# College of Arts and Sciences
# Dean's Council of Department Chairs
Wednesday, March 2, 2011
3:30-5:00 pm

## Minutes

**Present:**
Steve Bayne, Chair of Philosophy
Angela Biselli, Chair of Physics
Sara Brill, Co-Director of Classical Studies
Cecelia Bucki, Chair of History
Mary Ann Carolan, Chair of Modern Languages and Literatures; Director of Italian Studies
Kevin Cassidy, Director of Irish Studies
Matt Coleman, Chair of Mathematics & Computer Science
David Crawford, Chair of Sociology and Anthropology
Nancy Dallavalle, Chair of Religious Studies
Johanna Garvey, Director of Black Studies
Janie Leatherman, Director of International Studies
Mark LeClair, Chair of Economics
Danke Li, Co-Director of Women Studies
John McCarthy, Chair of Psychology
Marcie Patton, Chair of Politics
James Simon, Chair of English
Kraig Steffen, Chair of Chemistry
Brian Torff, Chair of Visual and Performing Arts
Brian Walker, Chair of Biology and Co-Director of LACS
Maggie Wills, Chair of Communication
Joan Weiss, Associate Dean of College of Arts and Sciences

**Regrets:**
Jocelyn Boryczka, Director of Peace & Justice
Elizabeth Hohl, Co-Director of Women Studies

**Guests:**
Beth Boquet, Dean of Academic Engagement
Judy Dobai, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
David Frassinelli, Director of Facilities
Michael Graham-Cornell, Director of Computer & Networking Services
Richard Regan, Ed Tech Committee Member
Robert Russo, University Registrar
Suzanne Solensky, Director of Undergraduate Academic Planning

**Approval of the Minutes**
Dr. Brian Walker moved to approve the minutes of February 2, 2011, Dr. Maggie Wills seconded the motion.  All department chairs were in favor of the minutes with four abstentions.

**Announcements and General Discussion of CAS Issues**

***Fall Course Schedules & Enrollment Management***—The Dean asked department chairs and program directors if there were any issues relative to course schedules and enrollment management. Dr. Cecelia Bucki expressed concern with the rollout process. The Dean commented that most people feel that the rollout process works well, but it takes a good plan and management in the time frame of registration for the process to be successful. Ms. Susan Peterson asked if Bucki had access to the listings of her courses through banner. She expressed the importance of checking schedules and time codes to ensure they were properly represented. Bucki confirmed that she had access, as well as her program assistant, so information could be checked for accuracy.

The Dean asked chairs and directors to check their schedules and time codes to make sure they were entered properly. Larger and more complex departments may have colleagues from their department help monitor subsets of the curriculum. Department assistants could help with the proof reading before submission. Ms. Peterson shared that course schedules submitted to the Registrar's Office by chairs and program directors are then typed into banner by members of the Registrar's Office therefore, there is room for error in transcribing. The Dean recommended that any systems issue should be communicated to Ms. Judy Dobai, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, and Mr. Robert Russo, University Registrar.

***CAS Faculty Meeting March 11, 2011***—**Important Votes**
The Dean summarized the following major issues to be discussed at the March 11, 2011 College faculty. There are a number of important votes that will take place during the College faculty meeting. She encouraged chairs and directors to spread the word to their colleagues, in hopes to generate a large turnout at the meeting.

