**Committee on Retention Efforts (CORE)**

**Meeting Minutes**

**January 25, 2012**

1. **Call to Order**

The Committee on Retention Efforts (CORE) was called to order on January 11, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. by co-chairperson Karla Sanders, in the Student Success Center Classroom 1117, at Ninth Street Hall.

**Members present:** Karla Sanders, co-chair, Kimberlie Moock, co-chair, Chad Cross, William Lovekamp, Christie Roszkowski, Tim Taylor, and Jean Wolski

**Members absent:** Mona Davenport, Jerry Donna, Mary Herrington-Perry, Kathleen O’Rourke, Patricia Poulter, Jody Stone, and Jennifer Stringfellow

1. **CORE Minutes from January 11, 2012**

The January 11, 2012 minutes were approved with Wolski abstaining.

1. **Update on Noel Levitz Visit**

Wolski reported for Donna that Noel Levitz will be on campus January 23, 26 and 27 for the ERMS visit.

1. **Spring Newsletter**

The following people volunteered to write pieces for the spring newsletter:

* Boyer- Spotlight piece on the Student Success Center overview on retention
* Roszkowski- SI, picture and quotes
* Poulter- Photo attendance application (Moock will email her)
* Taylor- Faculty member who used the Early Alert System
* Sanders will format the pieces

People who did not write articles for the spring newsletter are to be thinking about pieces for the fall newsletter.

1. **Early Alert Update**

Sanders reported there is an Early Alert (EAS) reminder flyer going into all the faculty boxes this week. The first week of this semester there were only 6 EAS reminders. Discussion followed.

1. **Sub-Committee**

Sanders disseminated data provided to Noel-Levitz on courses with 30% or more students earning a D, F, or W. Discussion followed.

The sub-committees Financial At-Risk and Development and Review broke into their groups and met for the next half hour.

1. Development and Review (Sanders, Davenport, Boyer, Stone, Stringfellow, Cross, Lovekamp, Woski, and Taylor)

Sanders reported the sub-committee does not know the reason why 50% of the faculty are not submitting mid-term grades when the IGP requires faculty to do so. If the faculty had to submit an answer on line as to why they aren’t submitting mid-term grades these answers would benefit the EAS. Some of the questions proposed for the faculty were:

1. Didn’t have any grades to submit at this time.
2. Students have C or better at this time
3. Haven’t given any tests or written assignments

A list of instructors who did not submit mid-term grades could then be sent to each department chair. There was also discussion on sending out reminders to faculty to submit mid-term grades and how to distribute this information with the faculty. Discussion followed.

1. Financial At-Risk (Moock, Donna, Poulter, O’Rourke, and Roszkowski)

Moock reported their committee had these questions and would like to see them in a report:

1. How many percentages are at rigor?
2. Are they being advised into a class that makes them less successful?
3. Move to pluses and minuses, some institutions use them
4. Significant change in instructor
5. Change in curriculum

With the results of the report give the top five data results to the Dean and say this is what we see. Discussion followed.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

1. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 8 from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. in classroom 1117 at Ninth Street Hall.

~Minutes submitted by Ms. Kimberly Sweeney, Recording Secretary