

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 Joint Committee Meeting

04/25/2005

1:00 – 3:00 PM

PSU, SMSU 333

Meeting called by:	Kathi Ketcheson	Meeting Type:	Joint Committee Meeting
Facilitator:	Kathi Ketcheson	Note taker:	Jewls Krentz
Attendees:	R. Carpenter, J. Jagodnik, K. Ketcheson, M. Kinnick, M. Nishishiba, J. Peterson, B. Pitonzo, M. Smith, J. Stoering, N. Szofran.		

Agenda item: Welcome and introductions

Presenter: Ketcheson

Discussion:

- Due to changes in position and availability, David Schwalm will no longer serve as a co-principal investigator on the Lumina/UTRN project.
- A conference call is scheduled with Arizona State University Dean of Instruction, Gail Hackett, and Assistant Dean, Shelly Potts, who will be taking Schwalm's place on the project.
- A liaison for Maricopa Community Colleges is already in place for the project in Arizona.
- Program Officer, Holly Zan, will meet with the Ketcheson in early May to provide feedback on the project.
- Leaders from all three states will meet in conjunction with the Biennial Transfer Conference in July. In addition, the leaders have submitted a proposal for the conference.

Agenda item: Project Updates

Presenter: Carpenter
Stoering

Discussion:

- At the last Data Committee meeting, participants discussed swirling and linear transfer issues.
- Further refining of categories is necessary.
- Chemeketa has provided their data. Carpenter and Stoering have already cleaned and added the data to the previous set. Currently, the new data is being run through the Clearing House.
- Other data to include:
 - Majors along with Bachelor's degree
 - Orientation and attendance data at PSU
 - Part time vs. full time status
 - Financial aid information with PSU data is better but still lacking. About 50% students in data set match financial aid data.

- Table 1 – Student Cohort Demographic Characteristics
 - Overview of cohort with Chemeketa added (6500 students). Cohort increased to 26,352.
 - Chemeketa has a larger portion of Hispanic students.
- Remaining data discussion for this meeting does not include Chemeketa data.
- Table 2 – Student Enrollment Patterns by PSU Bachelor’s Degree Attainment
 - Linear students have more Bachelor’s degree attainment but the swirling category includes swirling without ever attending PSU. Linear pathway by definition includes PSU attendance.
- Table 3 – Refined Student Enrollment Patterns by PSU Bachelor’s Degree Attainment
 - Recoded swirling to capture complexity
 - Linear: Community College (CC) to PSU with no more than 1 term back at CC
 - Swirl Linear: CC to CC or co-enrollment to PSU. Note: 33% in this category get Bachelor’s vs. 25% in the linear category.
 - Swirl CC: swirl at CC level
 - Complex Swirl: multiple CC to PSU and back. Note: only 14% at PSU.
 - Swirl Co-enroll: co-enrollment is only PSU attendance, never fully attended PSU. Note: no Bachelor’s in this category because never fully transferred.
- Tables 4, 5, and 6 not discussed at this meeting
- Table 7 – PSU Bachelor’s Recipient Majors by Enrollment Pattern
 - Science and Engineering majors – over half swirled. This pattern is more successful swirling, possibly due to tighter articulation agreements.
 - Business majors – 40% swirled. Strong articulation agreements may have an impact.
 - Analyses only include majors for graduates because many people change majors during their college career but it is set at graduation.
- Potential cluster analysis
 - Yves Labissiere has suggested using a chi square analysis with the data. Carpenter and Stoering will explore cluster analysis with Labissiere.
 - Variables:
 - Carpenter suggested variables would include attendance data, co-enrollment, part-time/full-time
 - Peterson cautioned that a straight forward cluster analysis needs a variable. However this data is co-occurrence data and not traditional cluster data. It may be possible to do a matrix and transform data, then do cluster analysis.
 - Ketcheson suggested going through literature and reviewing methodology other research has employed as well as consulting with a methodologist.
 - Ketcheson cautioned against making the analyses too complex. There is a tendency to believe data more if it is run through complex analyses. This is not necessary.
- Note: this study differs from Stoering’s previous study. The cohort from the previous study did not start at community college.

Agenda item: Administrator Interview Protocol

Presenter: Ketcheson

Discussion:

- Reviewed draft of interview protocol for administrators
- There was discussion about the use of broad vs. leading questions. It is necessary to lead interviewees some in order to stay within the parameters of the grant. For example, when asking what most facilitates transfer, the goal is to get information on institutional policy rather than student-related factors such as home life and employment. Thus, bracketing a definition or clarification for questions that may be used by interviewers will be helpful.
- Some members suggested referencing quantitative findings during interviews and asking interviewees to reflect on these. Ketcheson stated that the data is not ready for public release and that many administrators may not know about swirling vs. linear patterns of students. Rather, interviewers should target questions toward the specific areas that administrators have knowledge.
- Interviews need to include the right people. Careful selection is necessary.
- This interview process is preliminary. This is also a generic interview protocol to be used in all three states.

Agenda item: Website Update

Presenter: Krentz

Discussion:

- Krentz previewed the website for the project.
- Suggestions for improvement:
 - More photos of students
 - More identifiers on each page that it is the UTRN site