

MEMO**Date: June 30, 2009****To: Kathi Ketcheson, Ph.D.
Director, Institutional Research & Planning****From: Shelly Potts, Ph.D.
Director, University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness****Re: Urban Transfer Research Network -- Arizona Progress Report**Overview

For Arizona, year four of the UTRN grant was one of data collection, analysis, and preparation for presentations. The scope and impact of the project in the Phoenix metropolitan area were also expanded.

The Arizona team experienced several changes to the core working group, including the addition of Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) Institutional Research (IR) directors to the Arizona data committee, departure of the ASU core team's research analyst, and expansion of the Graduate Service Assistant's (GSA's) role to include duties previously held by the research analyst.

The Arizona team maintained regular communication with administration from both ASU and MCCCD regarding data and policy aspects as well as progress of the project. Communication took the form of emails, phone conferences, all site meetings, and presentations. The co-PI made a presentation on the UTRN project at the MCCCD Institutional Research Directors' monthly meeting (5/09), and MCCCD district staff participated in the March 2009 All Site meeting held in Arizona.. One member of the MCCCD district staff and a college IR Director also attended the UTRN presentations at the AIR Forum (6/09)

Much of the GSA's time during the past year was devoted to research components of the project, including data processing, coding, analysis, and interpretation as well as preparation for the student interviews. AZ team members partnered with PSU staff on the development of the administrator codebook, revision of the student interview protocol, and in ensuring inter-rater reliability for coding the administrator interview data. Extensive code tables were produced which allowed for the examination of similarities and differences among respondent types, between institution types, and across states. Regression analysis was conducted for the cohort data, and results were examined between states. Arizona team members also updated the cohort data tables to ensure consistency with Arizona's transfer definitions.

IRB approval for the student interviews was received from ASU In April 2009, and our application will be reviewed at the MCCCD IRB meeting on July 9, 2009. The ASU sample has been selected, and the team is set to work with MCCCD IRB directors in attaining access to students enrolled at the individual community colleges.

The AZ team also continued conducting an environmental scan and literature review.

The following section summarizes year four activities into six main categories: administrative activities, project management, data collection and analysis (quantitative), data collection and analysis (qualitative), advisory committees, and next steps.

Administrative Activities

- Personnel
 - The UTRN-AZ team met weekly to discuss data collection, processing, coding, analysis, and reporting/presentation activities as well as project-related challenges and issues.
 - Institutional Analysis staff were paid for data acquisition, analysis, and reporting services.
 - Services were contracted with Escriptonist.com (now VerbalInk.com) for transcription of the remainder of the administrative interviews.
 - Susan Zobl and Danna Cook completed and passed the online NIH Human Research Training course.
 - Susan Zobl left the Office of University Evaluation and consequently the UTRN project. Danna Cook incorporated Susan's UTRN files, and they met prior to Susan's departure to ensure a smooth transition.
 - Danna Cook assumed a greater role in the day-to-day coordination of the project, including responsibility for most of the data coding and preliminary analysis.
 - Danna Cook applied for an August 2009 graduation from her M.A. program which would end her status as a Graduate Service Assistant. Arrangements have been discussed and are in the process of being made to continue her employment as a half-time research specialist assigned to the UTRN project after her degree is posted.
 - AZ team members participated in the all site meeting at PSU in July 2008, and they hosted PSU team members in April 2009. Staff from the MCCCCD district office also attended the Arizona meeting. Arizona team members also engaged in ongoing phone conversations and email exchanges with Oregon and MCCCCD colleagues throughout the project year.

- Paperwork/Website
 - Staff provided updates for the overall UTRN web page earlier this year, and they are currently working on additional updates.
 - The UTRN section of the ASU Office of University Evaluation website was developed and implemented (<http://www.asu.edu/oue/utrn.html>). This site includes a description of the UTRN project, a summary of AZ activities, future plans, and relevant links to the main UTRN website and the Lumina Foundation for Education.
 - IRB approval for the student interviews was received from ASU (4/09), and the application will be reviewed for district level approval at the MCCCCD IRB meeting on July 9, 2009. Approval will then be sought from the individual colleges.
 - Meeting minutes, referrals, and resources were submitted to the PSU-UTRN team on an ongoing basis.
 - Administrative processes, procedures, and files were maintained for the project.

- Budget
 - Expenditures were processed for consultant fees, staff wages/salary redistribution, materials/supplies, and travel costs.
 - Autumn Fuhrmark (Administrative Associate, OUE) processed expenditures, payroll, and HR forms; reconciled accounts; and maintained documentation for the project. Accounts were reconciled and reviewed on a monthly basis. The previously determined budget obligations were met.

