

# University of Missouri-Rolla Retention Committee Annual Report

Following is a summary of key issues addressed by the UMR Retention Committee during monthly meetings held August 2005 through May 2006:

## I. Academic Alert System-

The UMR Retention Committee assisted with the development and implementation of the UMR Academic Alert System. The Academic Alert System is a web-based application that supports communication among instructors, advisors, and students in cases where students are not meeting academic course requirements. The Academic Alert System was designed to replace the "paper version" of the Early Warning System. The system is intended to improve student retention through increased early intervention. Access to the Academic Alert System is available to UMR instructors and advisors on-line at: <http://campus.UMR.edu/acalert/>.

The Retention Committee reviewed Academic Alert System summary reports, provided by the Office of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies (UGS) at the end of the fall 2005 semester.

## II. Students on Academic Probation & Academically Deficient

The Retention Committee reviewed data and provided comments and suggestions for developing a process for assisting UMR students who are on academic probation and those who are academically deficient. Input from the Retention Committee was incorporated into the design of a pilot program, organized by UGS. The pilot program was offered to all students who were on academic probation or academically deficient. The pilot program was implemented in the fall and spring semester, and each semester, the program assisted a group of approximately 25 students.

The purpose of the pilot program was to assist UMR students who have not been able to achieve academic success, to gather students' input to establish a valuable resource that can be delivered from the students' perspective, and to engage students in:

- a. Identifying their learning & study strategies;
- b. Offer proven strategies to improve learning and study skills;
- c. Use the LASSI to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses; and,
- d. Apply strategies that impact student academic success.

The Retention Committee reviewed summary reports, provided by UGS following the implementation of the fall 2005 pilot program. In the spring 2006, the Retention Committee discussed the need to determine the full impact of the pilot programs. The committee expressed interest in finding an effective way to assist all students within these categories. The committee plans to further its discussion and to look at similar retention programs implemented at other institutions.

## III. Academic Advising/Assessment of Academic Advising

The Retention Committee discussed the need for UMR to develop a comprehensive resource for academic advisors that provides the foundational information needed to prepare advisors to meet the advising needs of UMR students.

The Retention Committee discussed the characteristics of an advising program assessment

strategy for the campus. An Advising Assessment Subcommittee was formed to develop a general survey that would inform UMR's Advising Program of the important issues from the student and advisors perspectives. The subcommittee recommended gathering supportive data through campus surveys of students, advisors and department chairs.

The subcommittee recommends the UMR Advising Handbook be updated and include a description of how to properly complete and submit the paperwork required by academic advisors on the campus. The subcommittee plans to look at advisor training issues and consider ways to improve academic advising resources for faculty.

The Retention Committee reviewed the Freshman Engineering (FE 10) Advising Survey results, provided by the Freshman Engineering Program.

The Retention Committee reviewed the results of the March 2006 Advising Panel discussion, sponsored by UGS. The committee discussed the potential need for a campus-wide Advising Coordinator to assist with developing resources for academic advisors at UMR.

The Retention Committee reviewed the results of an academic advising survey, conducted by a group of UMR students in Speech 265.

#### **IV. Academic Dishonesty**

The Retention Committee held discussion on academic dishonesty and the impact it has on student retention at UMR. There was no apparent quantitative knowledge among committee members of the status of academic dishonesty on the UMR campus. This discussion led to the development of an Academic Dishonesty Panel Discussion to identify themes and arrive at strategies for improving the awareness of academic dishonesty issues, and the process UMR follows for dealing with these issues.

In November 2005, UGS and the Center for Educational Research & Teaching Innovation (CERTI) sponsored an Academic Dishonesty Panel Discussion for UMR students, faculty and staff.

#### **V. Graduate & Retention Rates**

The Retention Committee reviewed and discussed UMR Graduate & Retention Rate reports, provided by the office of Enrollment Management.

#### **VI. D/F/W Rates**

The Retention Committee reviewed UMR's D/W/F survey results and the comparative data representative of its sister campuses. The committee determined that the D/W/F rates are lower at UMR than those identified for UMC and UMKC.

#### **VII. Instructor-Initiated Drop Policy**

The Retention Committee reviewed UMR's drop policy in comparison to drop policies at other institutions. The information indicates UMR's instructor initiated drop policy is unusual in comparison with other institutions. Other institutions that drop students do so based on attendance and not performance. The Retention Committee recommended discussing the UMR drop policy with the Provost's Cabinet to gain a better understanding of what our policy implies and to determine if there is consideration for revising it.

### **VIII. Teaching Resources for New Faculty & GTAs Student Evaluations of Teaching/Courses**

The Retention Committee discussed the potential need for teaching resources for new UMR faculty and GTAs.

After reviewing a GTA teaching assignment report, provided by the office of Institutional Research, and a teaching evaluation summary, provided by the UMR Committee on Effective Teaching and Awards (CET), the Retention Committee discerned there is not a significant problem with GTAs teaching undergraduate courses at UMR. However, the Retention Committee recommends developing a process for receiving regular updates from the CET, who monitor teaching effectiveness at UMR.

### **IX. Consideration of UMR Retention Assessment**

The Retention Committee considered the need for an external retention assessment at UMR. After the discussion, the committee concluded that our internal assessment tools are sufficient for identifying important issues and cover most of the material an external auditor would cover. The committee may revisit the issue if the annual retention audit report identifies the possible need for an external audit.

### **X. UMR Learning Communities**

The committee discussed Learning Communities relative to Strategic Plan Initiative 4, Objective 4.2.

### **XI. Enrollment Statistics & 2005 Student Survey**

The Retention Committee reviewed and discussed enrollment statistics and 2005 student survey results, provided by the office of Enrollment Management.

### **XII. 2006 Entering Student Survey**

The Retention Committee reviewed 2006 entering student survey results, provided by the office of Enrollment Management.

### **XIII. Student Retention Audit**

The Retention Committee reviewed and discussed the results of the Student Retention Audit, provided by the office of Enrollment Management.

## **Appendix A**

Copies of approved Retention Committee minutes are available in Appendix A of this report. Retention Committee minutes are also available on-line at:

<http://www.umar.edu/ugs/Retention%20Committee/Minutes.htm> .

# **APPENDIX A**

**UMR Retention Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
2005-06 Academic Year**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

MAY 4, 2006

8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Meg Brady, Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Matt Goodwin, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, F. Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Steve Watkins
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Gregory Gelles, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Robert Whites
<b>GUESTS</b>	

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the April 20, 2006 meeting.

## Agenda Items

### I. Draft Retention Committee Annual Report

The committee reviewed and discussed the draft Retention Committee Annual Report. Committee members made suggestions and comments on the following issues:

#### Academic Advising

- Lynn Stichnote-What should we be saying about advising to the parents and students during PRO? How can we engage more advisors?
- Stephanie Fitch-Do we want to include a recommendation to investigate ways to assess advising? Feel the students would like to see something similar to the teaching evaluations implemented for advising.
- Harvest Collier- Further discussion on the need to have a campus-wide Advising Coordinator at UMR. Suggested more advising attend NACADA sponsored activities.
- Stephanie Fitch- Suggested making advising part of promotion and tenure.
- Harvest Collier- Indicated he would investigate further with Dr. Kosbar, the next Chair of Academic Council.

