is involved, and have that conversation. There are already some colleges in contact, communicating with one another. This process opens the door to ensure the conversations are being had, and that there is documentation of the dialogue.
 - xxii. Dr. Marcia Wilson mentioned that those were conversations that should have taken place, regardless of whether this process was to be implemented. She added that when going through the agenda, she makes sure to add that if there is any item on the agenda, to take it back to the faculty. Moreover, if everyone is comfortable with doing what they are supposed to do, that is great; however, what happens if the same issue that occurred last month comes up again? There should be a more intentional process.
 - xxiii. Mr. Mike Slavich asked if everyone would like to leave the process as is, they can move forward with that, but this is just to have more conversation about the program being requested.
 - xxiv. Mr. Lynell Wiggins added that it would be an opportunity to use technology, and possibly move some of the focus from the deans having to be responsible. It would be, having the submitting faculty member utilize a zoom conference call or webinar, and send out the information that they are sharing on a specific program. They can have their questions answered in the webinar, it will be recorded, there would be record that it is happening, and if anyone has questions, that email can be sent out to faculty that is interested.
 - xxv. Mr. Mike Slavich reiterated that this is just a recommendation, but is can be left as it is. The intent is to get more dialogue.
 - xxvi. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith mentioned that there was also an attempt to move dialogue as a notice of intent, so that if a college mentioned they were going to do a specific program, that the other college would come out to inform them of the existing program at their college. If the college re-introducing the existing item refuses to stop the program, the colleges can then discuss their ideas during the conversation, and the college with the existing program can say they do not support that program. At that point, it opens the arena for having the difficult dialogue.
 - xxvii. Mr. Mike Slavich added that there are times where it is necessary to escalate the issue to the VP, and let them know the issue between the colleges.
 - xxviii. Dr. Marcia Wilson reiterated on her earlier point, that if discussing the programs during this meeting can stop the process here, when it is not fair to the faculty. It should go back to faculty, when do voting members know that there was a conversation between faculty members of the colleges, and who's responsibility is it to make sure the faculty is having a dialogue with the other college. It will leave the ambiguity that we know, but how do we make sure faculty find out about it.
 - xxix. Mr. Mike Slavich responded by adding that as voting members, they were selected by their districts. They are supposed to be the consulate to bring this back to the district. It seems as if the process should remain as is.

