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

2/8/2007
1:30 – 3:30 PM
PSU, SMU326

Meeting called by:	Juliette Stoering Rowanna Carpenter	**Meeting Type:**	Data
Facilitator:	Juliette Stoering	**Note taker:**	Jewls Krentz
Attendees:	R. Carpenter, P. Collier, M. Nishishiba, J. Peterson, M. Smith, J. Stoering		

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

Discussion:

New Member

Masami Nishishiba has joined the data committee for the UTRN project.

Agenda item: Updates on data analysis **Presenter:** Carpenter

SUB TOPIC: *Cohort Definition*

Discussion:

NOTE: See handout for gender, ethnicity, income and first generation distributions under current definition.

New Cohort Definition

The new cohort definition is based on the original which includes students who enrolled in at least one credit at community college for the first time in summer or fall of 1999 or 2000. The new definition excludes the following:

- Students with previous enrollment per data from PSU or the National Clearinghouse
- Students with a previous degree per data from PSU or the National Clearinghouse
- Students who only enrolled in one term and did not attend PSU or a metro-area community college AND who did not earn any credit

NOTE: The data distribution did not change significantly after removal of excluded students.

Financial Aid Data

Available financial aid information has been added to the tables. The table suggests that only 29% of students in the cohort were in the lower income bracket. However, these figures may be misleading as data is not available for all students. The figures include only

those students who applied for and received aid rather than all students who would have qualified for aid had they applied.

NOTE: Post-transfer, better financial aid data is available from PSU.

Collier asked that findings reported to Lumina comment on the lack of available financial data.

Peterson suggested presenting the financial aid data issue to the policy committee. This may lead to policy recommendations that address the issue such as improved methods of obtaining student information in order to tailor retention, transfer and other policies for the student population.

Gender

Committee members from PCC have commented that the gender distribution indicated does not seem accurate. The data indicates a distribution of 48.2% female and 49.8% male whereas the classes seem to have more women. Collier wondered if this discrepancy is due to enrollment in certain programs or certificates. It may be that the data will include more females when traced to degree programs.

First Generation

There has been difficulty obtaining first generation information for the cohort.

The FAFSA asks student to report parents' education level. However, as many community college students do not apply for aid, this data is not available for most students.

First generation data may be available in the Warehouse or Admissions tables. The university has obtained some information this year to generate a running count of first generation students. However, over half of the respondents refused to answer the question. This leads to distrust the data. When freshman inquiry students were asked, 48% said they were first generation. However, this does not measure transfer and upper division students. Other methods of determining first generation status need to be established.

SUB TOPIC: *Pathway Definitions*

Discussion:

Linear/swirling coding is complete. The data suggests several patterns within the swirling group. Examples are as follows:

- One term at home community college → attendance at another metro-area community college → transfer to PSU
- Movement among metro-area community colleges
- Attendance at home community college → co-enrollment → transfer to PSU

NOTE: Swirling among CC and home CC categories are equivalent in that they are both not preferred (non-bachelor). In addition, these figures do not indicate whether a bachelor's degree was the intention. The students in these groups could have been attempting an Associate's degree without any aspirations toward the Bachelor's degree. Rowanna will combine these two groups in the coding process to limit the "swirling" category.

NOTE: The distinction between co-enrollment and co-admittance. Co-enrollment indicates attending at least one course at two or more institutions while co-admittance indicates

formal admission into programs at two or more institutions. At this point, data coding does not include a co-admittance.

Agenda item: Current Data Questions **Presenter:** Stoering Carpenter

SUB TOPIC: *Student Intent*

Discussion:

Possible ways to determine student intent to attain Bachelor's degree

Broad definition used in California suggests intent if any one of the following is true:

- Student is traditional age (lifecourse model)
- Student states intent on enrollment forms
- Student is enrolled for at least 12 credits (need to check on semester/quarter) and attempts math course (most people who try to take math usually do it to transfer)

Age.