- Governance document language for Individually Designed majors. Dr. Joan Weiss and the College planning committee are working on this. The original proposal around this program had a set of procedures, but not all made it into the College Governance Document, so Weiss and the College Planning Committee are working on getting this recorded officially.
- Election for at-large Merit Committee Members will take place during the March CAS Faculty meeting. In addition, the electronic input system for Merit reports will be demonstrated. Having as many CAS faculty members present at the CAS faculty meeting is important to weigh in their vote and view the new system. The Dean commended the Planning Committee and the Merit sub-committee for their hard work on the system. An MOU with a standard merit raise is expected and will be moving forward from the Faculty Salary Committee. At the next General Faculty meeting a motion to support the MOU will be presented. The Board of Trustees will vote on the budget before then.
- Near the end of March, the College should begin to input their annual reports into the newly designed electronic merit review system. Dr. Mark LeClair sent his faculty samples of what their report should look like. The Dean commended LeClair for doing this and asked that Ms. Jean Daniele remind her to forward an e-mail to the Merit Sub-committee, asking them to generate samples, populating it with examples—some that show mobility and some narrative. (Note: The Dean reached out to the sub-committee to generate samples, but they did not think it was a good idea.) There is no deadline set as of yet, but the Dean mentioned that the reporting process should not take a great amount of time. Faculty are required to upload a reflective essay (limited to 250 words) in each of three areas for teaching, scholarship, and service. They will have an opportunity to edit as they move along through the process.
- Dr. Nancy Dallavalle asked if a proxy vote would be accepted at the CAS Faculty meeting. The Dean commented that proxy would not be acceptable for Governance Document changes, but should be fine for election of Merit committee members.

***Annual review of pre-tenure faculty***

- Guidelines for pre-tenure faculty annual review were discussed intensively in the fall and were redistributed with the recent memo forwarded to chairs relative to pre-tenured faculty reviews. These guidelines should be followed for the annual review process.
- The Dean asked that interdisciplinary program directors be aware of colleagues who are untenured and active within their program. Directors should help faculty receive proper mentoring, engage in classroom observations, and offer constructive feedback. Pre-tenured faculty should feel that their interdisciplinary colleagues are supporting their professional development; therefore tenured colleagues (not just in departments, but in the programs as well) should be weighing in. As well, it's important for chairs to be consulting with their tenured colleagues when junior faculty are reviewed annually and when they go up for rank and tenure. It jeopardizes the candidate if all senior colleagues have not been part of the process, and if junior faculty members have not received regular feedback.
- Dr. Mary Ann Carolan asked if tenured faculty within the department should receive a copy of the letter of recommendation. Tenured colleague assessments should be reflected and a copy of the letter should be kept on file so colleagues have access for review. The Chair's letter of recommendations is sent to the Dean for contract renewal, along with any conditions or statements about deficiencies that need to be addressed, listing a specific time line. The candidate should receive a copy of their assessment. It is beneficial that they see the feedback clearly articulated, and that they view it before their meeting with the Dean. The Dean offered her help with delicate situations.
- The Dean mentioned that the Math/CS Department has multiple meetings of the whole to craft the letter. The Dean felt that this was not an efficient way to handle the process, but noted that it does ensure a process that is collective. If the recommendation is not unanimous it should be stated. Dr. Matt Coleman mentioned that the department meets as a whole, but the chair crafts the letter, and then circulates it for feedback.
- The Dean reiterated that the annual review materials should not include a complete dossier of the candidate. She is requesting three paragraphs, updated CV, quantitative teaching data, and at least one peer classroom observation report. The Dean should receive these materials, along with department chair's letter of recommendation, and the classroom observation report *one week prior* to the candidates scheduled review. The review process should follow systematic due process, where the candidate submits their materials, the chairs and colleagues discuss and evaluate, and communication of that assessment is then shared with the candidate. A sufficient amount of time should be allowed for this process, inclusive of enough time for the candidate to reflect on the feedback shared, before the meeting with the Dean

### *Assessment Next Steps – expectations and timeline for departments*
- NEASC Rubrics—They are moving from a nebulous to a much more specific framework that will provide a clear set of guidelines to follow and a finite set of questions to be answered by each major program. These inventories have the following basic questions:
    o Have formal learning outcomes been developed?
    o Where are they published?
    o What data evidence is used to determine?
    o What is the process for interpreting the evidence?
    o What changes could have been made as a result?

