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.

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 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 DECEMBER 15, 2005, 8:15 AM