The meeting began with a welcome and team introductions. M. Leach reviewed the agenda and briefly discussed the team charge. S. Robinson discussed the AQIP model of continuous quality improvement and its timeline and distributed handouts and a binder for assembling documents and notes for members who choose to use it. Documents distributed provided background and statistical information about AQIP at Mott and information to assist teams in going forward with their project, including the “Quality Toolkit.”

M. Leach discussed team roles including his as the Project Chair or Lead, and noted that roles will be adjusted and/or assigned as the team does their work. The first assignment of the team will be to draft and flesh out the Project Charter. Mark opened discussion concerning all the segments of the project charter and discussed the project phases, as outlined in an overhead presentation.

Areas of discussion:

**MCC Stakeholders** – Is the primary stakeholder, or ‘customer’ Student Services or the academic area? Both areas have shared ownership or customer-ship of this process. Both have needs and concerns about the implementation of a wait list process.

CPSC is a customer, as they were asked to study the wait list process via Form 1 (policies or proposals).

Financial Aid: The Waitlist provides the potential for more students with verified funding to be enrolled (see drop process discussion, below).

- **Project Overview**

  **Scope/Assumptions/Constraints** — Question Will more Datatel/Cognos reports be needed? It was noted that the waitlist may provide deans with helpful information. Deans have previously used lagging indicators for planning but using the wait list process will provide leading indicators and should be helpful in keeping sections close to capacity.

  Several questions were raised and discussed among the group. One concerned how pre-requisites and co-requisites will be satisfied with wait listing. It was noted that not all divisions and programs follow these “rules” with the same stringency. Another question: will there be any room for deviation from the waitlist criteria? For example, if it is known there is a problem that has caused a student to be dropped. Will the registrar be able to fill a vacancy with that student, rather than taking the next in line on the wait list?

  A great deal of discussion followed concerning the ramifications of the drop process and how this would impact the wait list processing. Will there be a lag? Will students be placed into newly opened seats if they do not have their financial aid secured?

- **Project Requirements**
  - Project Deliverables (from MCC AQIP Documentation)
“Centralized wait list for class overload.”
“An equitable system, ____________, an automatic system to fill the dropped slot that is open, pre-requisite and co-requisite satisfied.”

- **Project Costs/Budget**

Wait List is an available application in Datatel. There may be some costs for consultations, but the costs should be limited.

- **Other**

S. Robinson discussed holding focus groups with faculty and deans.

Since the CPSC had been asked to study wait listing, T. Boquette agreed to provide a brief report to CPSC during their first meeting.

- **Meeting Schedule**

Several noted that meetings may be difficult to schedule during the Fall start-up period and suggested holding meetings frequently, but for shorter duration. The next meeting will be scheduled in approximately two weeks for just one hour.
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