Dr. Curt Naser will be working on a "capstone project" (he will end his role as Academic Assessment coordinator this spring and return to full-time teaching in the fall), taking everything that was submitted on assessment within the College over the past few years and populate this information. Naser will be working with chairs to gather the necessary information for this project and create a snapshot of where the College is to-date.

By the end-of-summer, the Dean's expectations for departments are that they have measurable learning outcomes articulated and published in department materials (e.g., syllabi, appear in catalog, etc...). Aaron Perkus is a good source (along with Dr. Naser) for departments to ensure the learning outcomes they articulate are indeed *measurable*.  As a University, we will most likely develop a means of publishing program learning outcomes, perhaps on the webpage and in the catalogue.  This transparency will allow students to view what it is they are supposed to be learning.

By the time the College approaches the NEASC's five-year report, in the fall of 2012, everyone will be able to fill in the NEASC rubrics with different information (which can be compared with Naser's snapshot to-date). It's important to remember that this is an iterative process with new data leading to revised curricula or pedagogies, and also revised assessment protocols if needed. Further conversations will take place during the April Dean's Council meeting about this topic.  As well, Aaron Perkus will preview Digitation during the April Dean's Council meeting and discuss how this tool could be used for portfolio assessment of students over time.

Dr. Angela Biselli mentioned that when she worked on assessment in the past, they focused on the core. The Dean mentioned that in any given assessment cycle (year), a department may be assessing different things. We do not assess every learning outcome every year, using every method.  Everyone does have to assess core and major/degree learning outcomes.  A lot of times there is overlap between these.  In any event, on average, you should assess at least one core and one program learning outcome each year.

### Core Integration Update
As the Core Pathways Project continues to develop, we will begin to see the relationship between the Core Areas (requirements) and the Core Pathways, which can be seen as threads and links between the core areas and the majors.  The pathways are holistic learning outcomes not particular program outcomes (that is, they reflect outcomes we expect from four-year education, and that our Core Curriculum holistically seeks to achieve).  The Core Areas are discrete groupings that determine learning outcomes for any given core course in that area. The Core Pathways work across core areas and up into the majors (and minors).  Departments will not assess all of these components in a yearly cycle.  It is about having a plan for assessment of each expected learning outcome over time.

### IDEA Form Update—
- Results are in and will be distributed to faculty very soon.  There were a lot of problems.  Paper copies were damaged in the mailing process, and paper forms are extremely costly to the University.  The move towards on-line will be accelerated.  Faculty will receive instruction shortly and faculty will declare between paper and on-line between March 6 and March 18.  The default will be on-line.
- The response rate for faculty who completed the process on paper were extremely high— approximately 86% (though not all students and faculty used the forms correctly). Online response rates were not too much lower than this (if you take out the online courses where students do not use Stagweb and so do not respond to prompts to do evals).
- CAE and FDEC are managing this process. Various workshops will be offered to help faculty understand the data and plan for using forms more effectively for the next round, so they are learning from the idea forms about their students and their class. As well, workshops will help faculty read their data (a session is being developed for Deans to read the aggregate data).
- Department chairs and the Dean will receive group summary reports.  The Dean is also asking for reports that are sub-groups (arts, sciences, humanities, etc...).  She would like to look at cohort subgroups of the data (e.g., all sciences, all soc/beh sciences, etc.).

- The Dean will send out e-mail updates as she receives information, and FDEC and CAE will forward information about workshops, etc.

### *Program Review Queue Update*
The Dean would like to revise the program review queue.  She mentioned that the College learned from interdisciplinary program reviews. Interdisciplinary programs should go through the process at least once, but it is not necessary for them to engage in the cycle in the way that departments and degree programs need to.  Seeing the quality of engagement from Philosophy, Math, and Sociology and Anthropology made the Dean realize that all this work is already unfolding in a lot of departments.  The review process provides a structure.  Some programs late in the queue that have never been reviewed should be moved up in the queue.