#### Student on Academic Probation & Academically Deficient

- Harvest Collier-How do we best impact all 300+ students in this category?
- Committee discussed the financial concern of doing this: There are costs associated with the JAM session model. Stephanie Fitch-How do we look at incorporating this into Freshman Engineering and other freshman courses?
- Tammy Pratt- Several concerns. Where are we going with the pilot program? Has difficulty accepting the pilot program assisted students. According to the report, there is no evidence that strategies were applied by students. Recommends an On Course-based program required for all 300+ students.
- Gearoid MacSithigh- Suggested building self improvement resources into all defined

learning communities.

- Stephanie Fitch- Suggested attaching the requirement to deficiency notices in early June requiring students to take the course.
- Tammy Pratt, Stephanie Fitch and Gearoid MacSithigh-Recommended the committee come to a general consensus and make a recommendation for a full assessment/evaluation of the fall and spring pilot program to see what impact it had.
- Amy Gillman- Suggested taking another look at the Turning Point Retention Program implemented by Bradley University.

#### Teaching Resources for New Faculty & GTAs/Student Evaluations of Teaching

- Grammatical corrections noted.
- Suggested changing the last sentence in this section to “The Retention Committee would like regular updates from the CET committee, who is monitoring teaching effectiveness. (This identified the need to amend the February 2006 minutes.)

#### **II. Retention Committee Membership- 2006/07 Academic Year**

Discussed 2006-07 committee membership. Retention Committee members will confirm their membership at the last meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting in 2 weeks: Confirm committee membership, continue advising discussion, Look at Bradley University’s Retention Program and amend the minutes from the February 2006 meeting.

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

APRIL 20, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, Laura Stoll, Steve Watkins
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Gregory Gelles, Jay Goff, Marcus Huggans, Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Lynn Stichnote, Robert Whites
<b>GUESTS</b>	Clayton Weidinger and Sara Newman

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the March 9, 2006 meeting, with the correction on one minor typographical error.
- The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the April 6, 2006 meeting, as written.

## Agenda Items

### I. Student Academic Advising Survey Presentation

Clayton Weidinger and Sara Newman gave a presentation summarizing the results of an advising survey recently conducted. The survey was conducted by a group of students in Speech 265. The survey was triggered by one student in the group who felt he had a bad advising experience at UMR. (Attached is a handout, summarizing survey results.)

Following the presentation, Retention Committee members made the following comments. (*Student responses are italicized.*)

1. How common is it for a student to be told to take a class that doesn't count? Do students who complain about this run their own CAPs reports? *Unknown. A third of the responses indicate students have had bad advising experiences.*
2. How can we help improve the survey response from UMR students? *Completed survey = ticket to free BBQ.*
3. The survey points out an important issue: How can advisors best communicate with/inform students? *Students commented that advisors should give advice about extracurricular activities. Two students in the survey said that they were not encouraged by their advisors to join student organizations and extracurricular activities. Students also want to know about professional societies in their discipline.*
4. Do you feel UMR has a big advising problem? *It's not a huge problem.*
5. Carl Burns suggested organizing student focus groups to gather more information about advising.
6. Stephanie Fitch commented it will be difficult to reach the advisors who need help. Suggested going to Department Chairs and asking them to discuss advising with new faculty. Take issues from focus groups to Chairs.

<b>II. Draft Retention Committee Annual Report</b>
* Due to time constraints, this issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**MAY 4, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

APRIL 6, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Amy Gillman, Carl Burns, Lynn Stichnote, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Greg Gelles, Harvest Collier, Bob Whites, Steph Fitch, Laura Stoll, Emily Petersen, Marcus Huggans, Gearoid MacSithigh, F. Scott Miller, Tammy Pratt, Jay Goff
<b>GUESTS</b>	Martina Hahn

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- Due to time constraints, the minutes were not reviewed. The committee will review and approve them at the next meeting.

## Agenda Items

### I. Draft Retention Committee Annual Report

- \* Due to time constraints, this issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

### II. Retention Survey Questions

- \* Due to time constraints, this issue will be discussed at a future meeting.

### III. Student Retention Audit Update

Jay Goff and Martina Hahn presented a Student Retention Audit Update. (See attached PowerPoint presentation and handout).

“Summarizing the non-returning freshman data”: On average, those students that left UMR have 1 point lower on their ACT, lower high school GPA and class rank. However, the range is tight on these students.

Martina presented the phone survey results. After the presentation the committee discussed the following items:

- Harvest Collier asked how the Retention Committee can directly address these findings.
- Carl Burns suggested identifying the at-risk students early on and doing more early intervention.
- Gearoid MacSithigh- Suggested making students aware of the Academic Alert System.
- Stephanie Fitch asked what percentage of non-returning students were involved in UMR sports.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**APRIL 20, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

MARCH 9, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, F. Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Laura Stoll
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Carl Burns, Gregory Gelles, Jay Goff, Marcus Huggans, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Lynn Stichnote, Steve Watkins, Robert Whites
<b>GUESTS</b>	Robert Montgomery

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 2-23-06 meeting.

## Agenda Items

### I. Academic Advising Program- Continual Improvement

Amy Gillman distributed a summary of the March 1st Advising Panel Discussion.

- \* Stephanie Fitch-“Developmental advising” is not of particular interest with students. Students are primarily concerned with advisors knowing the curriculum, and the process for getting them on the right academic path without making mistakes. Would like to see how other departments train their advisors. Noted the advisors on the panel were all non-tenure track faculty
- \* Dr. Collier- Suggested an “Advising Coordinator” to facilitate advisor training, and provide resources to advisors (NACADA information, etc.)
- \* Tammy Pratt- Suggested that this person be a faculty member. Dr. Collier-Mentioned it would likely have to be an additional role for an existing employee of the campus. Stephanie Fitch- Concerned about asking someone to do more. May have difficulty identifying someone, but it could be possible with the proposed administrative re-alignment.
- \* Amy Gillman- The student group will present the survey results to the Retention Committee at the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### II. Assisting Students on Academic Probation

Committee Discussion:

- \* Dr. Collier- UGS is putting a report together that summarizes the outcomes of the Spring 2006 Achieving Academic Excellence (AAE) Program.
- \* Amy Gillman-Overall, students’ feedback indicates the program was useful and we should continue to offer this resource to UMR students. Their opinions varied on whether or not it should be required.
- \* Suggestion- Look at the comparison of FS05 vs. mid term SS06 GPAs for AAE participants- Did it help them?
- \* Tammy Pratt- Concerned that we know what we need to do- we need to develop a resource to assist students in developing academic skills and increasing motivation.

Concerned we have resources on campus that are not being utilized [Counseling & Academic Support Programs (CASP)].