- xxx. Ms. Kathleen Reiland stated that it does matter at the type of programs, for example health is really particular and there needs to be attention to the clinical side. However, for example, drone photography was in the regional project, so they all know of the drones in Orange County, but not in Los Angeles. The other thing is with coaching, it makes sense in any school, so it does not seem as it will be competition issue. It depends on the actual program.
- xxxi. Mr. Mike Slavich agreed.
- xxxii. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro addressed Dr. Marcia Wilson in asking that this process is more to have record that the conversations are happening.
- xxxiii. Dr. Marcia Wilson clarified that she is not expecting it to go to the previous way, with the grid included in the application. She further explained that it is a great idea to have a one-minute description of what exactly the program is, whether it is retail or design. It matters because she too, will know who she needs to forward that information to. The question had to do with figuring out the mechanism and system of how they will ensure these conversations are happening and how they are being documented.
- xxxiv. Ms. Lisa Knuppel indicated that the list of colleges involved with programs is still reflected in the LMI. She asked if the concern falls under having an official notice that there is contact. She continued by explaining that she does not believe there is a way to ensure the faculty engage, because in the case of OCC they do not. The question came up of whether the intent to reinstitute the process of approval and procedure, where recording the dialogue, stands.
- xxxv. Dr. Marcia Wilson responded with mentioning that when John Lancaster designed the approval process, not only would voting members discuss the programs the way Ms. Lisa Knuppel described, but there was an opportunity to come out and share if there was already a similar program implemented in one's college. Moreover, there was an official way to acknowledge that the college had a similar program and would like to be contacted; however, that piece disappeared. She continued by stating that there is not a specific suggestion, but it is important to know what the best practices are. For instance, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College (LATTTC) put into practice a process that ensures there is documented communication, via email. This process protects the college from another to come forth and hold them responsible. She clarified that her intention is to make sure that as a group, they come up with a plan to facilitate the process of communication between colleges.
- xxxvi. Ms. Lisa Knuppel suggested a twenty second summary, and allowing those who are interested in being contacted to raise their hand.
- xxxvii. Mr. Mike Slavich added that it can be a two-minute synopsis, which will help them see who would like to be contacted and it can be recorded.
- xxxviii. Ms. Kendra Madrid expressed that a two-minute synopsis would take a long time. This agenda only has thirteen programs listed; however, there is not enough time and two-minutes seems excessive. She asked if they can just allow time to look at the list of programs and those with questions, if any, can raise their hand.
- xxxix. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith clarified that it was up to two-minutes, but they are not required to take the entire two-minutes.
 - xl. Ms. Marla Uliana asked if the process existed, where the programs were reviewed and if anyone wanted to be contacted, they would request it.
 - xli. Dr. Marcia Wilson confirmed.
 - xlii. Ms. Marla Uliana continued by stating that stopping this process was harmful, because it allowed her to go back to her college and advise faculty who wanted to be contacted. She added that Mr. Lynell Wiggins mentioned holding Zoom calls as an option, and she believes it would be a great way to include the colleges that want to be a part of the conversation.
 - xliii. Mr. Mike Slavich summarized the suggestions by asking if the consensus falls around allowing an up to two-minute synopsis for each program, giving those who would like to be contacted the opportunity to come forth and request it, and exploratory programs would be introduced to give colleges an idea of what programs are being looked at.
 - xliv. The voting members responded in agreement with Mr. Mike Slavich's summary of suggestions.
 - xlv. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro confirmed that this process will begin in April, therefore, if anyone will have a program data request, they should be ready to provide a summary. He continued by stating that the

recommendation is that the group institutes this process, adding if anyone would like to be contacted.

- xlvi. **Program Data Request Process; Motion:** Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College; **Second:** Anthony Teng, Saddleback College; **Recommendation: APPROVED**
Abstentions: Mr. Nick Real, Cerritos College
- xlvii. Mr. Nick Real addressed the seating structure by stating that it is not space effective, and the old system with round tables is more convenient.
- xlviii. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith mentioned that this was an item they voted on previously, which was to go back to the original seating.
- xlix. Dr. Adriene Davis confirmed she received word about the structure; however, the CRLC Business Meetings need to have the same structure as that of the Governance Council, as there is an expectation that the structures are similar. This month there was a conflict with the rooms, but the Collaborative Meeting will have round table moving forward. This is the structure that is in place for the business meetings for the voting members who are at the table to take action on items that are on the agenda. It is a different format than that of the Collaborative meeting.
 - I. Mr. Nick Real requested to vote on the seating structure.
 - ii. Dr. Adriene Davis reiterated that the format used for the Governance Council is to be used.
 - iii. Ms. Jennifer Galbraith asked if as CRLC members, there is no control how the meetings run.
 - liii. Dr. Adriene Davis suggested that they have a conversation in a different environment.
 - liv. **Seating Structure; Motion:** Nick Real, Cerritos College; **Second:** Jennifer Galbraith, Mt. San Antonio College; **Recommendation: NO**
Abstentions: 8
 - lv. Ms. Nancy Jones expressed that it is concerning for the voting members to know that they do not have a voice in this matter.
 - lvi. Dr. Marcia Wilson stated that a vote was already made a couple months ago, and added that if the voting members control the content of the meetings, the structure should mirror that. However, she asked what environment is best to have this conversation.
 - lvii. Dr. Adriene Davis suggested a Zoom call. She added that the previous motion was not sent to her.
 - lviii. Dr. Marcia Wilson affirmed that she would put that motion forward.
 - lix. Ms. Lisa Knuppel asked for clarification on what the motion is about.
 - lx. Dr. Marcia Wilson clarified that it was specifically about the seating arrangement, which Ms. Jennifer Galbraith previously made a motion for it to go back to the previous format with round tables. She added that the motion was to be taken forth to Dr. Adriene Davis, which was not done. The conversation has been brought up the last couple meetings, and does not require a new vote. The group would like to simply reiterate to have the previous motion honored; however, a Zoom call will be setup to further discuss this matter.
 - lxi. Mr. Nick Real withdrew his motion due to a previous motion having been made by Ms. Jennifer Galbraith.

