Missouri S&T Retention Committee Meeting
April 21, 2011
8:15-9:15 AM


Members Absent: Thulasi Kumar, Rachel Morris, Lee-Ann Morton, Stephanie Rostad, Michael Schwartz

I. Review and Approval of Minutes
The committee members reviewed the minutes from the April 7, 2011 meeting. A motion was made (Cecilia Elmore) and seconded (Kristi Schulte) to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved with the noted correction of “Next Meeting April 21, 2011 at 8:15 am. A presentation will be made by Larry Gragg and Harvest Collier on Intrusive Intervention”.

II. Old Business—a) Reminder of Work Groups

III. New Business
Larry Gragg provided an update on his “Pro-Active Intrusive Intervention Lite” project. He shared that the student challenges of attendance, note taking, and grades were being considered for 211 History 175 and History 176 students during the Fall semester of 2009 through the Spring semester of 2011. He summarized the outcomes related to surveys/interviews he conducted between the first and second course exams during Spring 2011 semester. Noting how students indicated how they learned best, what were their greatest strengths/weaknesses from the interviews provided some general “best practices” for exam preparation and course success.

He provided incentives to promote student class attendance (points toward final grade) and in-class note taking (daily quizzes allowing use of notes) as well as shared with the class good insights for success provided by the high-performing students in the class. These insights included early exam preparation, engagement in collaborative learning, practice with selecting main ideas, responding to objective questions, and writing essay responses to these questions. Particularly revealing was the students’ relating that they were easily distracted (36%) and often procrastinated (23%).

A revealing finding so far for two sections of his Spring semester 2011 History 176 course was that there was little difference in the class GPA between the first exam and the second exam (section “C” exam 1/exam 2 -1.88/2.27) and (section “E” exam 1/exam 2/ - 2.07/2.22).

An end-of-semester assessment will be important to judge the impact of the intervention strategy.

Harvest Collier provided a Fall semester 2010 update on the continuation of providing interventions for Chemistry 1 students that were not successful early (by 4th-5th week) in the semester with academic alerts, LASSI/resources, and promotion of the student participation in
LEAD and instructor/TA resources. He shared a comparison of course grade outcomes for Fall 2009 and Fall 2010. Overall, for the “direct intervention” students (263) for the Fall 2010 semester, D&F grades were earned by 47.2% of this group of 263 course participants. In comparison, for the “direct intervention” students (195) for the Fall 2009 semester, D&F grades were earned by 44.6% of this group of 195 course participants. The Fall 2010 results represents a 2.6% increase in poor performance by the direct intervention students in the course correlated with a 34.9% increase in the number of students in this group compared to Fall 2009. The 9.8% increase in the number of students in Fall 2010 (748) compared to students taking the course in Fall 2009 (681) represents is generally expected to negatively impacted student success in the course.

An end-of-semester assessment will be important to judge the impact of the intervention strategy for ‘10/’11 when compared with ‘07/’08 through ‘09/’10 student performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Direct Intr F'10**</th>
<th>Fall’10 Pool*</th>
<th>Direct Intr F'09**</th>
<th>Fall'09 Pool*</th>
<th>'09/’10</th>
<th>'08/’09</th>
<th>'07/’08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.8% (10)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>3.1% (6)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.1% (45)</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>14.9% (29)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.9% (84)</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>37.4% (73)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.9% (39)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>18.4% (36)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32.3% (85)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>26.2 (51)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussions on data interpretation and the considerations of the appropriateness of the intervention strategies being employed were shared.

IV. Next Meeting: May 5, 2011 at 8:15 am; A presentation will be made by Thulasi Kumar on the CIRP Survey.

V. The meeting was adjourned.