

Data Committee Meeting notes for March 22, 2006 (3:00 – 5:00 p.m.)

Present: Rowanna Carpenter, Pete Collier, Tim Green, Jay Peterson, Michael Smith, Ron Smith, Juliette Stoering

Meeting began with introductions and review of Lumina project; Stoering reiterated the overarching purpose and elements of the grant, quoting from the Lumina document. Goals for this meeting include an update on data sharing, and to clarify next steps for moving forward.

Discussion of data sharing:

- Mt. Hood files: 2 cohorts, 99 Fall new students, and 2000 cohort
- Carpenter indicated that IT needs to set up secure server to preserve student confidentiality
- Clearinghouse reporting
- Florida's documentation – standardized information from student extract
- Use "OCCURS"?
- SSNs & PSU IDs – how to match these up?
- Carpenter discussed/explained the Mt. Hood data tables; indicated that out of the 16,000 records from Mt. Hood, 2000 were thrown out as they did not contain valid SSNs.; however 2200-2300 were SSN matches. It was noted that PSU students enrolled as of Fall 2004 or later do not have SSNs on their records.
- Peterson suggested the possibility of adding additional fields to resolve ambiguities.

Topics/questions related to discussion:

- How often do students go back to a community college from University for math and writing skills?
- Degree status: Vocational/Technical students not necessarily interested in a 4-year degree; a certificate is the goal. This may account for low degree attainment.

Notes on transfers to PSU:

- More non-degreed transfer students than degreed
- Swirlers are captured as transfer students
- Students who receive financial aid are more likely to transfer

Data issues will present a learning curve for Stoering & Carpenter

Stoering indicated the need for more thinking and clarity about who is being studied, with the following in mind:

- What data to use?
- The grant specifications point to low socio-economic status (tied to financial aid issues?)
- What is the definition of low socio-economic status?

----Here I have a note about the “Oregon Transfer Module” as something “new”-----

Peterson has identified 15 possible pathways

Stoering suggested categorizing/coding groups that “seem” to be on a pathway

Re: charge of UTRN ---specifies students beginning community college experience

Does this eliminate students having prior college experience?

Maybe not delete them, but code them differently (an example was a student who already had a BA, but went to PCC to earn a Library Assistant certificate, then went on to a Masters program in Library Science. (Possibly exclude from study students holding a BA)

Low-income question – needs to be defined:

- Pell-eligible?
- 150% of poverty level (family of 2 = \$25,000/year)

Some poor students would be excluded if they don't apply for financial aid

Under-represented groups: identifying these will use two threads, one from literature, one from data. What general breakouts?

Examples mentioned:

- Hmong, Laotian, Pacific Islanders, Vietnamese, Eastern European, Russian
- Immigrant status?
- Race, ethnicity, gender, status of first generation?

Look at students who transferred and succeeded in getting a degree; what pathway did they take?