

**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 Project Meeting, AM session**

**12/07/2006**

**9:00 – Noon**

**PSU, NASC 180**

---

<b>Meeting called by:</b>	Kathi Ketcheson	<b>Meeting Type:</b>	National Project Meeting
<b>Facilitator:</b>	Kathi Ketcheson	<b>Note taker:</b>	Jewls Krentz
<b>Attendees:</b>	R. Carpenter, J. Ignash, K. Ketcheson, B. Pitonzo, D. Schwalm, N. Shulock, J. Stoering.		

---

**Agenda item:** Welcome and introductions

**Presenter:** Ketcheson

**Discussion:**

*New Clerical Support*

Jewls Krentz is our new clerical support staff member. She is a graduate student in the Masters in counseling program in the Graduate School of Education. She will be working on the Lumina/UTRN project half-time.

She may be reached at [jewls@pdx.edu](mailto:jewls@pdx.edu) or 503-725-3428.

*Overview of Project Status*

- We are a year into the project and were able to make our deliverables for Grant Year One. However, due to the unexpected passing of R. D. Walleri, we are about six months behind where we would like to be with a rich discussion of the data.
- When Ketcheson met with David Cournoyer, representative of Lumina, he indicated that, rather than completing all items within the scope of the grant, the main priority should be creating a valuable product and disseminating the discussion and findings to other audiences. Thus, we have some flexibility on what the project deliverables and should discuss how the project is publicized. Cournoyer is longer the liaison for the project and has been replaced by Holly Zanville who is located in Oregon.
- Schwalm reported that Kate Dillon-Hogan has left Maricopa Community College. She will join the Biennial Transfer Conference in July but thereafter will be working as a consultant for Grand Canyon Univ. Schwalm is currently looking for another contact at Maricopa.
- One deliverable that Lumina may find appealing is a process/context for other institutions to do similar work. Process elements may be invaluable to other institutions. In addition, because the project includes three states with three different models, other institutions can see where they fit in the discussion. The data itself may not be new but the project allows for discussion of why the data is as it is in a particular setting.

**Agenda item:** Presentation from Portland State University (PSU)

**Presenter:** Carpenter  
Stoering

**Discussion:**

*Committee Structure*

- Research design includes two main committees: Data and Policy. The Data Committee has periodic meetings to discuss data issues. The Policy Committee joins the Data Committee in joint meetings several times per year. Data Committee members include faculty and administrators from Student Affairs and other departments. All members have experience gathering and analyzing data.
- In addition, Ketcheson has a Steering Committee that meets unofficially and provides a “think tank” for the project. Members include Pitonzo, Allen and Kinnick. Stoering and Carpenter also participate in meetings.

*Progress*

- Data analysis has been in process for some time. See below.
- Policy analysis has recently begun. See below.
- A website for the project is under development which will provide as a means to communicate project progress and findings. It should also serve a portfolio function.

*Data Analysis*

Research Design – Conceptual Model (see handout):

- Student characteristics:
  - Race
  - Gender
  - Socio-economic status
    - Difficulty obtaining data for entire cohort.
  - First-generation in college
    - Data not currently available.
- Mediating factors:
  - These are the focus of research because they will yield recommendations that influence outcomes.
  - Enrollment patterns (ie., swirling, linear, interruptions, etc.)
    - Shulock cited research suggesting fulltime attendance for a majority of terms equates to four time's higher completion rates.
  - Institutional policies (ie., financial aid, residency, co-admittance, etc.)
- Outcomes:
  - Community college performance (persistence, academic performance, degree attainment)
  - Transfer (PSU, other 4-year institution)
  - 4-Year institution performance (persistence, academic performance, Bachelor's attainment)

#### Research Design – Technical Model (see handout):

- Cohort definition: Students enrolled for at least one credit for the first time during summer or fall of 1999 or 2000 at either Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) or Portland Community College (PCC). Using National Clearinghouse Data, excludes students with attendance at any college or university prior to enrollment at community college and students who earned an Associate or Bachelor's degree elsewhere prior to enrollment at community college.
- Transfer definition: a student from the cohort who is enrolled for at least one credit at PSU. This is unlike other definitions in that it will include non-admits and students taking only one course that may still attend community college. Data Committee will continue to refine definition of "transfer."
- Other information collected includes number of credits, GPA and financial aid data collected term by term at MHCC, PCC and PSU.
- It is difficult to determine "transfer intention" with the data. It may be possible to look at course taking patterns and identify key courses that may indicate an intention to transfer such as writing, algebra, etc.
- Eventually it may be useful to look at recent PSU graduates and track backwards; however, this data set will only include successful students who made it through the pipeline.

