UMR Retention Committee Meeting
December 13, 2007
8:15-9:15 AM

Members Present: Harvest Collier, Kim Frazier, Amy Gillman, Jay Goff, Gerard Myles (for Sunnie Hughes), Larry Gragg, Mary Ellen Kirgan, C.R. Thulasi Kumar, Barb Prewett, Stephen Raper, Kristi Schulte, Laura Stoll, Christa Weisbrook

Members Absent: Sunnie Hughes, F. Scott Miller, Suzanne Schroer, Lynn Stichnote

The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the 11/29/07 meeting.

Dr. Collier announced that the Provost has requested a proposal for two new positions to support first and second year student retention. Dr. Collier has provided the proposal and is hoping it will be funded.

Agenda Items:

I. Academic Advising Subcommittee Update
Kim Frazier reported there will be a total of eight Outstanding Academic Advising Awards given this year (4 faculty awards, 1 staff award, 1 transfer advisor award, 1 freshmen advisor award and 1 PRO advisor award). This year’s program will include a new award for an outstanding PRO advisor. The call for nominations will be sent to the campus next week. The awards committee has formed a subcommittee for the new faculty recruitment and outreach awards. Recognition for all of these awards will be combined into one ceremony which will be held in April 2008.

II. Sophomore Survey/ Student Satisfaction Survey Models
Jay Goff presented an overview of the following student satisfaction survey instruments:

- Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory
- ACT Student Satisfaction Surveys
- Penn State Student Satisfaction Surveys
- Texas A&M Student Life Assessment Series
- University of North Dakota
- Limerick University Internal Online Survey
- Delta State’s Online Zoomerang Student Satisfaction Survey

General comments made by committee members are listed below:

- Jay Goff indicated that student satisfaction surveys used to be conducted by the UMR Student Affairs office; however, this has not been done in the last few years.
- Jay Goff reported that the two primary instruments are the Noel Levitz and ACT surveys; however, these products must be purchased.
- Amy Gillman asked which surveys target sophomores and identify factors that contribute to the sophomore slump.
- Via email, Suzanne Schroer commented that many of the surveys seemed too long. She also commented that she would not feel comfortable entering her student ID number. In
addition, she asked if students would have the opportunity to complete the survey during class time.

- Dr. Kumar suggested that after the survey is conducted, we should analyze the data and establish focus groups to address the issues.
- Mary Ellen Kirgan suggested students may be more willing to complete the survey if they get to see the results. We should consider providing a summary of outcomes to the students after the survey is administered.
- Dr. Collier said learning outcomes discussions with students related that they (students) are expecting faculty to explain the why and how of the material they cover in class and how it relates to their future jobs. They want faculty/student engagement outside the classrooms. They feel that UMR is a “cold” place and that we should be promoting institutional/cultural connections.
- Jay Goff pointed out that meta studies point out that students want heavy personal contact and we need to focus on excelling through residential advisors, academic advising, financial aid interactions, cafeteria interactions, etc. We need to pick primary focus points and zone in.

In summary, several committee members felt that the surveys presented were either too long or cumbersome or did not ask the right questions. No decisions were made regarding next steps. The committee will address this at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.