

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

5/14/08

9:30-11am

PSU, SMSU 229

Meeting called by:	Kathi Ketcheson	Meeting Type:	Joint Committee Meeting
Facilitator:	Kathi Ketcheson	Note taker:	Kim Armstrong
Attendees:	K. Ketcheson, R. Carpenter, F. Naas, R. Smith, J. Stoering, M. Kinnick, N. Szofran, B. Pitonzo?, C. Kollins, M. Nishishiba, P. Collier		

Agenda item: Welcome and introductions

Presenter: Ketcheson

This is the last big meeting of the year, and will give some updates and get feedback from committee members.

Agenda item: Research Updates Data Committee

Presenter: Stoering &
Carpenter

Data Committee update

Committee members at the last Data Meeting discussed how to add course-taking data to existing cohorts, and agreed to loose May 23 deadline to get course-taking data to PSU.

There is still some discussion of codes & remedial education categories for course-taking data going on. J. Stoering & R. Carpenter will probably clarify and make a decision on this so data can be submitted. (J. Stoering)

The Data Committee also decided to add more recent cohorts to examine changes in patterns. Fall 2004 & Fall 2006 community college starters will be added. There are some policies being implemented this fall that may impact future cohorts, and setting a pattern of collecting data in 2-year increments will allow examination of upcoming & future changes. Email will go out to request new cohorts with course-taking data soon.

Later item about Policy subcommittee—thought of existing data as a pipeline to identify points to examine different groups. Useful in pointing out points that need to focus on KK—try to represent some of the vital points in a simpler layout & zoom in on data in a presentable fashion

JS—discuss more in other item

The Data Committee revisited the idea of fine-tuning cohorts to identify transfer students (students who will be more likely to move through the pipeline). More consideration is needed, but we will be removing students from the cohort who attend only one term at a community college (J. Stoering). R. Carpenter will be tinkering with data to try and identify students with transfer potential/intention.

R. Carpenter did take out students who attend only one term at community college, but there were no large changes in demographics as a result. It does shift transfer rates, but patterns were the same. California has a filtering model that uses student age, declared intent, and number of credits completed during the year to determine transfer intent. R. Carpenter will use CA model to see what that does to cohorts & data. It may make sense to use a variation on this model to filter our data.

Kim is working on updating the FTP process & will get current instructions out as soon as this is complete. (J. Stoering)

R. Smith suggested looking at the pipeline progress of students with an Associates in Applied Science transfer degree.

R. Carpenter stated that we may be looking more at majors to see if transfers are coming from particular degree tracks or academic areas.

J. Stoering handed out some OR, AZ, and FL data tables. R. Carpenter walked the committee through the tables.

Basic demographics:

- ♦ FL has more students receiving an AA degree
- ♦ AZ has more Hispanic students

(Partner states may provide more info about some of these groups)

K. Ketcheson asked about international students, and R. Carpenter confirmed that we need to clarify if AZ & FL have folded international students into ethnic categories or excluded them.

K. Ketcheson also mentioned that AZ has a large number of 'unknown ethnicities'—usually these are white, but we need to find out what AZ knows about this category.

Students who transfer to partner university out of entire cohort:

(AZ & FL have not used Clearinghouse data, so Clearinghouse data was eliminated from OR to allow comparison)

- ♦ FL seems to have higher rate of transfer, but pattern is similar across all 3 states.
- ♦ AZ has the highest graduation rate, FL is slightly lower, and OR has a dramatically lower graduation rate than AZ or FL.

R. Carpenter clarified that students with at least 1 community college credit across the identified years are included in the cohort, but we did not define "transfer intent".

R. Smith wants to make sure we look at data differences—the differences in BA attainment between states seems too big. P. Collier agrees. R. Carpenter reiterates that definition of degrees, inclusion of certificate students, etc will be clarified. P. Collier also emphasized the need to create comparable baselines for analysis.

Data committee will examine data & confirm & compare further—we need to understand better what we're getting from partners (K. Ketcheson).

K. Ketcheson suggested that the project is at a point where data from all three states need to be considered for recommendations. She has asked AZ and FL for data on students receiving financial aid and first-generation college students as well, though this data may be less reliable.

