Triton Academic and Scholastic Standards Committee  
Meeting Minutes from February 8, 2010

Members Present:  
Julie Gilbert, Peter Jermihov, Ellen O’Connell, Lizette Rivera, Sue Collins, Teresa Romano, James Whitmer, Tracy Wright-Goehmann

I. Approval of the minutes from December 7, 2009  
   a. Ellen moved to accept with the correction of December 7th not December 6th  
   b. Sue move to second  
   c. Unanimous approval

II. Next Meeting: March 8, 2010 at 2pm in F 210

III. Old Business  
   a. Comparable Credit (Experiential Education Draft Document) will be the focus for the March 2010 meeting. The subcommittee (Amanda and Emily) plan to meet this week to fine tune the draft document.  
   b. College Hour: Our College Hour for online course standards / pre-requisites is set for February 25, 2010 at 2:00pm. We are co-hosting this college hour with the Academic Support Committee. Committee members are encouraged to attend and to also invite other faculty members. PTK members will be invited in order to provide student input.

   Possible College Hour Topics:  
      i. Online readiness / self assessment exam.  
         a. Should this be required for all faculty or just available as a support tool?  
      ii. A page dedicated to resources and a link or slide during New Student Orientation.  
      iii. Ask students to take the Learning Style Assessment (LSA) which is accessible via the student portal.  
      iv. Handouts available to students regarding online readiness after they complete the placement exam.  
      v. Modifying RALPH (if capable) to track student completion of self assessment for online learning.  
      vi. Flag students in RALPH (if capable) who need to complete an online readiness assessment.  
      vii. Use of an enrollment facilitator during peak registration dedicated to online course information.  
      viii. Recommendation for faculty to provide deadlines for assignments.  
      ix. Recommendation for a workshop through the CTE on engaging online students.  
      x. Survey students who take online courses and ask:  
         a. Why do they enroll?  
         b. Why do they drop?
c. Did the class meet their expectations?
   xi. Set up a control group of students who withdraw from online course to compare with those that complete the courses.
   xii. Collect and review best practices for online student success. Ask faculty members to bring ideas of what works to the College Hour.

IV. SAVI: We originally requested that a SAVI presentation be included at the January Faculty Workshop, however, it was not covered. Julie will look into setting up a workshop which might work better than another college hour.

V. Other:
   a. Tracy and Peter will speak with Dan Domin of the CTE to arrange an Educational Psychologist as a guest speaker.
   b. Lizette announced that Title III is moving towards provide faculty stipends for participation in CTE workshops in combination with using the Early Alert System.

VI. Adjournment:
   a. Tracy moved to adjourn
   b. James seconded
   c. Unanimously approved
In attendance: Larry Manno, Debbie Baness-King, Quincy Martin, Bill Decker, Dubvraka Juraga, Pat Hussey, Amanda Turner

The meeting began at 2:05 PM.

- Debbie Baness-King updated the committee on Achieving the Dream (presentation attached in minutes). Our committee expressed interest in exploring Improving College Readiness (Strategy #2).
- Larry Manno updated the committee about the College Hour pertaining to orientation for students enrolled in on-line courses. Members in attendance at the college hour agreed that a single orientation would not be feasible because instructors are using other platforms besides Blackboard to present their on-line courses. It was also agreed that a site be established where instructors can share information/useful tools they use to orient/retain students. Our committee will sponsor a brown bag/information session where instructors can share/discuss this information with each other.
- Larry updated the committee on the Textbook Rental Committee. The committee will meet on Wednesday, March 10 at 2:30 PM to view a webinar sponsored by Follett. This webinar will entail information about rental programs that Follett is currently using. The webinar will be held in the boardroom.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM.
CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.