- \* The committee discussed next steps. Do we develop a course? Who, What, Where needs to be determined. Can we offer it this fall?
- \* Mary Ellen Kirgan- How do we try to preempt it? Can we identify students through the LASSI, place them in groups and require they attend? Similar to conducting a first year experience course (FYE), with students grouped by “needs” level.
- \* Tammy Pratt- How do we use the data to develop a one-hour FYE course for all UMR students?
- \* Stephanie Fitch- There is no need to develop a new course. Consider incorporating the content into the freshman courses.

### **III. Retention Committee Annual Report**

Dr. Collier announced that UGS is working on a report summarizing the activities and outcomes of the Retention Committee for Fall 2005- Spring 2006. A draft report will be provided at a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**MARCH 23, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

MINUTES

FEB. 23, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Harvest Collier, Emily Petersen, Laura Stoll Carl Burns, Stephanie Fitch, Lynn Stichnote, F. Scott Miller, Dana Barnard, Matt Goodwin, Kristi Schulte, Gearoid MacSithigh, Tammy Pratt, Mary Ellen Kirgan
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Gregory Gelles, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Marcus Huggans, Stephen Raper, Steve Watkins, Robert Whites
<b>GUESTS</b>	Robert Montgomery

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 2-9-06 meeting.

## Agenda Items

### I. The Hogan Personality Index (HPI)

Dr. Robert Montgomery Chair of the UMR Psychology Department, gave a presentation titled "*Using Non Cognitive Personality Measures to Understand Student Success.*"

See attached presentation slides.

### II. Advising Assessment Subcommittee Update

Stephanie Fitch stated that although the advising subcommittee had been developing surveys concerning the current state of advising for administrators, faculty, and students, they were recently informed that a student group had already developed surveys as a class assignment for faculty and students. Since these surveys have already been distributed, the subcommittee will continue only with the administrative survey development. She also reminded everyone of the March 3 Advising Conference, and that some of the panelists will be students involved in the development of the surveys. The student group has agreed to share their results with the Retention Committee.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 23, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

FEB. 9, 2006

8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Jay Goff, Matt Goodwin, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Kristi Schulte, Jennie Bayless (for Lynn Stichnote), Laura Stoll, Bob Whites
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Gregory Gelles, Amy Gillman, F. Scott Miller, Stephen Raper, Steve Watkins
<b>GUESTS</b>	Marcie Thomas

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 1-26-06 meeting, with the addition of one statement under Agenda Item II.

## Agenda Items

### I. Follow Up on Teaching Evaluation Scores for GTAs

Marcie Thomas and Laura Stoll are working together to develop a data report indicating UMR GTAs with teaching responsibilities. A complete report will be provided at a future meeting.

The Retention Committee has concurred, based on the CET (Committee on Effective Teaching & Awards) information supplied by Larry Gragg, that further inquiry into identifying the graduate student population is unnecessary at this time. The GTA CET scores are only slightly lower than the faculty CET scores. The Retention Committee recommends developing a process for receiving regular updates from the CET, who monitor teaching effectiveness at UMR.

Dr. Collier summarized the initial meeting with the Deans Teaching Scholars on faculty CET scores. Faculty preparedness and mentoring were important discussion points during the meeting. A suggestion was made to consider discovering the nature of the mentoring activity that is occurring on campus to see if the theme is a "best practice".

Jay Goff suggested that 10 year CET data may provide opportunity to see longitudinal data of changes in faculty/student quality, good things that have happened, etc. Marcie will initiate information request with Larry Gragg.

### II. Draft Strategic Plan (Initiative 4, Objective 4.2)

Dr. Collier initiated a discussion on learning communities relative to Strategic Plan Initiative 4, Objective 4.2.

Questions and discussion included:

- Prestige of the tag on groups as "learning communities".

- What elements characterize “learning communities”?
- What groups are already “learning communities”?
- How can you measure the impact of “learning communities”?
- What objectives would groups have to meet in order to have "learning community" status?
- How to best present the “learning community” resource to students so they would own it.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 23, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

JAN. 26, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	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
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Carl Burns, Gregory Gelles, F. Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Robert Whites
<b>GUESTS</b>	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**

# UMR RETENTION COMMITTEE MEETING

## MINUTES

JAN. 12, 2006 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Meg Brady, Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Gregory Gelles, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Matt Goodwin, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Robert Whites
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Carl Burns, Marcus Huggans, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Steve Watkins
<b>GUESTS</b>	Marcie Thomas

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 12-15-05 meeting with 1 minor revision.

## Old Business

### I. PS Data Report- GTAs Teaching Undergraduate Courses

Emily Petersen provided the following information:

- \* Approximately 672 GA assignments [GA assignments include graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), graduate research assistants (GRA) and graduate assistants (GA's)]
- \* Approximately 189 of these (28%) are connected to a course (lab or lecture)
- \* 76% of those that teach are designated to labs  
24% of those that teach are designated to lectures
- \* Departments that utilize GA's the most include: Chemistry, Civil Engineering, Math, and Mechanical Engineering.

Committee Discussions:

- \* H. Collier-How do graduate students who have teaching responsibilities impact the classroom environment for our students? Consider: lectures, recitations and labs. Consider- What do we do with this information?
- \* S. Fitch-We need to know if this information a problem. Next steps- Look at teaching evaluations in these four areas (Chemistry, Civil Engineering, Math, and Mechanical Engineering).
- \* J. Goff- Did not see a problem 2 years ago in the Retention Survey.
- \* H. Collier- Asked Marcie Thomas to look at the evaluations to determine if a problem exists.

### II. Potential Sub-Committee on Establishing a Teaching Resource for GTAs

The committee agreed that we need to gather additional information first, to determine if there is a problem. The committee will revisit this topic in February 2006.

### III. 6 Week Pilot Program for Academic Success- Fall 2005 Report

H. Collier gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the 6 week pilot program, conducted during the Fall 2005 semester. A copy of the presentation is attached.

## **New Business**

### **I. Achieving Academic Excellence Program- Spring 2005**

Due to time constraints, this topic was tabled. H. Collier will provide an update at a future meeting.

### **II. Academic Alert System Update**

A. Gillman provided the following update on the Academic Alert System:

#### **Academic Alert System- Fall 2005 Summary Report**

- \* 500 Academic Alerts Issues (FS05)
  - 63% Still Open
  - 37% Closed
- \* Top 2 reasons for issuing academic alerts:
  - 1) Poor performance
  - 2) Lack of attendance
- \* Top 3 defined, recommended actions:
  - 1) Attend LEAD sessions
  - 2) Improve homework submission
  - 3) Increase attendance in class
- \* Student Engagement:

Students completed 75% of actions by the established deadline
- \* Advisor Engagement:

63% of all academic alerts issued in FS05 are still open  
37% of academic alerts are closed

### **III. Student Course Evaluations**

The committee will invite Dr. Larry Gragg, Chairman of the CET Committee, to the next meeting for a discussion on this topic.