R. Carpenter said that there will be additional analysis of students who don't transfer/get BA.

In OR we've looked at swirling, AZ showed us some data on that, but we're not sure how comparable coding is. FL does not yet have that data. (J. Stoering)

K. Ketcheson has asked J. Stoering & R. Carpenter to start communicating with AZ & FL more regularly. We need to clarify which community college campus data is being used in AZ & FL.

K. Ketcheson discussed the continuum of databases available across sites

- ♦ OR database is decentralized
- ♦ AZ is more centralized—started that community colleges & 4-year school wanted a common database that's now the responsibility of the board & can get data fast. OR may want to explore a similar system. AZ was able to gather data & compile tables very quickly.
- ♦ FL has a VERY centralized database with a lot of data. However, statewide data that is less useful for a few institutions & data management makes it hard to focus on issues. Good studies have been done using the data, but it's still difficult to use.

The UTRN report may discuss the continuum of data & what works & make recommendations. There will also be recommendations about staffing levels and access to databases and other information between schools, as part of the reason AZ's system works is because they have a dedicated onsite staff person.

Next year is Year 4 of the project. We will create a plan for Year 4 and an outline for Year 5, since Lumina is thinking that we will need an additional year to complete the project.

**Agenda item: Research Updates
Interview Codebook**

Presenter: Ketcheson & Collier

K. Ketcheson gave a quick codebook update—a small team has been working, with P. Collier guiding, and the first draft codebook is completed. We will have students code the interviews over the summer.

AZ will get completed codebook to use on their interviews & embellish codebook as needed.

FL interviews may be coded at PSU— K. Ketcheson is looking into this.

AZ will continue, but FL will phase out & finish out with a small amount next year

Agenda item: Policy Subcommittee Update

Presenter: Kinnick

M. Kinnick updated the group on the policy subcommittee's progress and handed out a pipeline data diagram that they have developed.

There appear to be issues all along the pipeline—no obvious single point in pipeline to focus on. The data raised several implications, but we will want to consider qualitative data before making final recommendations.

Questions to consider:

- ♦ Is there a limitation or downside to requirements/benchmarks to transfer?
- ♦ What is the role of the OR transfer degree? (50% of the students with the OR transfer degree do not get a BA)
- ♦ Could we develop a way to assess “readiness to transfer” that might be used for advising? How accessible is advising?
- ♦ Are there differences in what degrees students are getting by ethnicity? Are community college students doing as well or better than students who start at PSU? (R. Smith)
- ♦ What about swirling? Are transfer/grad rates impacted by swirling? (P. Collier)
- ♦ Would graduation rates improve if we extended timeline beyond 6 years? (J. Jagodnik)
- ♦ Will course-taking data show us more? Or a point that makes a difference? Bachelors in Applied Technical Studies or similar something that's making a difference in AZ or FL? (R. Smith)

Anyone who wants to participate in subcommittee should get in touch with Kim

Agenda item: Update on Arizona visit

Presenter: Ketcheson

K. Ketcheson discussed her meeting in AZ. They provided some websites & printed org charts showing state-level organization (handouts).

Everyone in AZ is on board with improving transfer & student success from state level down, and AZ is starting to draft initiatives around their best practices and strategies that seem to be working (like early advising).

K. Ketcheson will edit her notes from the visit & they will be distributed via email.

AZ team (and possibly FL) team will come to OR for a meeting over the summer (AIR meeting is not working out). Information will go out to committees once a meeting time/place is settled.

Agenda item: Discuss Student Interviews

Presenter: Ketcheson & Stoering

K. Ketcheson emphasized that we need to finalize the design for the student interviews. Questions from AZ brainstorming session given out for feedback from committee. AZ uses

points coming out of administrator interviews to help generate student questions— K. Ketcheson clarified that these are not final questions. We will work with AZ to finalize questions & AZ will be ready to start interviews when we are. FL will probably not do student interviews—there is a possibility of pursuing another partner.

Data committee will go back to protocol & come up with a process for student interviews.

Agenda item: Adjourn

Presenter: Ketcheson

K. Ketcheson suggested that we will need to do is simplify the presentation of all this data that makes sense for people.

Beth Pitonzo will be leaving Mount Hood for a new opportunity—Nancy Szofran will probably try to join the Policy committee, but we may also look at finding another MHCC person to participate.

K. Ketcheson will get financial reports from all 3 sites, N. Shulock will do another evaluation & we report to Lumina in August. Committee members will be updated on this process and any summer meetings via email.