**Members absent:** (voting) J. Wager, M. Enich and L. Dodt

**Resource Members present:** (non-voting) N. De Mayo, D. Domin and C. Allcorn

**Resource Members absent:** (non-voting) P. Hadjimitsos, V. Howard, D. Baness-King, P. Jensen and Sujith Zachariah

**Agendees:** K. Anderson and C. Antonich

**Visitors:** L. Rivera and M. Armas

APPROVAL OF COLLEGE CURRICULUM MINUTES

*Motion to approve the minutes December 3, 2009, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

K. Anderson stated that there was no action items submitted for this meeting. The bulk of submissions generally occur at the last two meetings of the fall and spring semesters, which is a topic for discussion later in this meeting. She welcomed everyone back after the long holiday break.

OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Course/Curr</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None

NEW BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Course/Curr</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None

INNOVATIVE IDEAS: ------

OTHER:

A) Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Approval of Stand-alone Certificate Programs – C. Antonich

C. Antonich referenced the HLC policy that is included in the packet, which lists the new policy and criteria for an additional approval required by the HLC for stand-alone certificates. A stand-alone certificate is one that is developed on its own merit and does not include courses that are attached to a degree or another certificate. The ICCB, after granting approval, does not automatically forward these submissions to the HLC for their approval. Each institution is responsible for the additional submission. The new stand-alone certificate would need to meet all of the criteria listed to need approval by the HLC. C. Antonich contacted the Financial Aid Office, as one of the criteria is that the certificate is ‘Title IV eligible’, (the certificate must have a minimum of sixteen credit hours). This HLC requirement became effective in 2008 and we need to be more cognizant of the required criteria when developing new stand-alone certificates in the future.
There will be no ramification or additional work for the Curriculum Committee. C. Antonich stated there is one stipulation, that the program must be submitted ninety days prior to marketing and admitting students. We need to be especially aware of one of the criteria, which states that ‘50% or more of the courses supporting the Certificate program have been developed for the Certificate program and are not drawn from those courses supporting an existing degree or previously-approved Certificate program.’ Discussion occurred regarding courses needing to be attached to a program to gain ICCB approval, which is true, whereas the courses the criterion is referring to would only be attached to the new stand-alone certificate.

K. Anderson made note to the amount of time spent checking grammatical and spelling errors and other issues on the submissions for the last two meetings in the Fall 2009, as people are trying to get their items included in the next printed catalog. We expended an excessive amount of time correcting some of the submissions, which is not our responsibility, but the submitters’. Spelling can be accomplished by the use of spell-check. She added that in an attempt to decrease the number of these submissions, they will be returned to the submitter for correction if corrections are needed. **K. Anderson will notify all faculty by requesting E. O’Connell to forward to all faculty.** Many of the documents that were submitted have been cumbersome to S. Maratto and have taken time away from her responsibilities to review and correct these documents. If the submissions do not meet the requirements, they will be sent back to the submitter and will not be added to the agenda. If the programs do not make the last meeting in December for those items to be included in the catalog, they won’t be included. An ad-hoc committee for review of submission was previously suggested. The committee felt that this was the job of the submitter, and an additional committee was not necessary. K. Anderson requested that everyone spread the word. The Curriculum Committee also has other duties to accomplish besides grammatical errors, counting topical hours, etc. We cannot have a repeat of errors that were submitted last fall. M. Flaherty concurred with K. Anderson and the goal should be to shorten the Curriculum meetings.

The entire package needs to be reviewed. K. Anderson added that she only referred to two major examples, however there are other issues such as writing ‘Learning Goals’ and ‘Objectives’ that need to relate to the topics, appropriately listing textbooks, i.e. the APA format. She stressed that items should be submitted earlier in the semester, which allows ample time for review. She also suggested that the submitter work with Dan Domin, as he can assist in the development of learning goals, objectives, and the process of tying all the components on the course outline together. M. R. Moore suggested allowing two minutes for each submitter’s summation of changes, which would then allow ample time for questions posed by the Committee. K. Anderson suggested three-to-five minutes, especially for larger submissions. Consensus of the Committee is to limit the presentation to five minutes. The Committee is spending way too much time on these issues.