#### Data Definitions (see handout):

- Carpenter and Stoering distributed a handout with definitions for their data fields and OCCURS field name equivalents.
- Note: not all colleges use OCCURS field names consistently.
- Degree intent (OCCURS field name "dintent") and general intent (OCCURS field name "gintent") are gathered on the day of admission and not necessarily for all students.

#### Three-stage Policy Framework:

- PSU is using a 3-stage framework to analyze policy. The three stages are:
  - Readiness (financial affordability, academic preparedness, personal goal commitment, contact with institutions, etc.)
  - Transition (co-admittance, co-enrollment, financial aid, cultural influences, peer/family influences, employer support, transferability, degree pathways, advising, etc.)
  - Early Success (expectations, scheduling, degree requirements, programs, student ability/skill, etc.)
- Policy Committee has collected as many policies as possible to begin discussion about where they fit into policy framework and how they help or hinder students. Still need financial aid policies.

#### Connecting Policy Framework with Data Elements (see handout):

- Handout demonstrates an attempt to equate policies/factors within each of the three stages in the policy framework with data.
- Idea for framework stemmed from Shulock's evaluation report from Grant Year One.
- Note: perceptions of affordability and perceived value of degree do not have data elements currently available.
- Note: courses taken in major and GPA in major courses may indicate student academic ability.

#### Enrollment Patterns Coding Scheme (see handout):

- Patterns coded in four areas:
  - Presence of swirling or linear transfer
  - Presence of interruption or continual enrollment
  - When interruption is present
    - Number of interruptions
    - Length of interruptions
- Will be helpful to incorporate fulltime vs part-time status in initial coding
- Preliminary findings indicate more linear movement than expected (2:1 linear to swirling) with the exception of Asian/Pacific Islanders who demonstrate more swirling (1:1 linear to swirling)

#### Qualitative Design:

- Design is somewhat different than what is described in the initial proposal. Interviews will include students along with administrators and policy makers.
- Protocol will be based on previous research.
- Focus groups:
  - First focus groups will be this spring.
  - Goal of focus groups will be to address items not available in the hard data.
  - Initial participants will be identified from those (in cohort?) already applying for graduation from PSU.
  - Discussion will include student expectations and perceived barriers.
  - Subsequent focus groups may draw from students at earlier stages (ie., those still at community college, those just entering PSU, etc.)
- Qualitative piece may be a good place to look forward for future Lumina funding. Potential future partners include Indiana, Cal State-Sacramento and WASC contacts.

#### Next Steps:

- Look at different pathways for different majors
- There is potential value in using multiple definitions to determine how much impact different definitions have on findings.
- Align data definitions with policy definitions.

*Other*

Portland Higher Ed Consortium:

- Goal of consortium is to make community college to university transfer easier with common forms, enrollment procedures, etc.
- Participants are divided into academic, service and IT subgroups.
- The first areas of focus include financial aid, admission and residency issues as there are different residency requirements at community college versus university. Academic issues seem to be in fairly good shape at present are not the primary focus.
- This project is for application/implementation of policy whereas the UTRN project is for research.

Survey:

- PSU is also gaining data from a survey of co-admitted, co-enrolled students.

**Agenda item:** Presentation from University of South Florida (USF)      **Presenter:** Ignash

**Discussion:**

*Context (see handout)*

- State-level governance adopted new K-20 Florida Board of Education and universities established their own local governing boards rather than operating under single state-level board.
- State-level performance in Baccalaureate degree production has been among the poorest in the nation. The state has identified increasing access to the baccalaureate as one of its major goals for education.
- State-level transfer-specific policies and programs attempt to create a transfer-friendly environment. A strong "2 + 2" AA to Baccalaureate policy serves as centerpiece for states articulation policies. An interesting component of this is that individual institutions may designate the number of courses in different discipline areas that make up the 36-hour general education block. Policies tend to address the traditional linear, vertical pattern from two-year to four-year institution. Patterns outside this (including swirling) receive less attention.
- The Florida Education Data Warehouse (FL EDW) is a state level information system that provides student data for the entire K-20 system. This allows longitudinal analysis from 1995 forward. Information in this system can also be linked to the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP).
  - Note: there are pros and cons to both centralized and non-centralized information systems.
    - In Oregon, there is willingness among institutions to share and discuss data even though the system is non-centralized.
    - Florida represents a very different model. Because there is an awareness of the accessibility of data within the system, institutions may not be as willing to engage in a discussion of the data.
- There is goodwill at the Florida state-level for the UTRN project.
- Regional context includes the fact that the Tampa Bay I-4 Corridor is one of the fastest growing regions in the US.
- USF is the 9<sup>th</sup> largest public university in the US with a total enrollment of 44,000 students. Hillsborough Community College (HCC) is predominantly urban and has an enrollment of 42,000 in four locations.

