

**RETENTION COMMITTEE MINUTES
JANUARY 27, 2005**

Present: Ron Bieniek, Carl Burns, Stephanie Fitch, Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Jay Goff, Lora Krizanich, Gearoid MacSithigh, Steve Raper, Keith Stanek, Laura Stoll.

Absent: Dana Barnard, Jennifer Bayless, Meg Brady, Harvest Collier, Chad DeShon, Kate Drowne, Greg Gelles, Lauren Etheridge, Fathi Finaish, Martina Hahn, Marcus A. Huggans, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Chris Ramsay, Kristi Schulte, Tina Sheppard, Lynn Stichnote, Bob Whites.

- I. Meeting was called to order at 8:20 a.m. in the Silver and Gold Room at the Havener Center. January 27, 2005 meeting minutes were revised and approved.
- II. Jay Goff said the preferred applicant did not accept the Director of Institutional Research position. Other candidates were not on the same level so the search is closed and will be reopening.
- III. Jay Goff discussed the website depository. The Enrollment Management site is up. Sean Gottlieb will update. Back reports should be posted to this site. [Copies of approved Retention Committee minutes from October 21, November 4, November 18 (2004) and January 13, 2005 were emailed to Jay Goff and Sean Gottlieb. December 16, 2004 meeting minutes are still pending approval.]
- IV. Jay Goff presented the Fall 2004 Follow-up Phone Survey with Non-Returning Undergraduates. Martina Hahn contacted them at home. There was some trouble tracking students (survey was based on 27/50); some students reinrolled. The survey was designed and implemented to be given after the fourth week of school. Students gave the same reasons for not returning as they did on their exit surveys. Members received copies of the Summary Highlights. After discussion, an additional bullet was suggested stating "60% consider returning at some point." Mizzou and SMSU were noted as leading alternatives to UMR and, possibly, students were going to more tech-type degrees. (Anecdotally, those may be 2-year degrees). Retention may be higher with the Havener Center and the new residential college. 85% said there was nothing UMR could do to prevent them from leaving. 95% would recommend UMR.

Carl Burns presented several items: how students perceive the campus differs by individual. There is a small number in the survey. This is the highest retention level we've ever had. It's anecdotal but it indicates that students recognize UMR is trying to be user friendly and the quality has not diminished. Students don't distinguish between math and other courses. Once students get into a degree program, there is 85-90% graduation rate.

Jay Goff said the potential six-year graduation rate for the 1999 class may be 64%. There were changes in degree requirements and students took advantage of them. The 2000 senior class is small and senior classes will be for the next couple of years. We have the potential to have 65-66% graduation rate. Tools have made a difference on the operational and structural system side.

There was discussion regarding SCHs. What incentives do departments have to deal with and produce SCHs for non-majors? Will the departments get credit for SCHs in the budgeting models? Deans will be responsible for resource distribution. They are actively recognizing success in striving for 87-88% retention rate and maintain the same socioeconomic level.

Incoming freshmen athlete retention is 10% higher than the general student population at UMR. Swimming has almost perfect retention. Females, athletes, and Greeks have higher retention rates. Will the loss of two sports impact retention?

- V. The data benchmarking task force presented a draft Survey of Student Performance in Freshman/Sophomore Mathematics & Science Courses. Discussion included needing personal contact, aiming the survey at the Registrar, if DF&W rate is higher than peer institutions or not. A CSRD consortium report from 4-5 years ago may be relevant to engineering and science. Other comments reinforced that phone conversations were more reliable. How do we define the goals of the survey for incentive? Can we use the name of the institution? Laura Stoll cited research opportunities on web sites, Arizona State, ASEE literature, Association of Institutional Research (AIR), and the Chronicle of Higher Education. The task force agreed to meet next week on Thursday, February 3, 2005.
- VI. The next meeting is scheduled at 8:15 a.m. on February 10, 2005 in room 201 of the Havener Center (Silver & Gold Room). IT will give a demonstration of the Academic Alert System, and will present the results of the Physics prototype and the training plan. The paper early warning system will be in place this semester. Meeting was adjourned.