B) Program Improvement – K. Anderson

K. Anderson included minutes and other documentation in the packet describing the history of the development of the Program Improvement Committee. Recently, there has been controversy and questions from the administration on whether there is a place for the Program Improvement Committee. D. Domin could assist with many of those items, but K. Anderson’s personal opinion is that there is a need for this committee, but suggested that D. Domin be added as a member.

She reviewed the history of how the committee began: Six years ago, Orderly Withdrawal was extremely contentious procedure. Situations where the majority of coordinators received little or no communication from the dean until their program was recommended for withdrawal. The faculty was offended and upset, as there was not ample time to review and revise the program for improvement. Program improvement is not the focus of the Orderly Withdrawal process, per the faculty contract, and should be done way in advance of the withdrawal recommendation. The Program Improvement Committee was developed in an attempt to change those dynamics. All avenues should be taken to review a program to see if it can be updated and become viable, and make the necessary changes. K. Anderson is speaking from the faculty’s point of view. A program is listed on the High Cost Low Enrollment Report because it is too costly to run. The Nursing program is always listed due to the State mandates. The High Cost Low Enrollment Review Task Force (former name of Program Improvement Committee) was a vehicle to look at other methodology to enhance communication and assist faculty coordinator/chairperson awareness that their enrollment is declining and interventions need to be made. Granted, there are some departments that rarely or never bring courses or programs to Curriculum for revision.
The AA/AS programs do not change as frequently as the AAS programs. The Health Career programs tend to change most frequently. The Program Improvement Committee has had excellent meetings, with a great example of shared governance where everyone is given a chance to speak. The name of the Committee was originally Program Review, which was too confusing with the ICCB’s Program Review; therefore it was re-named Program Improvement. The criteria for programs to be included on the Program Improvement Committee was their position on the High Cost/Low enrollment report, along with additional criteria recommended by the Dean, including the need for curriculum revision, is the career no longer employing individuals, are students not obtaining jobs, just to name a few. The CCC developed a list of criteria and K. Anderson developed an additional list to assist the Program Improvement Committee. The Research Department is an integral part when reviewing programs and initially many people did not understand the information obtained. The development of the Program Improvement Committee was presented to the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate Committee and was passed through both. Both administrators and faculty reside on the committee. Discussion at these meetings resulted in additional criteria besides the High Cost Low Enrollment Report, i.e. trends, student goals, salary, job demand outcomes (survey employers, advisory committee), as additional data was gathered and adjustments were made accordingly. A number of recommendations were developed to help programs and does not conflict with Orderly Withdrawal language in the contract. Since the development of the Program Improvement Committee, all parties involved felt it was very helpful and changes were implemented as a result. In some cases the program coordinator agreed that that the program should be withdrawn. A proposal was made for members of the Assessment Committee to be included on the Program Improvement Committee, which is a critical part of program review. As stated in the minutes from the first meeting, programs were selected from a ‘watch list’ submitted by a former Vice President of Academic Affairs (B. Scism) in February or March, of programs that would likely be up for withdrawal if issues were not addressed. The deans were solicited for other programs that might benefit from this committee, with a couple of more programs received. Each chairperson/coordinator (members and others) developed reports. The amount of cooperation by everyone progressed and therefore led to engagement and excitement by the faculty. Coordinators/chairpersons whose programs are successful came and spoke at the meetings. Every program has different issues and when shared, many ideas were generated. K. Anderson noted her disappointment that the dissolution of this committee was brought up to a few individuals, but she was not included in the discussion. She had tried to