

Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Lumina | Urban Transfer Research Network

Post Office Box 751 503-725-3432 tel
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751 503-725-8757 fax

UTRN Data Committee Meeting

4/21/08

3-5 PM

PSU, SMSU 326

Meeting called by:	Juliette Stoering	Meeting Type:	Data Committee Meeting
Facilitator:	Juliette Stoering	Note taker:	Kim Armstrong
Attendees:	R. Carpenter, F. Naas, M. Nishishiba, R. Smith, J. Stoering		

Agenda item: Welcome and introductions **Presenter:** Stoering

Agenda item: Updates & progress reports in course-taking data extraction **Presenter:** Stoering

R. Smith passed out some analysis using course-taking information to identify transfer potential. It's an attempt to show transfer intent, arising from problems identifying intent discussed in earlier meetings. R. Smith looked at a cohort and considered % of coursework that was collegiate, remedial, technical, etc.

F. Naas asked how degree-seeking was defined. R. Smith stated that currently students declare degree-seeking & major when they enroll. There are some built-in incentives to declare as degree-seeking (like financial aid eligibility) that could boost numbers. By refining our definition of transfer intent/degree-seeking we could eliminate data for students who are clearly not seeking a transfer (for example, students who attend classes for a single term and then drop out) and allow more meaningful analysis of remaining data.

See attached breakdown of analysis—R. Smith suggests that analysis shows that we could use a similar process to identify transfer intent & assign high/low transfer potential groups—may also show usefulness of major declaration. (Note: R. Carpenter is unsure if we have major information—it's not being used currently.)

M. Nishishiba asked for clarification on remedial credits. Remedial is reading & writing 80 & 90 math 80-85 (R. Smith)

R. Carpenter sent out proposed file definitions & request for comments previously. What is a realistic timeline for moving forward with the request for the more recent cohorts and the course-taking data? (Stoering)

Reviewed data list for course-taking sent by R. Carpenter. R. Smith asked if we should add an "Other" category for credit classes (or non-credit classes) that do not fit into existing categories.

"Remedial" courses will be renamed "developmental" to be current with terminology being used.

Should we look at students who move from non-credit courses to credit courses? Stoering suggests that we restrict data to credit offerings.

J. Stoering—Sum of credits in all categories should equal total credits for that period.

R. Smith & F. Naas can't speak to the staffing & workload of other colleges, but asking for course-taking data in the next few weeks should work for PCC & Chemeketa.

F. Naas to recap—We're looking at 1 record per student per term, breaking credits into 3 categories (collegiate, remedial/developmental, and technical) & possibly adding an 'other' category.

R. Carpenter will send out a request by Wednesday afternoon.

Agenda item: Discussion of preparing data extract for more recent cohorts Presenter: Stoering

J. Stoering: We need to look at more recent cohorts to feel confident that our findings are relevant to the current environment. We need to identify more recent cohorts & replicate the extracts for the 99-2000 cohorts. We also need to consider how to sustain research beyond the grant. Is programming already in place to pull data for new cohorts, or does programming need to be rebuilt from scratch?

Questions to consider:

Can we get information for recent cohorts & soon?

Do we want the same data for recent cohorts?

R. Smith: Student demographics at community colleges changed composition in 2002-3, when budget changes forced a significant tuition increase.

J. Stoering suggests identifying two more new and more recent cohorts, especially if we suspect a significant change happened & we want to see what difference that made.

R. Smith mentioned upcoming impacts from new policy to require prerequisites for precollege courses in 2007/8. This requirement will have policy implications—could have unintended impact on PSU student makeup

J. Stoering suggested pulling data for 04 & 06 cohorts, with the intent of extracting data in a 2-year cycle and pulling the 08 cohort in the future. F. Naas confirmed.

Data extraction should follow a similar process to extraction of 1999-2000 cohorts. What did we learn from that extraction that we can use to do this again?

R. Smith asked if there were data that have not been used that we don't foresee using in future analysis.

Usefulness of "need reading/need writing" columns and financial aid data was discussed. Financial aid data may impact future analysis due to an increase in students applying for aid. R. Smith wants to check on financial aid data quality.

F. Naas pointed out that extraction programming is already in place, and he'd prefer to send extra data rather than being asked to provide additional data later. R. Carpenter concurred.

J. Stoering asked if course-taking data for new cohorts should be requested in initial extraction. R. Smith suggested adding new fields to term files (identifying type of credit) for new cohorts.

R. Carpenter will request course-taking data for 99-2000 cohorts, and data for 04 & 06 cohorts including course-taking data.