IV. Updates

*Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean
 Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC*

a. Districts

- i. Cerritos
- ii. Citrus
- iii. Coastline
- iv. Compton
- v. Cypress – Ms. Kathleen Reiland introduced the new chair for their curriculum committee and the new curriculum specialist.
- vi. East Los Angeles

- vii. El Camino is having an entrepreneurial mindset day with the funding that they have from the region on April 21st. There will be panels of entrepreneurs and all students are welcomed.
- viii. Fullerton
- ix. Glendale
- x. Golden West
- xi. Irvine Valley
- xii. Long Beach
- xiii. Los Angeles City
- xiv. Los Angeles Harbor
- xv. Los Angeles Mission is having an apples with coding training on March 27th and 28th. They are currently working on a flyer and have about 30 open slots. There will also be a series of entrepreneurial workshops on either March, April, or beginning of May.
- xvi. Los Angeles Pierce
- xvii. Los Angeles Southwest
- xxiii. Los Angeles Trade-Technical shared that as part of the Strong Workforce Regional Project, Entrepreneurship, there will be a CTE Entrepreneurs event on March 13th. The event is free to students and it will be a day with breakfast and lunch provided. There will be resources around small business, small business development, a keynote, and a panel, as well as breakout sessions. Some of the breakout sessions will be around issues on how to start a small business, how to start a dba, how to create businesses, and how to grow them as well. There is a cap, however, it is open to all students.
- xix. Los Angeles Valley
- xx. Mt. SAC shared that the Non-credit Regional Project will be hosting an articulation workshop on March 27th at Quiet Cannon in Montebello. Information to register has been sent out, however, if anyone has not received it, or would like more information, reach out.
- xxi. Orange Coast
- xxii. Pasadena City is currently recruiting for a Dean of Applied Technology, which is a new position at PCC. If there is anyone within network, please send them over to the Pasadena website under human resources and current opportunities.
- xxiii. Rio Hondo is looking for faculty and opened up several full time tenured positions for auto, alternate fuels, accounting, welding, and two in business.
- xxiv. Saddleback is looking for an auto faculty and a full time business faculty; it will not post until next week. They had a conversation about classroom space, and are excited that there was a virtual reality activity with z-space that will be shared at CCCAOE. Mr. Antony Teng recommended that the group has z-space go to their campus and do a demonstration, it is multiple disciplines. In April, they are also working with Climate Education.
 - Dr. Julie Kiotas asked if Z-space provide opportunity for students to do that work from home?
 - Mr. Anthony Teng responded that They do not have that technology right now; however, they can do computer remote instruction.
- xxv. Santa Ana
- xxvi. Santa Monica announced that while at CCCAOE, SMC will host a Perkins V Workshop on Thursday, March 12th at 9:00 a.m.
 - Ms. Marla Uliana asked if there would be a cost to the workshop.
 - Dr. Patricia Ramos responded that there will be no cost.
- xxvii. Santiago Canyon
- xxviii. West Los Angeles announced that they will be posting a position for an acting Academic Affairs Dean.

b. Other

V. Adjourn

The next CRLC Meeting will be a Conference Call on **March 19, 2019** from 8:30 A.M. - 9:45 A.M.