solicit the deans for programs in trouble, but received no response. Faculty made changes, therefore reducing cost and made successful changes to programs that were listed on the ‘watch list’ and on the High Cost Low Enrollment Report, revealing that the committee was successful in reaching their goals. A. Latham intended to speak at this CCC meeting, but she was attending the ‘Achieving the Dream workshop’. K. Anderson felt that D. Domin should become a member of the Program Improvement Committee, along with additional faculty. D. Domin would be an asset to the Program Improvement Committee and he would also have an avenue to introduce himself and the services he can provide to the faculty. E. O’Connell noted that faculty would be better motivated if they are not dictated to from the administration, as the work is then done begrudgingly. When faculty work with faculty, they are more likely to be freer with suggestions. Faculty was encouraged and came to curriculum prepared, as they should take ownership and monitor their own success. She would not like to see this type of communication become defunct. K. Anderson added that the dean’s involvement is a concern of A. Latham. J. B. Halpin, who is also a member of the Curriculum Committee and was present at the Program Improvement meetings, stated that the process was broken when the ENT program was up for withdrawal. People were yelling at each other and were very defensive. This new way of approach is a more positive experience. When discussing pedagogy and curriculum, the result is positive ideas. C. Antonich, stated that she was a dean for a long time and had recommended some programs for Orderly Withdrawal. No matter which way a program is up for withdrawal it is going to be a contentious process, one that is difficult for the administration and the faculty. She does not believe that another committee is necessary to address these issues. Some programs linger in trouble for five years and she asked why after five years would they expend time to now revise. E. O’Connell questioned why there was no prior discussion. C. Antonich replied that we cannot assume there was no prior discussion. Everyone involved should understand what is involved. Now we are faced with a horrible financial situation and forced to do things we don’t want to do. We can lay blame on the past, but at this point it does not matter. We do not need another committee. There is no barrier to having communication amongst faculty. K. Anderson respectfully disagreed with C. Antonich and added that often times a faculty member is unsure what to do, has inherited a curriculum, never wrote objectives or revised curriculum, or surveyed employers and graduates. There are a
number of reasons why a program is in a difficult situation as they are now. Through Program Improvement, the coordinators/chairperson would be contacted and informed, "Notice you’re on the watch list…; and be guided on what to do in order to improve their program. The latest programs that have gone through the Orderly Withdrawal process are not nearly as contentious as in the past. ENT and CIS departments attended Program Improvement meetings and they were able to realize that the programs needed to be revised and some withdrawn. C. Antonich inquired if it would not be contentious today if a program is submitted by the dean for Orderly Withdrawal. K. Anderson stated that the faculty would be policing each other. C. Antonich inquired as to where are we going to start? K. Anderson responded by saying that the Program Improvement needs to be given chance and she would like to bring this back to Curriculum Committee to be voted on. E. O’Connell questioned if the High Cost/Low Enrollment Report is currently posted. C. Antonich replied that it is and was also discussed at Academic Senate. T. Porebski added that he did not remember seeing it on website this year. J. Frye was unsure of the argument. When in a bureaucracy, we don’t have monies from the State, which is critical and decisions must be made quickly as we don’t have the luxury of time. Decisions must be made in a different way in these times and made quickly, which is the reality of the situation. E. O’Connell questioned if the faculty worked with programs in need last year, would we be in better financial shape than now. J. Frye replied that faculty is not responsible for the budget and fiscal responsibilities. E. O’Connell stated that they are trying to have an avenue for communication that would benefit programs all the time. K. Anderson added that one responsibility of the members of the Committee is to inform faculty that their program(s) is on the list and make recommendations for improvement. The reality may be that the program is no longer viable and needs to be withdrawn. We also need to develop new programs, perhaps an