

1/17/08**UTRN Data Committee Meeting****1:30-3 PM****PSU, SMSU 328**

Meeting called by:	Kathi Ketcheson	Meeting Type:	Data Committee Meeting
Facilitator:	Kathi Ketcheson	Note taker:	Kim Henneman
Attendees:	K. Ketcheson, R. Carpenter, P. Collier, M. Smith, R. Smith, J. Stoering, N. Szofran (conference call), J. Jagodnik, C. Kollins, M. Kinnick, B. Pitonzo, J. Peterson		

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

New Staff:

- Kim Henneman is the new UTRN support person at PSU.

Agenda item: Introduce Provost Roy Koch **Presenter:** Ketcheson

Agenda item: Provost's remarks & discussion **Presenter:** Koch

Roy Koch's remarks: Student success is a priority at PSU & with the State Board. Some future funding will depend on performance measures, so there is interest and opportunity for improvement at PSU.

There may be an opportunity to include student success programs in an upcoming Policy Option Package (request for funding from state legislature). The UTRN work on 1st generation/underrepresented students may be helpful for this package.

OSU & community colleges may be able to be included in the research network to provide more student data (K. Ketcheson).

K. Ketcheson remarked that at this point we've almost reached the end of the quantitative data– there are a couple more questions & more recent cohort data to examine for changes. We now have data from all 4 community colleges, and the original guide Framework linking policy factors w/qualitative data elements.

It may be appropriate to redistribute committee members and form a subcommittee. The subcommittee would examine the framework chart & data findings to date & try to start seeing where data can inform policy/where policy can explain data. The subcommittee would return to full group with a plan on how to proceed.

Some discussion of recent cohorts and newer programs: C. Kollins likes the idea of looking at more recent cohorts—framework chart lists trio programs & many community colleges started trio programs after cohorts in the data set.

J. Peterson—It is worth noting that trio programs are selective—have a good sense of the variety of intake & selection processes, since it's part of the game to keep the grant & meet the goals.

J. Peterson—One of the key pieces (in trio and other programs) is how well the instructions meet students needs. How do we measure how well the institution is doing to meet student's unmet academic unmet needs? Trio students acknowledge that they have unmet needs & are given resources to meet them, which gives those students an edge over students who don't know they have unmet needs. Perhaps we need to individualize rather than equalize to meet student needs—we're looking for big regularities, but the biggest one w/underrepresented students is "don't regularize".

R. Smith—First-generation students are often not realistic.

The Provost (and other policy folks) will be looking at findings in order to determine what we need to do to foster student success, what we can be doing more with, what's the scope, and is there a funding source for programs and resources. (K.Ketcheson)

Committee members have thrown out ideas about things we should be looking at/gaps in the data—do committee members want to suggest things we haven't looked at that should be considered? K.Ketcheson)

Considering trio & other programs that develop specific strategies for students—if it turns out that a trio model has a lot of characteristics, how much would it cost to double? (M. Kinnick)

Can we provide some of the things that trio provides in different ways, for less money to expand availability? (J. Peterson)

Students in our trio programs are high-touch & costly. We may be able to parse out what does the most good, but I suspect that to get close to all the benefit you need all the components. You may be able to do some of those things for less money—but it will be important to identify who needs help the most. (R. Smith)

If we could find/validate components that are the most important then we would know what to provide/how to expand programs. (M. Kinnick)

Big differences between trio & non trio are not picked up by clear indicators like GPA, but they stay in school & complete the degree (R.Smith)

A recent study indicated that providing the benefits first-generation students need to everyone is beneficial—improves everything for everyone. (J. Peterson)

J.Jagodnik suggested talking to students earlier—middle school, high school

Provost talked about partnering w/OSU to look at k-12 connections. This is not a current focus but keeps coming up –might want to think about what can be done in that direction. (K. Ketcheson)

Community colleges do some testing of Sophomore/Junior high school students & share info with high schools—some of this data might be useful. (R. Smith)

There may be survey data for more recent cohorts that could get at some of universal issues (dropout prone-ness, etc). (R. Smith)

Students who start & drop out quickly one issue, but student who is a senior (completes all requirements but does not receive a degree) represents a huge amount of effort that's lost—identifying natural breaks to intervene with those students could be a big plus. Consider adding an indicator to the data set for when a student leaves and does not return. (J. Peterson)

These issues are likely to receive more attention in the future. (R. Smith)

Agenda item: Discuss Evaluation report, new directives from Lumina, National Meeting in Florida **Presenter:** Ketcheson

The decision was made to wait until Clackamas & Chemeketa have gotten transcripts to PSU to (January or shortly thereafter) & do codebook all together (K. Ketcheson)

N. Schulock finished evaluation report, which has not been distributed yet, but will be distributed soon.

Ketcheson has discussed the evaluation report with Lumina and will travel to the national meeting in Florida on January 29 to discuss the findings with our partners in Florida and Arizona. Ketcheson will assess progress in the other two states and report back to Lumina and the committee on a plan for the remainder of Year 3 and prospects for Year 4.