*2011 Chairs' Retreat*—Monday August 29th, 8:30-4:30 with continental breakfast and lunch. There will be very few new chairs (1 or 2), and the Dean will put together a separate orientation for them earlier in the summer (so they are ready to begin on July 1).

## Student Academic Support and Engagement
Dean of Academic Engagement, Dr. Beth Boquet, and Director of Undergraduate Academic Planning, Suzanne Solensky discussed Academic Engagement and Planning.

### *Structure and Activities*
Dr. Boquet offered an overview relative to Academic Engagement.  She started off by sharing the basic definition for student engagement—"academic and social integration" (Tinto 2000).  This is the working definition seen in a lot of higher education literature.

Engagement is a term that is deployed with a fair amount of specificity in educational research.  It means very specific things when people are measuring engagement for surveys, assessment, outcomes, etc…  Some of the indicators measured are as follows:
- Faculty-Student Interaction
- Peer-to-Peer Interaction
- Purposeful—Are students, faculty, and staff reporting that they are engaged purposefully in a holistic way?  Does their education feel meaningful?
- Accessible—Does it occur across the spectrum of student population, student years, or is it confined to small pockets of students?
- Focus on Student Learning—What are students learning through the various interactions they encounter?

A few years ago the Intersection of the time frame for dissemination of these results nationally were coming out through AAC&U, Carnegie, Ford Foundation, etc.  Results started to surface the same time we were getting results from NEASC and thinking about the implementation of the University's Strategic Plan, especially Goal II calling for greater collaboration between academic and student affairs.  There was an interesting overlap of some of these measures of engagement and some of the issues that were identified either with accrediting agencies or in surveys such as NSSE and Wabash, most notably in advising and peer interactions around intellectual experiences where Fairfield did not meet expectations.

What does Student Academic Support and Engagement do?  Dean Boquet explained in broad strokes they support co-curricular engagement that gets students talking about ideas and excited about intellectual projects.  The idea is to have students take these experiences outside of the classroom,

having intellectual lives that are interesting to them.  There is a lot of collaboration with Student Affairs, developing and supporting collaboration in the area of Goal II, Living and Learning.

Dean Boquet introduced Ms. Suzanne Solensky, Director of Undergraduate Academic Planning.  Ms. Solensky discussed the following points.

### *Overall goals*
- Prepare for two major events:
  - Fall 2011 advising and registration (in April)
  - Orientation for the Class of 2015 (in June)
- Increase coordination and communication among offices and areas involved in advising
- Promote greater use of technology where it is appropriate

### *Key action steps*
Assist faculty advisors
- Develop more online resources for faculty.
- Offer workshop for junior faculty on advising – Monday, March 14.
- Add advising components to other CAE sponsored events.

Strengthen the peer academic advising program
- Provide additional training to the current First-Year Mentors (FYMs).
- Coordinate outreach by FYMs to first-year students prior to April advising and follow-up by FYMs after registration ends.
- Use peer academic advisors to assist at the optional library registration session for first-year students on Monday, April 18.
- In collaboration with FUSA, hold peer academic advising fair on Thursday, March 31.

Enhance academic planning for the Class of 2015
- Revise First-Year Student Guide to encourage greater understanding of course planning and the advising process.
- Oversee planning for the academic portions of June Orientation: panel presentations, sample classes, small-group and individual advising, and registration.
- Focus on certain key areas:
  - Providing more information to students ahead of time and at Orientation.
  - Preparing Orientation student leaders to be better peer academic advisors.
  - Improving procedures for language placement and for registration for Cornerstone courses.