offshoot of old program. Foreign Language (French and Sign Language) was the only contentious withdrawal in the last three years and the ENT program was completely revised and is now viable. K. Anderson added that we are not voting today on whether or not the Program Improvement Committee should continue, but was put on the agenda for input. The outcome of the discussion it seems, that the faculty think one way and the administration another. C. Antonich added that she is not saying the Program Improvement is not worth the time, but there are already too many meetings on campus and asked if this committee could be combined with another committee. K. Anderson concurred with C. Antonich, and stated that it currently has members from both the CCC and the Assessment Committee. C. Allcorn stated that there is a wall between communication with faculty and administration. The administration should realize that the faculty are intimidated and act differently when called by an administrator as opposed to a faculty member. There is a financial crisis that needs to be addressed. K. Anderson inquired, if D. Domin, who is new, joins the Program Improvement Committee, the Program Improvement Committee would not be necessary in the future. If D. Domin become a member of the Committee, faculty would know what he has to offer. There may be not be a need for the Committee in the future and faculty would contact him with issues. Persons who have attended the Program Improvement Committee meetings were made to feel comfortable and welcome. Communication traveled by word of mouth to faculty apprising them of where to go for help. E. O’Connell added that there are faculty who are not comfortable communicating with their administrator. K. Anderson stated that J. Libner contacted her and asked to become a member of the Program Improvement Committee, based on the positive results she had heard. She felt that the Program Improvement Committee should be given a chance, with the addition of D. Domin, before disbanding it. A. Baldin questioned why the faculty do not utilize the brown bag meetings held by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), which is a place where faculty can discuss with other faculty. She noted her approval of persons whose programs were successful and who attended the meetings to share their strategies. E. O’Connell added, no disrespect, but D. Domin is an administrator, which removes the faculty to faculty component. A. Baldin added that everyone is welcome at the brown bag sessions, and faculty is encouraged to come. C. Antonich added that D. Domin does not have to be the moderator. E. O’Connell asked who would be the moderator as a leader is needed for organization. A. Baldin stated that everyone should be reviewing their programs regularly and asked how we can relay that communication to all faculty members. C. Allcorn reiterated the difference in connotation of recommendations coming from an administrator then a colleague, and D. Domin is an administrator. A. Baldin stated that having a healthy program is the responsibility of the faculty and there is nothing to stop them from working with each other. J. B. Halpin stated faculty are involved in many other duties, but when reminded to attend a Program Improvement meeting where programs that are on a ‘watch list’ will be discussed, they are sure to attend. C. Antonich stated that the High Cost Low Enrollment Report is a starting point to look at programs that have declining enrollment for five years and no action was taken and needs to be looked at. There are more than five programs currently on the list and this should trigger that something is wrong. K. Anderson suggested maybe the list is needed to
trigger action. C. Antonich applauded K. Anderson for taking on this responsibility, but it is the faculty’s responsibility. They need to communicate with their dean. K. Anderson added that when meeting with the dean, they need to come prepared with some suggestions, which would be obtained by discussion in a Program Improvement Committee meeting. She has taken on this responsibility because she likes to assist people with these issues. M. R. Moore inquired if anyone has anything additional to bring forward and we can vote on this issue next month. N. DeMayo suggested having a College Hour to get the word out to faculty. K. Anderson stated that programs in question are mostly career programs and the College Hours are scheduled at 2 p.m. when many of the faculty are teaching classes. Sending emails to adjuncts and full-time faculty was suggested for input, which is one of many ways they can engage in communication. E. O’Connell added that if it is presented that ‘The Committee recommends that you should do…’ might be taken the same as if suggested by the administration. K. Anderson added that is a good point.