Agenda item: Discuss research focus and composition of committees **Presenter:** Ketcheson & Stoering

(Discussed early in the meeting)

We have a large number of data committee members. It may be appropriate to redistribute committee members between data & policy committees and form a steering subcommittee.

The subcommittee would examine the framework chart & data findings to date & try to start seeing where data can inform policy/where policy can explain data. The subcommittee would return to full group with a plan on how to proceed.

Agenda item: Data Committee Updates **Presenter:** Carpenter & Stoering

So far we have data cohorts from 6 years ago in community college & tracked term-by-term. We have community college registration information, PSU information, and have used the National Student Clearinghouse to find information on other enrollments.

Data has been coded, and there are two general student types:

Linear—stay at 1 community college & then transfer to a 4-year school

Swirling—combination of several community college enrollments, go to PSU, return to community college, drop out, etc

The projects is looking at how patterns relate to points of success, either in receiving a transfer degree or receiving a BA within 6 years (very few do).

Linear path seems to have higher rates of success

More complicated swirling seems to have low rates of success, but some swirlers are successful.

In more articulated programs (engineering, etc) swirling is not a negative indicator—suggests that clearer articulation makes is easier for students to take prerequisites at community college level. A clear (prescriptive, defined/rigid) degree path may also provide similar benefits.

Discipline and institutional-level articulation are important. (R. Smith)

Goal commitment or clarity of program may be a variable to consider. (M. Kinnick)

A clear goal commitment program w/a process may work to filter out less-successful students. (J. Peterson)

Students who earn an AA or transfer degree are more likely to be successful—but most students who transfer do not have a transfer degree.

Are there specific courses that students should take at the community college level to improve success (reading, math, etc)? (C. Kollins)

Within the minority of students who are getting AA degrees or transfers, getting a degree may serve as a proxy for other things—family support, etc. We should consider factors that may serve as proxy for significant support and are major factors for success. (R. Smith)

We are coming to the end of quantitative data—will be looking at courses at the community college level, and looking at total number of credits accrued in a period of time as indicators of student success. We need to start interviewing & will start doing so in Spring. (J. Stoering)

What are the data gaps & how can we collect the missing information?

Why are students not choosing the AAOP degree? Can we find out why students are not getting the transfer degree, and what they are doing instead?

The purpose of the grant research is to inform policies at institutions and provide information that can be used to make policy decisions. So far data is supporting some existing literature, but now we want to look at policy implications—what would the Board like, what might other OUS institutions like? (K. Ketcheson to R. Koch)

It may be helpful to determine a direction to take with big groups of data. The AAOP is an indicator of success, but not a cause. It might be helpful for policy decisions to get at the cause. (R. Koch)

Research should be asking questions not just to find data, but with an eye to potential helpful changes—i.e. advising is shown to be a cause of success, so schools provide more funding for advising. (K. Ketcheson)

Research findings could go to Community College Boards, Policy Option Package for consideration. (C. Kollins)

There is an interest in the subject of degree completion, but we haven't identified those to whom this information might be interesting. (K. Ketcheson)

This project (and similar projects) could be used to develop a clear plan for funding received under the Policy Option Package. (R. Koch)

OSU is a more traditional campus but there are a lot of similarities in issues. It is unclear of causes for student success are the same at OSU.

J.Jagodnik suggested looking at orientation data for PSU students—did students attend orientation, see advisor, etc. R. Carpenter responded that orientation data is available but has not yet been considered. We do not have advising data, however.

Recent data will be considered to determine if policy changes in financial aid, advising, etc has impacted students, or if anything significant was missed in the original cohort. (K. Ketcheson)

Agenda item: Adjourn

Presenter: Ketcheson

Meeting schedule has been discussed farther out in order to facilitate planning. Next meetings will be scheduled with more notice.

An email will go the entire group to explain the reason for a subcommittee on policy analysis, ask for volunteers, discuss who might want to move to policy from data, etc & next meeting dates.