Project Activities & Management

- The Arizona team maintained regular communication with ASU and MCCCDC administration regarding data and policy aspects and progress of the project. Communication took the form of emails, phone conferences, and presentations.
- Staff from ASU's Office of University Evaluation and Office of Institutional Analysis attended an All Site Meeting in Portland, Oregon (7/08).
- ASU hosted an All Site meeting in March 2009, and staff from ASU, the MCCCDC district office, and PSU participated. Arizona team members participated in business meetings as well as sessions specifically focused on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the project's research components. During these meetings, the group discussed the creation of new data tables that would compare BA attainment and transfer rates across the sites; clarified cohort, transfer, and swirling definitions; compared data collection approaches for consistency, and made decisions about the processes to be used for codebook creation and determining inter-rater reliability. The team also set a tentative timeline for the development of the student interview protocol, codebook, and data collection activities.
- ASU hosted an All Site meeting in March 2009. During this meeting, the group developed goals and a timeline for completion of action items during the remainder of year four, including the administrator and student interviews, the AIR presentations, and the expansion of the UTRN network. Specifically, we solidified plans for data collection, analysis, and the production of comparison tables. The team also refined the methodology and instrumentation to be used while conducting the student interviews, discussed IRB paperwork and processes, and identified completion dates. The possibility of a fifth year no-cost extension of the grant also was discussed, including goals, areas of responsibility, and a timeline for completion.
- The Arizona co-PI made a presentation about the current status and future activities of the UTRN project at the MCCCDC Institutional Research Directors' monthly meeting (5/09).
- The Arizona co-PI and GSA helped plan, develop, and deliver two presentations at the 49th Annual Association for Institutional Research (AIR) Forum (Atlanta, GA: 6/09). The presentations focused on the methodologies and initial findings of the project's quantitative and qualitative research components. The AZ team also contributed to preparations for and discussions with potential partner institutions at the UTRN invitational meeting.
- The Arizona co-PI and GSA will attend an All-Site Meeting at PSU in July 2009.
- Arizona team members completed an orientation training program for ATLAS.ti and familiarized themselves with the program's functions and processes.

Data Collection & Analysis – Quantitative

- ASU's Office of Institutional Analysis updated the student cohort data tables based on the state's revised transfer definitions. Production of the tables was a collaborative effort between ASU and MCCCDC. Updated cohort summary tables were shared with PSU.
- Arizona and Oregon team members collaborated on the regression analysis of selected enrollment data elements. The cross-state team discussed the approach, results, and how to present the findings at the AIR Forum.

Data Collection & Analysis -- Qualitative

- Arizona's GSA conducted the final administrator interviews and finalized arrangements with VerbalInk.com for transcription services. She edited and formatted all interviews for analysis, including the replacement of any identifying data with secure codes. Miss Cook loaded all of the administrator interview transcripts into ATLAS.ti and developed a document to track each interview's status throughout the analysis process.
- Arizona staff contributed to development and refinement of the interview codebook and participated in teleconferences to ensure consistency in the coding process. They also participated in inter-rater reliability testing to ensure coding reliability across states. Ms. Cook coded all of the administrator data, used ATLAS.ti memos to track "other codes," and produced a variety of code count displays and summaries of indicative quotes. Similarities and differences were compared across states, institutions, and personnel types, including factors contributing to/impeding transfer completion and Baccalaureate attainment. Co-occurring code counts for underrepresented students were also produced and interpreted.
- ASU collaborated with PSU on the methodology, processes, and instrumentation for the student interviews, including development of the development of the interview protocol, sampling criteria, and language for the IRB application. The Arizona team received IRB approval from ASU for the student interviews (4/09), and the application for MCCC'D's district level IRB approval will be reviewed on 7/9/09.
- The Arizona team reviewed the previously collected transfer research and organized the articles based on region: West, Southwest, Midwest, Southeast, Northeast, National, or Arizona. Arizona's GSA also scanned the internet for research on several transfer systems chosen for their relevance to the UTRN project. Systems and areas of interest included Miami-Dade, University of Washington, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and CUNY. The research included the location of articles or dissertations relevant to the UTRN and/or these systems and then navigating the state, university, and community college websites for information on transfer resources and structures. This research was compiled and shared with PSU.
- A bibliography of transfer literature was also created and maintained throughout the project year.

Advisory Committees

- Data Advisory Committee
 - Data committee meetings were held in 8/08, 2/09, and 3/09. Informal meetings and communications also were conducted between ASU and MCCC'D Institutional Analysis staff throughout the year. Committee members discussed data collection, analysis, and interpretation strategies for the quantitative and qualitative data; updating the cohort data tables; ways of sharing/presenting the data; and IRB processes.
 - The Arizona co-PI made a presentation about the current status and future activities of the UTRN project at the MCCC'D Institutional Research Directors' monthly meeting (5/09).
 - Invitations to join the Arizona data committee were extended to IR Directors within the MCCC'D system. So far, IR directors at Chandler-Gilbert Community College and Glendale Community College have joined the data advisory committee. Arizona will continue to expand the committee during year five of the grant. The next data committee meeting will be scheduled for August.
- Policy Advisory Committee
 - AZ Co-PI Shelly Potts provided regular updates to the policy makers at both ASU and MCCC'D. A policy committee meeting will be scheduled for September.

Next Steps:

- Administrative
 - Process paperwork for summer salaries & expenditures.
 - Continue to update project activity log and files.
 - Submit administrative (6/10) and financial (7/09, 6/10) reports.
- Project Management
 - Participate in the all-site meeting (7/09) in Portland, OR to plan final year of UTRN project.
 - Participate in AIR 2010 and make presentations on project findings.
 - Continue weekly ASU-UTRN meetings.
- Data Collection & Analysis – Quantitative
 - Continue to analyze quantitative data, including the examination of similarities and differences across sites and institution types.
- Data Collection & Analysis – Qualitative
 - Continue analysis of qualitative data with code counts, collapsing code counts, indicative quotes, and further comparisons between faculty, staff, and administrator responses.
 - Conduct student interviews. Transcribe, code, and analyze the data. Produce data summaries.
 - Examine qualitative findings across sites to determine similarities and differences.
 - Use qualitative data to better understand cohort tables and transfer patterns.
- Advisory Committees
 - Data:
 - Convene meetings of the data advisory group to welcome new members and to discuss cohort data tables, the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, student interviews, and next steps.
 - Convene meetings twice during each semester.
 - Policy:
 - Meet with leadership at ASU and MCCCCD to discuss project updates, to share data and to identify next steps.
 - Convene policy advisory group twice to review quantitative and qualitative findings and to discuss implications for policy. Examine policies and practices in light of UTRN findings.