K. Anderson thanked everyone for their input.

Adjournment: K. Anderson adjourned the meeting at 4:14 p.m.

Submitted by: 

K. Anderson, Chairperson

Susan Misasi Maratto  
Recording Secretary
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
March 3, 2010
2:00 PM
E-210

MINUTES

Members in attendance: Sue Rohde, Tom Porebski, Sue Collins, Renee Wright, Dan Domin, Mary Casey-Incardone, Maria Tereza Dyer, Jose Delgado, Maxi Armas, Panos Hadjimitsos, Maureen Musker
Guest: Will Edwards

A. February minutes approved.

B. Professional Development – Maureen Musker reminded committee members that if they want to attend The Illinois Community College Assessment Fair, it takes place on 3/5 and the HLC conference is April 11-13th. Attendance at either event cannot be covered in the current financial situation. If any members want to attend, they need to use their contractual travel funds.

C. Program assessment update – Dan Domin updated the current status. Out of 46 programs/areas to do Program Assessment, 31 have plans in place for this spring.

Maureen reminded the members that there is a Program Assessment Brown Bag on 3/10 from 3-4 in the CTE. She will be unable to attend due to jury duty. Dan will facilitate, but members were encouraged to attend if at all possible.

D. Resources review

a. Assessment webpage – We reviewed the web page at www.triton.edu/assessment to remind members of the resources available there and the status report. Members were asked to review the report and note any inaccuracies. They were also asked to look at assessment web pages at other schools before our April meeting. Maureen and Jose Delgado will take suggestions and incorporate what they can after that meeting. Renee Wright offered to send links to all members of pages she recommends reviewing.

b. Blackboard shell – This shell is under construction. When complete, it will house all the assessment documents, provide a submission venue, and a discussion forum for academic assessment. Access and log-in issues were discussed, including concerns about too much access to assessment tools, especially if they are final exams. It was decided that these will be stored on the shell but in a limited access format. We also discussed whether or not we should use a general Blackboard user login to provide wide access or just make it an option on people’s individual logins. For now, we will use the general access, but there could be an issue with multiple logins. We will pilot this option for a time, knowing we can switch to the other option later on if warranted.

While we considered having people post their own documents to the shell and even have access to updating the status report, it was decided that once
the shell is up, Dan will be the sole submission conduit to streamline the process. People will be able to email him, and he will post their documents to Blackboard, and he’ll update the report. In the meantime, Maureen will convert the files we already have, post them, and continue to update the status report.

This led to a discussion on how to make the entire process as self-sustaining as possible so that despite committee turnover, a solid assessment infrastructure will be established. Next year, as Dan receives submissions, the committee will review them with him in an effort to train a wider group of people to evaluate these documents, so that the continuation of this process is not dependent on one or two people.

c. Reporting form – Members reviewed the revised reporting form and decided to move forward with this version.

E. Achieving the Dream – We discussed the strategies list that the ATD team has developed, deciding on our three top choices. These were numbers 3, 4 and 6.

ACTION ITEMS:

Maureen Musker will:
- Update status report and reload to the committee web page.
- Meet with Jose to update Committee’s CubeIt page.
- Investigate assessment grant opportunities.
- Continue to work on the Blackboard shell.
- Schedule an Assessment Platform Task Force meeting.
- Follow up on adjunct and student committee member candidates.

Dan Domin will:
- Continue to contact programs to arrange one-on-one meetings on assessment plans.
- Keep the committee informed on progress of those meetings.
- Facilitate Spring 2010 Brown Bag sessions.

Jose Delgado will:
- Meet with Maureen to update the committee’s CubeIt page.

Renee Wright will:
- Send committee members some links to other college assessment web pages

Committee Members will:
- Review other assessment web pages before the April meeting.
- Contribute to program assessment efforts in their areas.
- Attend Spring 2010 Brown Bags when possible.

Next Meeting – April 7, 2010 from 2-3 pm in the CTE.
1) Tom Olson has confirmed that departmental URL's may be included on any FT faculty member business cards. This would be in addition to the www.triton.edu URL - the departmental URL can be listed under the faculty member's contact information on the card. This is great news for recruitment and networking purposes.

2) All academic departments should have a designated website content manager. This person is responsible for updating content on the Triton web site. Training is available - contact Todd Shamaly at ext. 3244 or tshamaly@triton.edu for training information.
Minutes: Professional Development Committee – Summary for the Academic Senate
February 23rd, 2010
Attendees: Dan Domin, Jean Dugo, Gabe Guzman, Mary Jeans, Angelee Johns, Pat Knol, Peggy Murnigham, Lucy Smith, Preet Saluja, Rene Wright, Liz Brindise

1. Reconfiguration/shared responsibilities of Professional Development Committee Chair
   • Following the suggestion last semester of Ellen OConnell, the committee has decided to go with a co-chair arrangement. Peggy Murnigham has graciously agreed to co-chair the committee with me (Liz Brindise). This will provide the opportunity to redistribute the ownership of some of our initiatives.