### *Tutoring, Mentoring, and Disability Issues*
Dean Boquet shared the following information relative to Disability Support Services.
- Directorship updates—There was a change in directorship, since the end of the fall 2010 semester. Ms. Beth Garvey is Interim Director, until the end of July 2011.
- Proposed re-organization of this area:  There was a proposal to disaggregate Disability Support Services and Academic Support Services.  Academic and Disability Support Services came over to Academic Affairs from Student Affairs when the Academic Engagement Office was originated.  There is a proposal for a position in Disability Support Services that is a corresponding position to a director in Academic Support Services. The idea is to build collaborative models.  There are specific accommodation issues that Student Affairs is better

prepared to work with, especially because there needs to be close articulation between counseling and Health Services in so many of these areas. The documentation is confidential; therefore, a strong mechanism is needed to ensure this. Many of the Disability Support Services involves facilities accommodations and parking accommodations, which fall under the division of Student Affairs.

- In the area of disability support there has been approximately a 10 % increase each year over the past 3 years of students coming to Fairfield with accommodations. The projections from the Department of Education indicate that we could expect about a 20% increases moving forward.

- There have been many improvements in terms of early identification. Students have been receiving services for as long as they have been in school, and understand the accommodations they are entitled to by law. Providing reasonable accommodations can be a complex and dynamic area, particularly if we want inclusion to be genuine and meaningful.

- In area of academic support (peer-tutoring area), there was a 40% increase for support from last year and a greater need this year. There is a lot of pressure on our Academic Support Services. We could see this as an opportunity to improve the peer-learning experiencing for the students. Data revolved around peer-to-peer interaction is very significant for students.

- There is a focus on working on improving staff development, regularizing hours and locations. Much of the tutoring that takes place on campus, with the exception of the Writing Center, Math Center, and academic support for athletes has no home. Scheduled tutoring was not feasible until three weeks into the semester, because space could not be allocated until classrooms needs for scheduled courses were sorted out.

- Last year, only through Academic and Disability Support Services, there was over 5000 tutoring contracts by over 200 tutors. This does not include the Writing Center, Project Excel, Academic Support Services for Athletes, and other tutoring needs that do not run through the Academic and Disability Support Services.

- Dean Boquet thanked everyone for their support with the Corner Stone Courses in the variety of work that needed to be done around the improvements and recruiting process. Ms. Solensky worked very closely with Dr. Debnam Chappel and Ms. Susan Peterson. For the most part, there is a good mix of courses with a few exceptions. There may be some outreach in some very targeted areas that will occur over the next few days.


***Student Recognition***—Dean Boquet reminded chairs and directors that Thursday, April 28, will be a day to highlight student scholarly work.
- The Undergraduate Research Symposium is scheduled from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the Barone Campus Center. A broad representation is encouraged, encompassing students from all years. This will be an on-line proposal process, requiring a brief abstract and a budget request to help with the cost of the project. An information session will be provided Thursday, March 31, at 6:00 p.m. for students. The session will help students understand how to present their research, how to write an abstract, etc… The planning committee for this event would be willing to come to classes, to student groups, or any other format about the event and how they may participate.
- The Sigma Xi Poster Session will be held from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in the Bannow Atrium
- The College of Arts and Sciences Student Awards Ceremony is an evening event, beginning at 6:30 p.m. in the Barone Campus Center, Oak Room.

Ms. Solensky mentioned that she was working on organizing advising workshops for junior faculty and was seeking feedback on what would be most helpful within each department—department visits,

particular types of workshops with CAE, through the Dean's office, etc.  Chairs and directors were asked to e-mail their suggestions.

Dr. Mary Ann Carolan asked if there was any thought given to supporting faculty, as we have an increased population with special needs.  She has been in situations where students with disabilities had difficulty, identifying themselves as people with documented needs for accommodation.  Dean Boquet mentioned that the transition for the Interim Director of Disability and Support Services was a challenge, because there was a steep learning curve.  We need faculty development opportunities around working with students with disabilities.  We do not have enough expertise in this area or resources.  Dr. Ceceila Bucki mentioned that FDEC had a great workshop relative to this area.