### **IV. Strategic Plan Item- UMR Learning Communities**

Due to time constraints, this topic was tabled until the next meeting.

### **V. Enrollment Statistics & 2005 Student Survey**

J. Goff distributed copies of the *Spring 2006 Enrollment Statistics*, and the draft *Entering Student Survey*. Jay asked for e-mailed suggestions on the survey within the next 2 weeks. A copy of the enrollment statistics is attached.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**JAN. 26, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

DEC. 15, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Stephanie Fitch, Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Gearoid MacSithigh, F. Scott Miller, Tammy Pratt, Laura Stoll, Bob Whites
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Gregory Gelles, Jay Goff, Emily Petersen, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Lynn Stichnote, Steve Watkins
<b>GUESTS</b>	Mark Fitch, Jonathan Helm, Marcie Thomas

### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 11-17-05 meeting with 2 minor modifications.

## Agenda Topics

### II. "Teaching Engineering" Course, Dr. Mark Fitch

Mark Fitch joined the Retention Committee to discuss his "Teaching Engineering" course. He explained the course is aimed at graduate students interested in teaching engineering. There is a relatively small class size. The course begins with educational psychology, moves towards methodology and finished with academic job search issues.

- \* On the impact of the course- some students discover they are not interested in teaching; one student has moved on to teach at the AF-Institute-Technology.
- \* On using the course as a potential resource for new faculty-Some of the course content is included in new faculty orientation. Elements of the course could be delivered to new faculty if they were receptive to the information. The course is not appropriate for experienced faculty.
- \* It's a summer class- held 1 hr/day- 5 days a week.
- \* The course is part lecture, part discussion, and includes a few guest lectures.
- \* Average enrollment ranges from 1-12 students in the last 6 or 7 years.
- \* As part of the course-students prepare a lesson and receive feedback.
- \* Most students are GTAs that have not had to teach.
- \* Those who have taught will volunteer examples and ask questions related to specific incidents.

Marcie Thomas suggested it may be a great introduction and a tremendous asset for all GTAs to have a similar experience before they teach courses at UMR.

Stephanie Fitch indicated that it may not be practical in all cases to introduce GTAs to the course before they teach, but it could be offered concurrent with GTA appointments. If it were required- What would the departments and advisor's reaction be? Would they think this is a

good thing?

Mary Ellen Kirgan explained:

- \* Previously the Math Dept. met with Math GTAs once a week for 1 hour to discuss classroom issues. She said it worked well for the first 4-6 weeks then it became difficult to engage the students (as they got busier).
- \* These meetings created an information network for the students to discuss common issues.
- \* Concerns were related to "time". Students need time in the summer for research.
- \* Regardless of the teaching courses available, a student's personality plays a big role. We tend to teach the way we were taught, therefore, we are most influenced by our favorite and least favorite instructors.
- \* Incorporating knowledge of the environment from which our students are learning from may be more advantageous than establishing a teaching course.

Mark Fitch stated that what opens the eyes of the students taking the course is exposure to educational psychology and preferred learning styles, etc.

Marcie Thomas indicated we need data to demonstrate which GTAs are teaching students at UMR and identify if there is a problem. We need to look at teaching evaluations and ask UMR GTAs how they feel about their teaching skills and needs. Marcie indicated that she has received feedback from the Council of Graduate Students and they are interested in receiving some teaching assistance.

Harvest Collier indicated he would speak with Larry Gragg and ask where the teaching evaluation committee is with the issue. He may ask Larry Gragg to visit with the Retention Committee and bring the relative information.

Tammy Pratt asked: Do we want to prepare GTAs to graduate from UMR better instructors or are we primarily concerned with improving the quality of what UMR students experience in the classroom?

- \* Harvest Collier answered that we are primarily concerned with the UMR classroom experience.
- \* Mary Ellen Kirgan stated it would be important to include feedback on the first year experience.
- \* Marcus Huggans stated it would be important to incorporate "student ownership of learning" into the course.

Marcie Thomas asked if the Retention Committee would consider forming a subcommittee to take this project on. Harvest Collier indicated- yes.

Harvest Collier asked: Are preparing GTAs and preparing faculty two separate issues

### **III. PS Data Report- Number of GTAs teaching undergraduate courses at UMR**

- Marcie Thomas has requested a report identifying the GTAs that are currently teaching undergraduate student courses at UMR. A report has not yet been prepared. Emily Petersen indicated that she would try to have a report prepared by the next meeting.

#### IV. FE10 Advising Survey

F. Scott Miller distributed copies of the FE10 Advising Survey results.

- The survey was conducted near the end of the Fall 2005 semester.
- 629 students responded to the survey

Survey results are summarized below:

##### **FE10 Advising Survey** Fall 2005

1. Please rate the **AVAILABILITY** of your advisor. (Available during office hours? Responds to email?)
2. Please rate your advisor's **KNOWLEDGE** of courses and procedures.
3. Please rate your advisors **WILLINGNESS** to help.
4. Please rate the **OVERALL QUALITY** of advising provided by your advisor.
5. Finally, please rate your satisfaction with the service and assistance provided by the directors and staff in the FEP office (125 McNutt).

Total number of students responding: **629**

OVERALL AVERAGES (includes all 31 advisors)

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
3.2	2.9	3.4	3.1	3.3

(INDIVIDUAL RESULTS SHOWN ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

**SCALE:** 0=Poor, 1=Below Average, 2=Average, 3=Above Average, 4=Excellent, NA=Not Applicable

#### V. Preliminary Report- 6 Week Pilot Program for Academic Success

- Harvest Collier offered a preliminary report of the Fall 2005 Academic Pilot Program results. A full presentation will be made at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**JAN. 12, 2006, 8:15 AM**

# UMR RETENTION COMMITTEE MEETING

## MINUTES

NOV. 17, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Meg Brady, Carl Burns, Harvest Collier, Kate Drowne, Stephanie Fitch, Jay Goff, Gearoid MacSithigh, F. Scott Miller, Emily Petersen, Tammy Pratt, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Steve Watkins <b>Guest:</b> Marcie Thomas
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Ron Bieniek, Gregory Gelles, Amy Gillman, Matt Goodwin, Martina Hahn, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Robert Whites

### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 11-3-05 meeting with minor modifications to four comments made under the “UMR Drop Policy Update (Committee comments)” section: “Suggest offering a ‘teaching course’
- Collier noted that as a result of contacting all committee members to verify their continued committee service, the names of Jennifer Bayless, Jeff Cawfield, Kate Drowne, Fathi Finaish, Martina Hahn, Nancy Hubing, Christopher Ramsey and Tina Sheppard will be removed as committee members.

### Agenda Topics

#### II. Developing a Teaching Resource for New Faculty & GTAs

The committee wishes to have a more accurate number of GTA's that actually teach on campus. Marcie Thomas offered to contact Bob Mullin and work with Emily Petersen in an effort to extrapolate the data from PS.