2. Outstanding Faculty Award – Nominee chosen
   • Subcommittee led by Lucy Smith has reviewed all submitted materials from nominees, and made the selection from a number of highly qualified nominees. Terri Fencl has been chosen for Triton’s 2010 Outstanding Faculty winner, and she will be representing the college in the ICCTA outstanding faculty nominees statewide.

3. Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award
   • Materials for nomination will be distributed this week, and the subcommittee will be reviewing submissions late March-early April.

4. Distinguished Service Award and Assessment Award
   • These awards were recommended last year as new additions to our college’s current recognition programs; they were well received at the Senate meeting at which they were presented. Forms for these awards will be developed, parameters outlined and nominees will be accepted and reviewed by the committee. Given the nature of the awards’ premises, they will be reviewed as they are received, as opposed to an annual award. VP of Academic Affairs Angela Latham had committed to providing the recognition plaques that describe and reflect the service provided by the recipient.

5. Achieving the Dream – updates by Dan Domin
   • Dan Domin brought committee members up to date on the major areas of potential focus for the ATD initiative. He solicited input from members as to what we collectively agreed to in the ranking of these areas of potential focus.

6. CTE Newsletter released, CTE website developed
   • The first CTE newsletter was released in February, and faculty contributors included one of our committee members – Jean Dugo. The committee will continue to be supportive in providing content to future newsletters, as well as in recommendations for CTE programming.
Attendees: Christina Brophy, Jackie Mullany, John Lambrecht, Bill Decker, Kathy Deresinski, Jeff Sargent, Steve Marjurik, Jon Grigalunas, Richard Rodriquez, Jennifer Smith

Non-toxic and Odorless Paint: John indicated that per the recommendation of the Committee, his Department researched the cost and effectiveness of using VOC3 paint for the painting of offices. He reported that they found the paint to be cost effective and results in good coverage. The campus will currently be switching to said paint for offices.

Shade Update: John updated members about the shade project. The campus wide shade project was approved by Finance last week. Every location that has a window will have blinds. Every classroom with a window will have black-out shades. All other areas will have perforated shades. It is being put forth for Board approval on March 16. John estimates that the project should be completed by July 2010.

Interior Signage and Way Finding: John addressed the issue of temporary letters falling off of the room identifier signs revealing the old letter resulting in confusion to students. The reported that the interior signage is in review. As it stands, due to budget constraints, final destination signs are being temporarily suspended. John’s department is exploring options for way-finding signs, such as creating them internally. In the meanwhile, if an employee sees a sign that has lost the temporary new letter, they should contact Maintenance to have it replaced.

Parking Lot: John reported that the previously gated B-lot is no longer gated. Based on the recommendation of the Parking Lot Committee, it was decided that the B-lot was being underutilized and would be better used if it were an open lot. It will remain open 24 hours a day. The exit gate opens automatically. Jeff S. indicated that if anyone has paid the $5 fee to a parking pass, they should contact the Police Department for reimbursement.

Jeff S. reported that the back door of the R building now automatically locks. According to Jeff, this door was never meant to remain open. As a result of the new locks, problems associated with the back parking lot have been greatly reduced.

Space Temperature Concerns: Any concerns regarding room temperatures should be reported to Maintenance.

Maintenance E-mail: John indicated that they have created a Maintenance E-Mail account for work orders, set-ups, etc… It is Maintenance@triton.edu
Science Lab: As of this meeting, 307 labs are fully operational, 310 are still on hold. John indicated that it is taking longer than anticipated because his department is doing most of the work by themselves.