Bucki mentioned that she just found out the name of the student tutor for History.  She did not have input in choosing the tutor.  What kind of input do chairs have in these situations?  While the tutor is a very good student, she is not a history major.  Dean Boquet mentioned that presently there is a freelance system, but moving forward these are the questions needing to be addressed.  The tutoring area needs more staff in order to meet growing needs.  It is an office that is run without an office assistant.  They are functioning with two graduate assistants and a full-time person organizing all of the academic support and disability support, inclusive of compliance, the hundreds of request for parking accommodations, etc.

**Classroom Scheduling, Technology, Pedagogy: Managing Today and Planning for the Future**
Open conversation took place with Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Judy Dobai; University Registrar, Bob Russo; Director of Computer & Networking Services, Michael Graham-Cornell, Ed Tech Committee Member, Richard Regan; and Director of Facilities, David Frassinelli.

Ms. Dobai explained how the Classroom Management committee was formed.  Fr. Paul Fitzgerald formed the group at end of October to acknowledge and address classroom issues.  They worked on making sure the following was appropriately addressed:
- Classrooms offered a safe conducive environment
- Appropriate Equipment to support teaching
- Assignment of classrooms to faculty

The charge was to examine these issues and make recommendations for improvements.  The committee recognized that there needed to be more ongoing work, such as data collection and use of the data in a more efficient way.  The committee flagged the following points as issues needing change.

1. Stream line reporting—The committee created a system for collecting information about what is happening in individual classrooms.  There are new signs in the classroom and a new centralized phone tree to communicate a problem, avoiding the inconvenience of having to call many extensions before the issue is addressed.  These first steps are not a solution, but it filters information to people that need to hear about the problems.
2. Course information—Discussion is underway to automate the course submission process, allowing faculty to include accommodations required to teach their class (such as media), as well as preferences they would like to see.  This would allow for a much more robust decision-making process, in terms of classroom placement and providing a database that allows for future planning.  If there is an opportunity to think about a new academic building or classroom renovations, the database would help capture faculty classroom needs and preferences.
3. Room Database—The committee initiated a room database, cataloging the setup of each classroom.  Over the spring, they will be adding a grading system, relative to the condition of each room—condition of media equipment, computer hardware, the facilities itself (carpeting,

windows, ceiling, furniture, etc...)  This will allow them to address spaces that need immediate attention and address in a more integrated way the multiple areas that are affecting the particular room.
4. Coordinated Work Orders—Plans to implement a submission process of one work order to accommodate facilities, media, and equipment request is being considered.  If a work order was submitted for a particular classroom, the order could be communicated to all people that are impacted by the room.  In addition, communication would go out to all faculty teaching in the room, so they are aware of the changes needing to be made, the work taking place, and the time frame.

Dr. Richard Regan mentioned the University will most likely end up with five or six different categories of classrooms to accommodate the various classroom needs.  There will be a walk through over spring break making a complete record of all classrooms.  The technology classrooms already have a projector and a facility for plugging in lap tops.

Dr. Kraig Steffen asked where faculty should forward their suggestions relative to classrooms.  Ms. Dobai suggested that it be sent to **Classrooms@fairfield.edu**.  This would be helpful as the committee works through the grading process of the classrooms.  Grading is relative to the current state of affairs not what is preferred.

Bucki mentioned that in some of the classrooms there are two projector screens in the room.  Regan was aware that CNS 203 and 305 had two screens, and mentioned that both screens do not need to be lowered.  Ms. Dobai commented that an automotive screen may not be needed for all classrooms.  This is something the committee will consider when assessing classroom needs.  Biselli shared that the positioning of the screen is sometimes an issue.  It prevents her from using both the screen and the white boards simultaneously. Ms. Dobai mentioned that once they have an inventory, the committee will engage in a much broader dialogue integrating all factors to take into consideration.  Faculty voices are needed during this planning process. This would be the best way to address compromises, because there is a variation relative to the needs for faculty, who are utilizing the same classroom space.

