

**RETENTION COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**JANUARY 13, 2005**

Present: Dana Barnard, Meg Brady, Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Kate Drowne, Stephanie Fitch, Greg Gelles, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Matt Goodwin, Marcus A. Huggans, Lora Krizanich, Gearoid MacSithigh, Tammy Pratt, Steve Raper, Kristi Schulte, Keith Stanek, Laura Stoll.

Absent: Jennifer Bayless, Ron Bieniek, Chad DeShon, Lauren Etheridge, Fathi Finaish, Martina Hahn, Emily Petersen, Chris Ramsay, Tina Sheppard, Lynn Stichnote, Bob Whites.

- I. Meeting was called to order at 8:15 in the Silver and Gold Room at the Havener Center. Copies of the draft minutes from the December 13, 2004 meeting were distributed for review. Keith Stanek asked that comments be returned within one week for revision.
- II. Jay Goff discussed the Director of Institutional Research position. The search committee recommended a candidate to the Provost and it is under negotiation. They may know tomorrow. The applicant will be able to co-chair this committee. Start date may be mid-February.
- III. A task force was formed regarding benchmarking data between schools. Members include Carl Burns (Chair), Steph Fitch, Gearoid MacSithigh, Keith Stanek and Laura Stoll. Carl Burns said there was a survey from 1995-96 with about 20 schools that may have been updated by Dave Saphian. The UM System role and scope institution comparison study focused on Virginia Tech, RPI, IIT, and South Dakota. Colorado School of Mines and Michigan Tech were closest to UMR. Carl Burns suggested that math courses should review previous course. Knowledge is not fresh; recall needs to be unearthed. Math discussion continued. How do you measure the quality of learning? Calc I and Calc II may be looked at as remedial courses. Other discussion suggested that questions may need to be broader than math. Foundational courses include math, chemistry, and physics. The review question set will be presented to the Retention Committee. Carl Burns said the CRDE report may be helpful and Emily Petersen may have an update.
- IV. Academic Alert System discussion. Harvest Collier said the Academic Alert system was close to completion. Reports will be sent to the faculty, Chair, advisor and student. Question was raised if Tammy Pratt's group will have access. Laura Stoll suggested not having a paper option. Steve Raper seconded the ease of use but wanted to know how the speed of the system will help the student. What are the consequences? Suggestions included tangible items such as holds on accounts and parking permits, but must focus on due process rather than punishment. Harvest Collier stated that there is a narrative component and can insert stops that are actionable. Meg Brady gave a status report on the Academic Alert system. It is

in the final debugging stage and a demo will be available in the third week of the semester. Meg's role is now in the academic application of technology and how to apply technology more appropriately. There are prompts tags which generate more information to the students. Advisors having more than 100 advisees could be more proactive. The system will capture and quantify interactions.

- V. Harvest Collier said there was good participation in advising seminars and would like to add this to next meeting's agenda. NACADA handout was distributed to the committee. Plaques will be awarded for each of four schools. Suggest those be located in Havener Center.

Keith Stanek said there was a burden on the departments for new faculty advisor training. They are not familiar with the concept of course sequence and Keith suggested new advisor training during orientation process, especially regarding non-ABET schools. Could this be posted on Institutional Research website?

- V. The meeting was adjourned. Next meeting is scheduled on January 27, 2005 in the Havener Center, Silver & Gold Room.