The committee wants to better understand what material is covered in the other GTA programs offered on campus and wish to invite Lance Haynes and Mark Fitch to give a brief 10-15 minute overview of the programs they offer.

Topical Issues:

- What do millennial students expect? How do we need to change? What resources do we need in place? Lynn Stichnote mentioned that there are strengths in this generation that can be embraced.
- Academic dishonesty-is there a problem on campus?
- Graduate students: Connecting with undergraduates, how to motivate students in the classroom...low tolerance for barriers...parents ‘taking care of needs of child’ becomes an expectation of the student.

Marcie Thomas: GTAs- what is happening now:

- Lance Haynes does orientation training.

- Marcie met with GTAs to talk about ongoing support, challenges, and strategies in the classroom.
- Counseling & Academic Support Programs hosting some workshops about strategies.
- RPDC is also helping- branching out into higher education environments, course design, learning styles etc.
- Looking at language as a barrier. Many GTAs are international students- increased amount of dissatisfaction about language barriers.
- Barriers: The GTA workshops are not mandatory; therefore there is some poor attendance. There was a great turn out for the proposal writing workshop but the On-Course design and learning styles workshop was not well attended. Consideration: Why can't it be mandatory? Deans would have to decide it.

#### Additional Discussion:

- The GTA workshop is only an orientation. Skills are acquired through experience.
- GTA's activity sometimes directed from the advisor. GTA title doesn't necessarily mean they are teaching. Stephanie Fitch mentioned there is a 3 hour course in the summer about teaching.
- GTAs in front of students are screened for language barriers.
- Deans are looking for a professional who can assist with reducing accents. Mostly working with faculty but also includes GTAs. (UM system issue.) Person or position is still in process of putting into place. Will the GTA workshop be coordinated with this position?
- Contact Emily Petersen about the number of GTAs teaching the undergraduates.
- GTA support requires working with departments or chairs. May be more time intensive but better results. Advisors can have an impact as well.
- Conclusion: We need to pursue this. Something needs to be developed or enhanced in order to find a solution. It was mentioned that Mark Fitch teaches a course titled "Teaching Engineering.". It is a summer course which includes about 10-12 students. Note: Some fellowships require taking the course. Would this be suitable for faculty? Some faculty have attended the class. Harvest will contact Mark. Question: Can this course be mandatory for GTAs?

#### Closing comments:

- Steve Watkins: Talked about Chinese students involved in Toastmasters and have seen improvement.
- Language improvement may be excellent job marketing quality.
- Find out how many GTAs are in the classrooms with undergraduate students.
- Marcie is interested in getting more details on where GTAs are concentrated in regards to teaching. Is it supervised by the instructor? Are they primarily responsible for the course? What kind of courses are they teaching?
- Steve Watkins mentioned he saw the evaluations in the past about the workshops which they do a presentation. His impression is that it is more of a filter for language barriers. Students have to pass it in order to teach so they put more time into the presentation than they might with the actual class they will teach.

### **III. Consideration: UMR Retention Assessment**

- After discussion the committee felt that our internal assessment covers most of the material that the outside auditor would perform. The retention committee would revisit in January the scope of the annual retention audit report and determine if the need exists for an

external auditor.

- Retention audit by Martina Hahn. She is starting the phone calls right now. Harvest Collier asked- Do we need to do more than the internal audit?
- ACT summaries will be collapsed into the audit. Findings, observation, cum. data, benchmarks then we make our recommendations. Do we need more?
- Teresa Farnum & Assoc. proposal – Comment that this does not really extend beyond what we are currently doing. We do it on an annual basis. Is that an effective use of resources if we are already doing this? Is there anything to gain? Outside perspectives are helpful. One thing that happens is that it takes as much time to work with the outside as it does with the inside. One benefit might be for accreditation. Is timing is an issue? Is there any 'influence' to an outsider making the recommendations that would be a benefit for us?
- We are having problems making change but do not have support financially. Talked about the Enrollment Management audit (formalizing it). Having a consultant to provide direction in the next five years.
- What are the primary issues we are facing? January is the internal audit. Where are we internally assessing?

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**DEC. 15, 2005, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

NOV. 3, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Matt Goodwin, Carl Burns, Amy Gillman, Harvest Collier, Laura Stoll, Emily Petersen, F. Scott Miller, Stephanie Fitch, Kate Drowne, Gearoid MacSithigh, Dana Barnard
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Jennifer Bayless, Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Jeff Cawfield, Fathi Finaish, Gregory Gelles, Jay Goff, Martina Hahn, Nancy Hubing, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Tammy Pratt, Christopher Ramsay, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Tina Sheppard, Lynn Stichnote, Steve Watkins, Robert Whites

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 10-20-05 meeting with minor modifications to four comments made under the "Impact to UMR Drop Policy" section.
- The committee suggested modifying the format to include the identification of those who were not present at the meeting.
- The committee suggested contacting those who are routinely absent from Retention Committee meetings for the purpose of establishing a list of active members.

## Agenda Topics

### I. UMR Drop Policy Update

Laura Stoll provided the following summaries:

A. Summary of drops and changes to hearer status the two weeks prior to the Oct. 4, 2005 deadline:

- Drop- by student- 349
  - Drop- excessive absence- 10
  - Drop- Unsatisfactory work- 35
  - Drop- both work & absences- 36
  - ENRL- Hearer – 148
- Grand Total = 578

B. Summary of FS 2005 of instructor drops:

- Excessive absences- 102
  - Unsatisfactory work- 37
  - Both work and absences- 42
- Grand Total = 181

Committee comments:

- Are we at a change in policy? Has there been a decision by the administration?
- Can we incorporate On-Course principles into all UMR courses? (Students taking responsibility for their own learning.)
- Suggest incorporating active learning into UMR courses. We can also make it a part of

GTA training.

- Suggest offering a “teaching” course and inviting new faculty to take the course prior to teaching their first semester. What is the best way to develop this resource? The committee suggested beginning with new faculty and GTAs. Suggest support from the Dean’s Office to make this happen.
- March 06- On Course conference in St. Louis. Those who attend the conference can possibly serve as a resource for others at UMR.
- CERTI’s On-Course User’s group has examples of how On-Course principles have been applied in UMR courses.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Ask Patti Fleck and Marcie Thomas to attend the next meeting to discuss potential ways to develop and deliver this resource.

#### **II. Academic Pilot Program Update**

- The Academic Pilot Program project has been implemented. UGS has met with students each week, and will continue to meet through Nov. 21, 2005.

#### **III. Assessment of Advising Update**

- The Advising Assessment subcommittee is continuing to develop the survey questions for next semester.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING                      NOV. 17, 2005, 8:15 AM**

The Retention Committee Assessment topic will be discussed at the Nov. 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

# UMR RETENTION COMMITTEE MEETING

## MINUTES

OCT. 20, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Harvest Collier, Amy Gillman, Carl Burns, Greg Gelles, Laura Stoll, Emily Petersen, F. Scott Miller, Gearoid MacSithigh, Stephanie Fitch, Tammy Pratt
<b>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	Dana Barnard, Jennifer Bayless, Ron Bieniek, Meg Brady, Jeff Cawfield, Kate Drowne, Fathi Finaish, Jay Goff, Matt Goodwin, Martina Hahn, Nancy Hubing, Marcus Huggans, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Christopher Ramsay, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Tina Sheppard, Lynn Stichnote, Steve Watkins, Robert Whites

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 10-6-05 meeting with the correction of one minor typographical error.

