

UMR Retention Committee Meeting

MINUTES

JAN. 26, 2006 8:15 AM

MEETING CALLED BY	Harvest Collier
MEMBERS PRESENT	Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Marcus A. Huggans, Jonathan Helm, Harvest Collier, Marcie Thomas, Steve Watkins, Meg Brady, Jay Goff, Nancy Hubing, Geariod MacSithigh, Stephanie Fitch, Tammy Pratt, Mary Ellen Kirgan
MEMBERS NOT PRESENT	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Carl Burns, Gregory Gelles, F. Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Robert Whites
GUESTS	Larry Gragg

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 1-12-06 meeting (with the revision of three minor typographical errors).

Agenda Items

I. Student Evaluations of Teaching

Dr. Larry Gragg presented the following information regarding UMR CET evaluations:

CET Teaching Evaluations, 2003-2005

	<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>
# of sections	1286	1303	1324
# of sections evaluated	1081	1105	1136
% below 2.50	18.5	18.4	18.8
% below 2.00	7.9	6.5	6.2

Distribution of those below 2.50 in the Schools/College of Arts and Sciences:

- * School of Engineering—46%
- * College of Arts and Sciences—45%
- * School of Materials, Energy and Earth Resources—5%
- * School of Management and Information Systems—4%

The first year courses which had instructors with low teaching evaluations (in the first instance those sections with CET averages below 2.00 and in the second instance those sections with CET averages below 2.50). I have noted how many students were affected in the fall semesters of 2003, 2004, and 2005:

Number of students in 1st Year Courses with CET evaluations below 2.00:

2003 (331)
2004 (199)
2005 (430)

Number of students in 1st Year Courses with CET evaluations below 2.50:

2003 (1605)
2004 (1519)
2005 (1693)

Dr. Gragg distributed a document titled, “KEY QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN THE LITERATURE ON EVALUATIONS”.

In summary, Dr. Gragg stated the data indicates that most of the lower scores are not found in first year courses. Most students who gave a 2.5 or lower are second, third and fourth year students. This may indicate that departments make an effort to have first year courses taught by their best instructors.

He gave an example from the Chemistry department, demonstrating that the department made significant improvements between 2003 and 2005. Dr. Collier indicated the change occurred after Chem 1 faculty incorporated the use of “clickers” (personal response cards) into the classroom. The use of technology in the classroom engages students to learn with each lecture.

Dr. Collier recently met with the Dean’s Teaching Scholars (DTS) to discuss offering a resource to faculty on teaching effectiveness. The DTS recommended: 1) Mentoring (will require culture change), 2) Motivation (will require recognition), and 3) Preparation (needed to inform faculty about the nature of our students).

Mary Ellen Kirgan indicated that students are not allowed to evaluate her in the Math drop back course. She would like to see evaluations by these students. Dr. Gragg indicated he would look into it.

Stephanie Fitch asked Dr. Gragg for evaluation data on GTAs who are teaching. Dr. Gragg indicated the information could be obtained.

II. 2006 Entering Student Survey

Jay Goff distributed a copies of the 2/18/06 PRO Schedule and New Student Survey. Jay indicated they have expanded the assessment period to 2 ½ hours. He was recently asked to add another assessment during this period.

The committee asked about the Hogan Personality Index (HPI). What happens to this data? Dr. Collier indicated the information is sent to Dr. Bob Montgomery on the Psychology Department. Dr. Collier will invite Dr. Montgomery to join the Retention Committee to give a report on HPI.

The committee asked about the Hobson’s program. Tammy Pratt asked if there is a way for those outside of recruiting to see what Hobson’s can do. Jay Goff indicated that Sean Gottlieb can provide Hobson’s data and training opportunities.

Jay Goff has received the following feedback on the New Student Survey:

1. Be more specific on race- add multi-racial option.
2. Ask if students are interested in fraternities or sororities
3. Ask if students are commonly bored in their classes.
4. Ask if students plan to become a leader in a student organization.
5. Ask if students desire to study abroad.
6. Suggested changes from Tammy Pratt on Academic Support Program were incorporated.

Amy Gillman asked about including questions about a student’s interest in learning communities. Jay indicated the question is most appropriate on the first housing application.

III. GTAs With Teaching Assignments

Marcie Thomas distributed a handout illustrating the data available in PeopleSoft regarding GTAs with teaching assignments. Marcie also distributed a draft survey that could be sent to GTAs, should the Retention Committee decide they want to pursue a qualitative assessment of the preparedness for GTAs and teaching.

Marcie welcomed comments by the committee. The committee decided to look at the GTA's CET scores (provided by Dr. Larry Gragg), before deciding how to proceed.

IV. Strategic Plan Item- UMR Learning Communities

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled for discussion at the next meeting. Dr. Collier asked the committee to review and consider Strategic Plan Objective 4.2 a. prior to the discussion.

The meeting was adjourned.

NEXT MEETING FEBRUARY 9, 2006, 8:15 AM