

UTRN Joint Meeting
10/12/2006, 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Minutes

In Attendance:

J. Allen, R. Carpenter, K. Ketcheson, M. Kinnick, C. Kolins, J. Peterson, B. Pitonzo, M. Smith, J. Stoering

Handouts (see attached):

- Policies from PSU
- Policies from MHCC
- Summary of Preliminary Findings from Rowanna

Updates:

- Arizona on board
- National meeting, including Florida and Arizona, schedule for December 7, 2006
 - Meet for entire day
 - Arrange meeting with committee for at least part of the day
 - PI's meet in small group for portion of time
 - Make sure all moving in the same direction
 - May bring community college colleagues to attend
 - Program officer will hopefully attend meeting
- Review applications for .50 FTE clerical position
- Jan, David S. and Kathi to present AIR proposal for three states regarding policy arena for each state
- Upcoming conferences
 - CSCC – Council for Study of Community Colleges
 - AACC – American Association of Community Colleges
 - PNAIRP – Rowanna and Juliette will attend

Preliminary Analyses:

- Questions from program officer as begin to discuss results
 - Who are your audiences for this besides Lumina?
 - Who is addressed by what format?
 - Need to consider these issues and make decision
- Michael S., in discussion with Kathi K. about strategy for qualitative data collection, suggested having a student help sift through policy and literature

- Goal includes linking data with policy analysis and considering indicators for readiness to transfer, transition, and early success
- Mary K. provided a conceptualization of three phases
 - Suggests major reshaping of thoughts about process
 - Affects which policies or procedures to consider
 - Raises questions about how to handle a person who leaves and comes back – where does this person fit in the three phases?
 - BUT may have data potential
- Rowanna C. provided definition of cohort: 99, 00, summer or fall, enrolled for credit for the first time
 - ABE -- Decided if courses bore credit include and may select out later
 - Mth 60, ESDL/ENL included
 - Exclude ESL, Community Ed., apprenticeships, ABE, GED
- Rowanna C. reviewed preliminary findings (see attached)
- Low income indicator
 - Difficult - only 40% apply for financial aid so missing many of the Pell Grant eligible students
 - Students not applying for aid is definitely a barrier
 - Michael S. will provide link to write up of financial aid for low income Latino students (Sage Publication)
 - See Tom Mortensen, Measuring Up
 - Reference student responsibility model in Oregon
 - Jay indicated that FGIC had the same challenge, data not available
 - Consider what might be used as a proxy
 - Craig K. suggested K12 data
- Preliminary findings only based on MHCC at present
- Review placement policies, especially for math – 10% placing into math remediation seems too low
- LEP – use transcripts for ESL or ENL history

Policy framework:

- Three stages, groups of students and policies
- Consider what we know about what is happening at each stages and that increase moving to next stages (as well as barriers)
- What characteristics of students present greater or fewer challenges
- Structural quality of institution – policies supporting abilities, behaviors
- Categories of policies that support abilities and behaviors
- Statewide policies
- Internal policies aligned with structure for success, cohort size matches possibility for success environments
- Data is about student performance
- Policies are about “access”

Model Framework to Examine Policies Affecting Student Transfer and Success (Achieving the BA/BS)

Examine policy re: 3 stages--

1. Readiness

- Financial Affordability
 - Perceptions of affordability
- Academic preparedness
- Personal goal commitment
 - Perceived value, meaning and utility of degree
 - Contact with 4-year institution
 - Good academic experience
 - Clear goals
- Connections, contact
- CB Analysis
- Consider how to make students more ready

2. Transition from CC to university

- Co-admittance/co-enrollment
- Financial aid
- Cultural differences/socialization into university environment
- Peer influences
- Family involvement with certain groups, generational issues, engaging families – cc vs. PSU
- Re-entry, older students – impact on programs
- Employer support – time and financial
- Transferability – policy and procedure differences, aid, residency, etc.; may not impact student until transfer; note “frustrating” vs “blocking” policies
- Model for success – interaction (see Hostler’s work on choice)
- Articulation
- Appropriate degree pathways

3. Early success

- Expectations into practices – do expectations match behavior?
- Predisposition, assigning value
- Scheduling, degree requirements, possible external demands
- Student abilities/skills in social and content area (context-free or context-dependent/appropriate)