- Collier noted that the traditional age factor is based on a lifecourse model that may or may not be true. There may be a way to look at intent by intersecting high school GPA and age.
- Collier suggested that, rather than age, use number of credits attempted as a factor.

Declaration of intent.

- Nishishiba suggested that declaration of intent may be the only real way of showing student intent, all other factors are predictors of transfer and not necessarily intent.
- Peterson suggested that many students who say they do not have an intent to continue for the Bachelor's, do, in fact end up having the intent and transferring. In addition, many students, who state the intent, fail. It may be necessary to use declaration of non-intent as a validity check.
- Peterson further suggested finding out how students actually declare intent. If the number is significantly small, then this criterion is useless.

Courses Taken.

- Peterson commented that any of the prep courses (ie., WR 121) may be used in California model. If a student is taking all prep courses, then this could surely indicate intent.
- Peterson noted that if the project uses a pathway model, then the only factor consistent with this is courses taken or, possibly, declared intent. He suggested that student behavior (ie., courses taken, meeting with an advisor) should be considered above other factors because they are more consistent with degree pathways. Factors should include required behaviors for transfer such as taking certain classes rather than elective (albeit beneficial) factors such as meeting with an advisor.
- Stoering suggested the need for careful analysis of the time periods used to correlate student success with intent. If the period is too long after starting community college, the behavior is part of success. If the period is too short after beginning, then there is not enough data.

Multiple Factors.

- M. Smith suggested using a factor analysis model to determine intent. For example, determine criteria predictive of transfer and then consider a student has intent for Bachelor's if he or she meets 60% of criteria.
- Collier suggested the California model is not sufficient. Rather intent should be determined based on a composite of factors including, for example:
    - Participation in gateway classes
    - Meeting with a counselor in first year
    - Participation in orientation
    - Enrollment in college prep courses

Policy Implications based on "Intent"

- Stoering reminded the committee that the means of determining intent should be correlated with the use of the information. For example, Nancy Shulock used the California criteria to develop a study group.
- Nishishiba and Collier commented that there are two types of policy implications related to intent:
    - Promote completion among students who intend to attain the Bachelor's.
    - Promote intention and completion among students who do not declare intention.
    - Both populations should be served in policy recommendations.

Other considerations

- Nishishiba suggested that there is a need to separate measure of intent from measure/predictors of success.
- M. Smith commented that the word "intent" may not be appropriate, rather "indicators" may be a better description.
- Peterson reminded committee that factors related to intent or indicators of transfer must be in the existing data.
- Collier referenced a psychological model that suggests that intention of behavior is the best indicator of success in that behavior.
- M. Smith commented that other studies may be the best way to inform a composite definition of success. He stated that he would search ERIC and UCLA for more recent models.

SUB TOPIC: *Full-time/part-time Status*

Discussion:

Stoering requested the committee defer the full-time/part-time status issue for now; however, Carpenter noted that the issue is the next part of the coding process and that she would like some input. She referenced Nancy Shulock's studies indicate that the biggest predictor of success is full-time vs. part-time enrollment.

Peterson noted the federal reporting criteria for enrollment pattern is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Number of enrolled terms}}{\text{Time frame (years or terms)}} = \text{full-time/part-time status}$$

For example, if a student attended 27 credits over 9 terms out of a possible 36 credits in 9 terms (four years excluding summers), then he or she would be a 3/4-time student. This does not work when the pattern is varied.

Student enrollment patterns could be categorized as full-time, 3/4-time, 1/2-time, less than 1/2-time and varied. Our data needs to come up with a ratio for what is full-time over the number of terms taken and a mechanism for creating leeway.

Peterson noted that the federal reporting standards distinguish between two types of interrupters (students who take terms off but continue later):

- Interrupters are students who take one term off and then continue.
- Re-enrollers are students who take more than two terms off and then continue.