## Agenda Topics

### I. Impact of UMR Drop Policy

- Stephanie Fitch redistributed a copy of the DFW Survey and distributed a report with comparative data for UMR. She related some recent discussions she had with UMR coaches who are upset about UMR's current drop policy.
- Laura Stoll explained that in addition to the report provided, some additional data has been compiled to include reason codes for student drops (reasons such as excessive absences, unsatisfactory work, or both). This data was recently distributed to the Deans and Vice Provosts for review; however, the data requires additional analyses.
- Stephanie Fitch explained that nearly all drops at other institutions occur within the first two weeks, due to absences.
- The committee discussed potential legal concerns. Students who are dropped from courses may require their tuition returned.
- Carl Burns indicated that approximately 6 students recently reported their reason for withdrawing from UMR was for being dropped from one or more courses.
- Harvest Collier suggested that instead of using the drop policy, instructors could make LEAD, tutoring and JAM Sessions a requirement of the course, instead of a recommendation. Gearoid MacSithigh indicated that if this becomes a requirement, the schedule should be modified so students can attend. The committee agreed it would be important to clarify how this requirement would be standardized for the campus.
- Harvest Collier recommended the discussion be brought to the Provost's cabinet.

### ACTION ITEMS

2. Laura Stoll will bring a summary of recent student drops to the next meeting.

### II. 6- Week Pilot Program Update

Harvest Collier gave an update of the academic pilot program:

- During the first session, students completed the LASSI (Learning & Study Skills

Inventory). During the second session, students focused on critical issues identified by the LASSI results and discussed their individual goals.

- Students reviewed their goals during the third session and discussed the practicality of implementation.
- Three faculty members are participating. Students are owning the process. Jeremiah King has agreed to participate in future sessions, as a student mentor.

### **III. 6- Assessment of Advising Update**

- Stephanie Fitch reported that the subcommittee is currently working on the survey questions.
- They are planning to conduct the student survey during the spring 2006 semester by attaching the survey to the registration process in Joe's SS.

### **IV. 6- Limitation of Hours for Work Study Students**

- Laura Stoll reported that currently, UMR students who are working less than 16 hours per week maintain an average GPA of 3.17. UMR students working > 16 hours per week maintain an average GPA of 3.21.
- Currently, UMR work study students are limited to 16 hours per week; however, all other UMR students may work up to 20 hours per week.
- Bob Whites is planning to meet with the Academic Council's Student Awards and Scholarships Committee to request making the work study requirement consistent with work requirements for other UMR students.
- The committee agreed it would be better to keep our students employed on campus, rather than have them work off campus.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**NOV. 3, 2005, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

OCT. 6, 2005

8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>GUESTS</b>	Marcie Thomas, Center for Educational Research & Teaching Innovation
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Harvest Collier, Amy Gillman, Nancy Hubing, Kate Drowne, Meg Brady, Matt Goodwin, Bob Whites, Stephanie Fitch, Dana Barnard, Lynn Stichnote, Laura Stoll, Greg Gelles, Gearoid MacSithigh, Emily Petersen

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 9-22-05 meeting. The committee approved the minutes with two minor revisions.

## Agenda Topics

### I. Results of D/F/W Survey

DFW Survey- Stephanie Fitch provided the committee with copies of the D/F/W survey results. Overall, the survey results indicate that UMR's D/F/W rates are lower than those reported by UMC and UMKC. Laura Stoll explained that when DFW rates were previously tracked (in 2002); there was a steady decline in the numbers. Stephanie Fitch explained that although this was a previous issue with our administration, the survey results indicate that that this is not a big issue for UMR and that the report shows comparative data with sister campuses to support this.

Instructor-Initiated Drop Policy- The same report contains information that Jonathan Helm collected from other institutions regarding drop policies. The responses indicate that UMR's policy on instructor drops is unusual in comparison to the responses received from other colleges and universities. Other institutions that drop students do so based on attendance and not performance.

### ACTION ITEMS

3. Harvest Collier recommended discussing the UMR drop policy with the Provost and Deans to gain a better understanding of what our policy implies and to determine if there is consideration for revising it.
4. Harvest Collier requested a complete report for UMR be used as comparative data and to include a summary of the impact on our students (such as the number of complaints). Laura Stoll volunteered to compile this report.

### II. Academic Alert System- Update

Amy Gillman reported that approximately 414 students have received academic alerts (prior to mid-term). Overall, the system is working well. IT is working out the minor issues that have been brought to their attention. UGS is seeking ideas for raising Academic Alert System awareness among UMR students. Committee members suggested making information available on table tents in the residence halls and posting flyers. The committee also discussed the effectiveness of asking instructors to put the information in their course syllabus, and to

make announcements in class. UGS indicated an interest in developing an Academic Alert-student activity for Opening Week.

### **III. 6-Week Pilot Program for Academic Success**

UGS sent an invitation to 300+ students to participate in the pilot program. Harvest Collier will give an update at the next Retention Committee meeting.

### **IV. Advising Subcommittee-Update**

Stephanie Fitch gave the report for the Advising Assessment Subcommittee. The subcommittee recommends gathering supportive data through campus surveys. The subcommittee is currently working on survey questions. They proposed the following 3 surveys and methods for conducting each.

1. Student surveys- Work with Registrar & IT to incorporate the survey into the registration process.
2. Undergraduate faculty advisors- Unsure how to best deliver the survey.
3. Chairs/Administrators- Conduct electronic survey.

The subcommittee recommends the UMR Advising Handbook be updated and include a description of how to properly complete and submit the paperwork required by academic advisors on the campus.

The subcommittee plans to look at advisor training issues and to consider: What is currently offered? How do we improve the Academic Advising Conferences currently offered by UGS? Amy Gillman asked the subcommittee to propose a topic and potential speaker for the April 2006 academic advising conference.

Retention Committee members commented that many advisors want to become more familiar with the "basic information" related to the UMR curriculum and how to best advise students and process UMR paperwork.

### **V. UMR Retention Report**

Harvest Collier distributed a copy of the Fall Semester 2005 Graduation and Retention Rates report, provided by Jay Goff.