Carolan mentioned that if all classrooms were equipped with technology, there would not be an issue.  Regan commented that this point will be discussed during the committee's joint meeting with the Technology Committee.  Should there be a standard classroom profile, so that anyone could walk into a classroom and find the appropriate setup needed?  There are issues with some faculty not wanting any technology in their classrooms.  The Dean mentioned that the issue is not just about technology vs. non-technology, but we need furniture that is mobile, so different learning environments could be created with or without technology. Mr. Michael Graham-Cornell mentioned that there were several discussions leading towards this path.  It was recognized that faculty teach differently in the same classrooms, and there was awareness of the need for moveable components with consideration of durability.  The spaces that are up for renovations will be looked at first.

Dr. Leo O'Connor asked if there would be any consideration for installing dimming switches in classrooms.  This would be useful for many people for different reasons.  Ms. Dobai will make a notation of this request, but she reiterated that although many of the committee members may have a direct influence on some of the decisions to be made, they are not a decision making committee.  They will make recommendations.  Each member, working from their own unit, collaborates to discuss the changes needed, in an attempt to move the process along.

Mr. David Frassinelli discussed the following progress with new dorms and classroom space.

- Clocks were replaced in Bannow, Canisius Hall, and Donnarumma.
- Fire doors will be replaced in Bannow.
- Spotted ceiling tiles will be replaced, particularly in Bannow, once the roof is replaced.
- Card readers will be installed. There is a focus on Bannow first for safety issues. There will be thirty card readers installed this year, costing approximately $100,000. This project will rollout over the course of multiple years.
- New construction is going extremely well. Starting first with the freshmen dorm in recognition of the Living Learning initiatives, there is a large lobby on the ground floor that can be used for many purposes; there are smaller lounges on each floor above and study rooms at the end of the corridors.
- One of the University initiatives tied to the Living and Learning is to create space similar to Loyola's Residential College. Creating those spaces in the other four buildings of the quad involves creating living and learning spaces within the envelope of the existing dorms, taking bedrooms off line. Those renovations run approximately one million dollars each. They are not funded at this time, but it does not mean that it has fallen off the radar of Facilities or the Board of Trustees. It is still on the list of projects discussed at the Facilities Management meetings with the Board of Trustees.
- The dorm across from the library will be one of the more impressive in terms of finishes. There are large lounge areas on the ground floor, as well as offices and a meeting room.
- The dorm, formally known as St. Ignatus and currently known at 42 Bellarmine Road, was renovated to accommodate 140 students. There was some discussion of dropping the number of students housed, but this does not appear to be happening. The building has a lot of opportunities on the ground level, with a big lounge area and a usable dining room for functions.
- The "A" wing in Dolan Hall will be completed as scheduled.

**Registration—The following questions were addressed to Mr. Bob Russo relative to registration.**
- Dr. Dallavalle asked to explain the function of the wait list. Mr. Russo explained that an automotive wait list will be implemented, where the computer will put the student into the class automatically. Bucki shared her concern with the rollout process. Some seniors complained that they could not sign up for the waitlist. Mr. Russo mentioned that the waitlist was not activated during the rollout process until all classes have registered. Bucki felt that seniors should be at the top of the wait list, once the rollouts were completed. Mr. Russo explained that the waitlist is turned off through registration, but once it is turned on, seniors have first option for wait list for the first day the system is activated. Ms. Peterson asked if the rollout could be limited more specifically, specifying only senior majors. Mr. Russo confirmed that a few spaces could be reserved for seniors.
- Ms. Peterson asked if a student is enrolled in one section and their name is on the wait list for another section, would they be added for another section of the same course for the different time? This could create a problem with holding up opportunities for other students on the wait list. The Dean asked if students could be limited to only one section of the same course. Ms. Dobai would try to work this out.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.