R. Smith suggests requesting course-taking on old cohorts first; to allow programmers to adjust as needed to include course-taking info for newer cohorts.

J. Stoering will talk to Nancy & Judy before requests go out to make sure they can comply.

Agenda item: Discussion of Pipeline diagram

Presenter: Stoering & Carpenter

J. Stoering: K. Ketcheson appointed M. Kinnick to create a subcommittee to look at policy connections. M. Kinnick requested a pipeline & will be using it at the next subcommittee meeting.

R. Carpenter walked the Data Committee through the pipeline diagram.

The pipeline came from thinking about series of events, i.e., get an AA or not, transfer or not, get BA or not—and looking at percentages of subgroups & total cohort that move from one step to the next.

R. Smith wondered how many of these students were not successfully matched using clearinghouse data. This led to some discussion of matching strategies and whether or not to attempt to eliminate students because we suspect that they were erroneously unmatched with Student Clearinghouse data. However, since there appears to be no way to distinguish between students who didn't transfer and students who didn't match, this idea was shelved. If we can improve matching, however, we may improve data.

SSN data may be available with financial aid—R. Carpenter will look into it.

M. Kinnick thought the pipeline may indicate paths & placement for intervention to shift percentage of successful transfers/graduates.

R. Carpenter presented the profile of students by ethnicity who made it to each point and compared profiles to full cohort. Hispanic students are underrepresented, Asians overrepresented. There are also pipelines by race/ethnicity. Statistical analysis was not run on the data during the pipeline creation process, past analysis has shown that these are statistically significant differences. However, the large N means that most differences will be statistically significant.

R. Carpenter pointed out that right now pipeline includes all students who completed at least 1 credit, which means students who may not be degree seeking are included, probably accounting for a lot of the no transfer/no degree students.

Agenda item: Discussion of criteria for refining cohort definitions

Presenter: Stoering

R. Smith advocated for reducing cohort size based on logical basis of determining who should be in the cohort, or, alternatively, disaggregating the cohort. He believes there are students who don't belong in the cohort (i.e. career technical). What basis is there to eliminate students from the cohort? How do we disaggregate the data?

R. Carpenter asked about degree-seeking flag as a determiner. R. Smith and F. Naas both indicated that course-taking behavior is likely to be a better determinant of actual intent to transfer.

CA institutions used the following criteria to flag high transfer intent: Traditional-aged student (18-20-something) OR declared intent OR completed 12 credits in the 1st year (Oregon equivalent would be 18 credits in 1st year). Students who fit *any one* of these criteria were flagged as high transfer potential.

R. Smith suggested that the cohort would be reduced 30% by just dropping students who do not attend 2nd term or all 3 terms in the first year. We need some way to behaviorally define transfer intent. The purpose of the grant is not to improve 1st or second term retention, it's about transfer or BA attainment, so it's appropriate to remove those students from the cohort. We may have more meaningful data and more useful policy recommendations if we eliminate some of the students who are not showing transfer intent.

R. Carpenter suggested that the process of refining the cohort could have some implications—for example, if a large percentage of Hispanic students are eliminated, it may suggest a need to focus efforts on 2nd term retention for Hispanic students.

R. Carpenter suggested using enrollment for more than one term as a criterion. What about # of credits in a defined timeframe?

J. Stoering expressed some concern about eliminating students who may not be sure they're able to transfer, but are making slow progress in that direction.

R. Smith suggested an alternate way of looking at retention, recognizing that community college students experience more stopout. For example, considering a criterion of 3 or 4 terms attended out of the last 8 terms could pick up slowly-progressing students. He would still prefer to look at transfer potential rather than intent, since indicating intent is very easy.

R. Carpenter pointed out that we're not trying to exclude people who did indicate intent, we're trying to add people who *show* intent. R. Smith doesn't want to keep students in cohort based solely on declared intent

J. Stoering: We are agreeing that attending only 1 term is a criterion for exclusion, but beyond that falling into one of these categories (traditional student age, declared transfer intent, completing some minimum number of credits within a certain number of terms) will allow inclusion in the cohort.

F. Naas asked about possible inclusion of nursing & dental students using these criteria. R. Smith suggested that course-taking data should allow us to assess transfer potential based

on type of classes attended (lower-division college credits vs. career technical), which should help eliminate those students.

Agenda item: Discussion of criteria of sustaining shared data activities

Presenter: Stoering

Will be discussed at the next meeting.

Agenda item: Adjourn

Presenter: Stoering