Overall:

87% first-second year retention rate\* (85% for the 2003 cohort)

64% six-year graduation rate\* 1999 Freshman class cohort (63% for the 1998 cohort)

2001-2006 Strategic Plan Goals:

88%-90% first-second year retention rate

65%-68% six-year graduation rate

### **VI. Academic Dishonesty**

Marcie Thomas announced the Nov. 2, 2005 panel discussion on Academic Dishonesty and distributed a draft copy of the agenda for this event. The panel discussion is being held to identify themes and arrive at strategies and solutions for improving the awareness of academic dishonesty issues, and the process UMR follows in dealing with these issues.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING**

**OCT. 20, 2005, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting MINUTES

September 22, 2005

8:15 AM

## MEETING

### CALLED BY

Harvest Collier

## ATTENDEES

Harvest Collier, Kristi Schulte, Dana Barnard, Tammy Pratt, Stephanie Fitch, Gearoid MacSithigh, Laura Stoll, Emily Petersen, F. Scott Miller, Steve Watkins, Matt Goodwin, Carl Burns, Debbie Schatz (for Lynn Stichnote)

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Amy Gillman, Marcus Huggans, Kate Drowne, Jay Goff, Jennifer Bayless, Ronald Bieniek (Sabbatical), Meg Brady, Jeff Cawfield, Fathi Finaish, Greg Gelles, Nancy Hubing, Mary Ellen Kirgan, Robert Whites

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 9/8/05 committee meeting with corrective changes to the meeting attendee list and one word substitution 'involving' for 'inviting' in the Agenda Topics section under "Proposed Pilot Program: Committee members comments"

## Agenda Topics

### I. Pilot Program for Assisting Students – Update

Harvest Collier reported that he had held meetings with UMR Curators Distinguished Teaching Professors and Deans Teaching Scholars to gain their insight on how addressing the needs of academically deficient/probation students could best be done. They were very supportive of the need to provide a beneficial resource. The Deans Teaching Scholars offered to assist as practical as possible in the implementation of the campus resource.

Collier related that Amy Gillman was pursuing the identification of UMR students that may potentially serve as peer mentors to support a pilot implementation. Collier related that in a discussion with the academic deans, there was strong support from them for providing a resource for academically deficient students.

Laura Stoll has provided a list of students that currently have deficient or probation status, but are currently enrolled at UMR. Students from this list may be invited to participate in the pilot implementation.

Carl Burns noted that it may be too ambitious to consider implementing the pilot this semester without first providing the appropriate training for the peer student mentors that would be invited to participate in the project.

### II. Assessment of Academic Advising

The committee participated in a general discussion on the characteristics of an advising program assessment strategy in order to arrive at the charge for an assessment advising subcommittee. Assessment issues discussed included student input, faculty/advisor input, level of student (including freshman, transfer and graduate students) to target, and desired outcomes of an assessment survey.

The discussion generally supported that the new subcommittee charge should include the development of a general survey that would inform UMR's Advising Program of the important issues from student and advisor perspectives.

### III. Advising Subcommittee

Stephanie Fitch, F. Scott Miller, Gearoid MacSithigh and Carl Burns volunteered to serve on the Advising Subcommittee.

### IV. Discussion of the Need for an Advising Course

The committee briefly discussed the need for a comprehensive course for UMR advisors that provides the foundational information needed to prepare advisors to meet the advising needs of UMR students. There was consensus that the course should be developed and made available to the campus.

Collier noted that the Retention Committee's development of the advising evaluation tool and the advising course should be presented to the Academic Council for its endorsement.

### V. Discussion of Academic Dishonesty

The committee briefly discussed academic dishonesty and the impact it has on student retention at UMR. There was no apparent quantitative knowledge among committee members of the status of academic dishonesty on the UMR campus. Collier suggested that the committee come to the next meeting expecting to discuss this issue and to bring any knowledge contributions desired to aid the discussion and determine the role the committee should undertake.

The meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING: October 6, 2005, 8:15 a.m.**

## APPENDIX

### Resource References

Advising Program Evaluation: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/AssessmentInst/index.htm>

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

SEPT. 8, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Harvest Collier, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Greg Gelles, Jeff Cawlfild, Kristi Schulte, Dana Barnard, Tammy Pratt, Stephanie Fitch, Gearoid MacSithigh, Kate Drowne, Laura Stoll, Emily Petersen, Marcus P. Huggans

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</b>
The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 8-25-05 meeting. The minutes were approved with two minor changes (typographical errors).

### Agenda Topics

<b>I. Proposed Pilot Program- for students on academic probation &amp; academically deficient</b>
<p>The Retention Committee continued its discussion related to assisting students who are not meeting the academic course expectations. Dr. Collier indicated he would like to invite students to participate in a pilot program this semester.</p> <p>Committee members shared the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Which students will be invited to participate? How will we identify them?</li><li>• Will there be one person who is consistently present at these sessions? Who will that be? Consider identifying certain faculty, student organizations, or Honors students.</li><li>• Consider asking the Dean's Teaching Scholars to assist.</li><li>• How many of the Distinguished Teaching Professors and Dean's Teaching Scholars have participated in the On-Course workshop?</li><li>• Consider using the Supplemental Instruction model and incorporating it into the program.</li><li>• Consider involving the students' advisors.</li></ul> <p>Dr. Collier indicated he would move forward with the development of a pilot program and invite students to participate this semester. Ideas for program improvement can be incorporated as the program expands.</p>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. Laura Stoll will provide Dr. Collier with a list of students who can benefit from participating in the program. This list will include students who were academically deficient or on probation in May 2005, and are currently enrolled in FS 2005.</li><li>6. Dr. Collier will select a sampling of students from this list and invite them to participate in the program this semester.</li></ol>

<b>II. Student Enrollment</b>
<p>Dean Goff reported the increase in UMR student enrollment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• He mentioned that much of this increase was due to improved student retention and he thanked the Retention Committee for their efforts.</li></ul>

- Dean Goff will provide a detailed update for the committee in October 2005.

### **III. Evaluation of Academic Advising at UMR**

Dr. Collier described the background/development of the UMR Academic Advising Program. He asked the committee to consider developing an advising process and a method for evaluating the advising process.

Committee members shared the following comments and suggestions:

- Focus on freshman engineering advising- it may have its own process. In the past Ron Fannin has sent out an email survey regarding advising.
- Consider looking at other schools for model programs. Collect data/success stories from other schools and share this information with the UMR faculty.
- Are we going to ask our advisors how confident they are about advising students? Particularly for new faculty who have been at UMR less than 5 years. Many new faculty members wonder how the advising process works, and what to recommend to students regarding their course schedules, placement tests, etc.
- What kind of training do UMR advisors get? Does each department handle it differently?

The committee discussed the potential development of an “Academic Advising 101” session for UMR faculty which would include the fundamentals of advising students.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

At our next meeting, Dr. Collier suggested the Retention Committee form a sub-committee to address the evaluation of academic advising at UMR.

**NEXT MEETING**

**SEPT. 22, 2005, 8:15 AM**

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

AUGUST 25, 2005 8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Harvest Collier, Amy Gillman, Emily Petersen, Marcus Huggans, Stephanie Fitch, Gearoid MacSithigh, Tammy Pratt, Steve Watkins, Carl Burns, Laura Stoll, Jay Goff, Lynn Stichnote

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</b>
The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 8-11-05 meeting. The minutes were approved with two minor changes to the action items noted.