*Quantitative Study (see handout)*

- Data for the project will come from two sources (FL DofE and USF) but may be linked using FETPIP.
- There is some difficulty because the FETPIP uses its own ID# for entries so there is a wait for data to be matched to individuals.

*Qualitative Study (see handout)*

- Karen Owens is a doctoral student at USF and is working as the Research Associate for the project. Her dissertation will use some of the data gathered in the qualitative portion of USF's study. Because of this resource, USF will rely heavily on qualitative data for their analyses.
- Owens is recruiting participants for the first portion of the qualitative study this term. Recent transfer students will be asked to complete an e-journal every 2-3 weeks for a total of 8 entries during the study period (November 2006 through March 2007). The goal is to get data on lived experiences immediately before and immediately after.
- The methodology will use the guidelines set forth from Mitchell and Coltrinari (2001) in exploring student e-journal writing:
  - Descriptive: What occurred that is significant to you in your transfer adjustment process?
  - Metacognitive: What were your perceptions and feelings?
  - Analytic: What do you understand as the reasoning surrounding this issue?
  - Evaluative: What were the implications for you?
  - Reconstructive: What changes would you recommend?
- The first set of qualitative data will most likely come from education majors. Arts and Science majors use an online orientation process so it may be more difficult to access these students.
- Note: PSU will use a similar theoretical framework for their study but will use different methodology.

*Website*

- Ignash shared a website dedicated to the project at USF, <http://utrn.coedu.usf.edu>.

**Agenda item:** Presentation from Arizona State University (ASU)

**Presenter:** Schwalm

**Discussion:**

*Context*

- Recently Maricopa Community College and ASU have created an alliance making transfer much easier. In general, students graduate from high school, enter Maricopa and transfer to ASU after two years. The advantage is early advising and more integrative pieces such as dual enrollment, etc.
- In general Arizona has fewer institutions than many states. There are only three major state universities including ASU. ASU is considered one university in several locations. It is program centric rather than campus centric.
- Maricopa is the largest community college in Arizona. Pima is the second largest but has very small enrollment. The second largest transfer institution to ASU after Maricopa is BYU. Therefore, the only community college in the study will be Maricopa.

### *Policy*

- Governor's P-20 concept may be helpful. There is an interest in current movement of students and identifying obstacles.
- A recent operations analysis team composed of individuals from the university and Maricopa completed a study of institutional policy collisions that exist between the two large systems. This produced a substantial amount of data on university – community college data clashes. The study determined that, while state policy was very transfer-friendly, institutional policies were not. Many of the policy clashes relate to financial issues such as application fees. Other issues include parking and library access between institutions. The solution involved creating a hierarchy of problems and addressing the most crucial first.
- Arizona used to have a state board and board of regents for university. Now the state board has been eliminated because the elected board was problematic. There is some sentiment to bring back an appointed state board. Now using board similar to trade board. Currently the community colleges meet outside P-20 and the statewide system.
- Recently ASU is putting more enrollment and other decisions under the power of the school deans at the program levels.

### *Data Collection*

- Maricopa has ten separate data system but is moving toward a more centralized system. ASU has always had a central data system. There are political hurdles in the data collection as ASU and Maricopa are both competitors and collaborators at the same time. There is beginning to be some parity between systems on data sharing and analyses.
- The statewide model has been in place for some time but is being used more widely now. Maricopa has just recently begun promoting the statewide model. Therefore, the Arizona team will be choosing a more recent cohort.
- ASU will look at using the state-wide database as a comparative piece for the quantitative data.
- The state of Arizona has contracted with Eisel Associates to do a study on the impact of the statewide system. The study includes a comprehensive program with a strong qualitative portion, surveys of students, administrators and policy makers, etc. It will also have focus groups to follow-up on data. In addition, there will be an analysis of the statewide database. The system is not as comprehensive as Florida's but still quite good. Finally, the study will include an analysis of the statewide website to evaluate how well the model is communicated.
- The statewide analysis will be useful. Therefore, even though ASU was not included last year, it will not be difficult to catch up on data points and variables similar to other institutions.

### *Next Steps*

- The major focus for ASU at this point is to catch up and identify particular programs of focus.
- ASU would like to set up an engine that will allow researchers to trace a given cohort backwards through the system. The advantage of this engine is that it would provide a process that would be ready for future projects.
- Schwalm will communicate project needs to the team at PSU
- Schwalm anticipates cultivating a new Maricopa contact. A new person could provide a valuable fresh view of the project and context.

**Agenda item:** Other topics

**Presenter:** Ketcheson

### **Discussion:**

- USF and ASU should invoice PSU for their expenses in May for the grant year. In addition, they should include an estimate of future expenses for that grant year.
- If at all possible, PSU appreciate an invoice in January as well. This could be an estimate.