### Agenda Topics

<b>I. Students on Academic Probation &amp; Academically Deficient</b>
<p>Vice Provost Collier has contacted the Distinguished Teaching Professors (DTPs) at UMR about providing a resource for these students to assist them in succeeding academically. The DTPs agreed that they are interested in discussing it further. Dr. Collier indicated that initially, the work with these students would be provided out of the classroom, but may be organized as a class in the future. Dr. Collier asked the Retention Committee to suggest potential activities/ roles. Committee members made the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee suggested involving UMR student organizations</li> <li>• Tammy Pratt recommended we look at models from other schools that use "peer advisors".</li> <li>• Stephanie Fitch suggested involving those students who struggled (academically) in the beginning but pulled through.</li> <li>• Dr. MacSithigh suggested involving alumni who had difficulties, but ended up successful.</li> <li>• Tammy Pratt suggested we invite them to participate in a summer bridge program.</li> </ul>
<p>Dr. Collier asked the Committee if we should require these students to participate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laura Stoll suggested we make it a requirement for students on deficient status, and persuade students on academic probation to attend.</li> <li>• Jay Goff indicated we could make a requirement quickly if we put together a recommendation and gave it to the Academic Council.</li> <li>• Tammy Pratt expressed concern that the students will be angry if we require them to attend this semester without them being informed up front.</li> <li>• Stephanie Fitch suggested we pilot the program this semester and make it a requirement in January 2006.</li> <li>• Carl Burns suggested we wait until next semester to pilot the project, allowing time to organize the program this semester.</li> </ul>
<p>The Committee discussed different ways for identifying student who would be required or encouraged to participate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tammy Pratt suggested using the LASSI as a toll to identify students.</li> <li>• Stephanie Fitch suggested we look at the "450" students and identify how many have not followed the recommended actions on their scholastic action form.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee discussed the deficiency process and Peoplesoft. - How to follow up on students and their academic status. How do advisors get a list of deficient students early in the semester? It was suggested that the paperwork process is not always effective.</p>
<p>Dr. Collier indicated that by mid-term, he would like to invite students to participate in a pilot project. He asked the Committee to consider the best way to structure the pilot program. Committee members provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we require participation this semester, timing will be a problem.</li> <li>• Must provide incentives.</li> <li>• Look for equal representation of the two groups (probation and deficient).</li> <li>• Consider- how do we identify students? Do we talk to their advisors?</li> <li>• Consider- If we got 10% of these students to participate- is that enough to go through with the pilot project?</li> </ul>
<p>Further Discussions: Lynn Stichnote asked if there was value in looking at the implementation of a 2 week program before the beginning of each semester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Huggans suggested making the 2 week course required.</li> <li>• Carl Burns suggested using the JAM session model using peer mentors.</li> <li>• Jay Goff asked the Committee to consider potential operational road blocks such as preparation time, availability of residence halls and peer mentors, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr. Collier will arrange a meeting with the DTPs.</li> </ol>

## II. Academic Alert System- Update

The Office of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies (UGS) gave an update on the Academic Alert System. The system is currently available for use by all faculty and students. All faculty members have been notified electronically and in writing. Amy Gillman explained the status of the administrative reporting functions of the system. The application will allow UGS to access the following reports:

- a. General Summary Report- This report outlines 1) the number of alerts issued, open, or closed; 2) the number of actions that were addressed, and the number of actions that are past due. This data is organized by student, instructor, advisor or school/department.
- b. Student Engagement Report- This report offers information on how well students are responding to/using the academic alert system. The report outlines 1) the number of actions that have been completed or not completed by the established deadline; 2) the percentage actions that have been completed or not completed by the established deadline. This data is organized by student, instructor, advisor or school/department.
- c. Academic Advisor Engagement Report- This report offers information on how well advisors are utilizing the system. The report outlines 1) the number of alerts that are closed out/not closed out; 2) the percentage alerts that have been closed out/not closed out by the advisor. This data is organized by advisor or school/department.
- d. Root Cause Report- This report outlines: 1) the total number of alerts issued for each of the listed root causes; 2) the total number of recommended actions by category; 3) the total number of each potential consequence.

Additionally, UGS will be able to automatically run and send reports to department chairs during mid-term and at the end of each semester. Departmental reports will contain information regarding the total number of alerts issued within their department and the status of each alert. The data will be sent in an Excel format. The data can be sorted by student, instructor, or advisor.

NEXT MEETING

SEPT. 8, 2005, 8:15 AM, SILVER & GOLD

# UMR Retention Committee Meeting

## MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2005

8:15 AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Harvest Collier
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Harvest Collier, Amy Gillman, Tammy Pratt, Art Brooks, Jerry Hammons, Carla Bates, Gearoid MacSithigh, Marcus Huggans, Carl Burns, Laura Stoll, Lynn Stichnote, Matt Goodwin, Nancy Hubing, Emily Petersen

## Agenda Topics

### ACADEMIC ALERT SYSTEM

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Carla Bates and Jerry Hammons of IT conducted an on-line demonstration of the new Academic Alert System. Committee members were provided with a one-page description of how the system is intended to work. The description outlines the roles of the instructor, student and advisor.
	During the demonstration, committee members made the following suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amy Gillman suggested the required date format (00/00/2005) be posted next to the Deadline box.</li><li>• Nancy Hubing suggested the phrase "This information will be made available to the student" be placed adjacent to the Other box, so instructors and advisors are reminded that their comments will be viewed by the student.</li><li>• Gearoid MacSithigh suggested a link be made available on the Joe's Self Service page.</li></ul>
	Additional discussions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The current system notifies the advisor within one week if a student does not open their academic alert. Gearoid MacSithigh suggested the email be sent to the advisor within 3 days instead of one week. This modification would require programming changes of the current application. IT agreed to consider this change for revision after the system was used for the 2005-06 academic year.</li><li>• Tammy Pratt expressed interest in the ability to search for or receive notification of students with disabilities who had received academic alerts. Further investigation is required.</li><li>• Marcus Huggans asked if there was a way to identify minority students who had been issued academic alerts. Further investigation is required.</li></ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UGS announced that all UMR faculty will receive a memo and a one-page description of the academic alert system in the campus mail during the second week of class.</li><li>• A demonstration of the academic alert system will be open to all faculty and staff on September 9, 2005 from 12:00-1:30 pm in the Turner Room of the Havener Center.</li></ul>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	
	2. IT will make the minor modifications suggested near the Deadline and Other box on the academic alert screen.
	3. Laura Stoll will provide a link to the Academic Alert System on the Joe's Self Service web site. The link will be available within the next few days.
	4. UGS & IT will meet with Marcus Huggans and Connie Arthur to further discuss the possibility of identifying special groups of students with the reporting function of the Academic Alert System.

NEXT MEETING

AUGUST 25, 2005, 8:15 AM, SILVER & GOLD