

IR Council Meeting

Wednesday July 20, 2005

Members Present:

Matt Ashcraft (GC), Jan Binder (PC), Amber Daines (GC), Mary Day (CG), Georgia Gudykunst (DO), Linda Hawbaker (DO), Cathy Hernandez (GW), Sandy Hill (EM), Christy Hoedel (Rio), Dan Huston (DO), Ajit Kelkar (DO), Damita Kaloostian (PC), Paul Marsh (PV), Tracy Salter (DO), Christina Santacruz (MC), Donna Silber (DO), Jeff Simonson (SM), John Snelling (EM), Sue Starrfield (SM), Crystal Theaker (CG), Jim Waugh (GC), Genevieve Winters (Rio), Nancy Osborne (DO), Patience Akpan-Obong (DO), recording.

Colleges not represented: SC

Meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

Agenda Items

Welcome

New members to the IR Council, Dan Huston (DO), Christy Hoedel (Rio) and Laurie Cohen (SC) were acknowledged. Laurie, the new IR director at SC, was at the new employee orientation and therefore absent at the meeting.

Brio Tips – ASSIST queries (handout)

-- Tracy Salter and Nancy Osborne

Tracy and Nancy spoke on two course tracking queries that have been used in the past two years. One was developed by Jan and it tracks students who took a specific course in a college and all the related courses they subsequently took at a university. The second query tracks particular courses that students took at the college and their grades at the higher level of same courses taken at the university.

The queries have been used to answer the question about how well Maricopa colleges prepare students for sequential courses at the university.

A comparison between Maricopa transfer students and ASU students is problematic because ASU does not release data on its native students. The group agreed that this problem can be solved by creating a query that tracks ASSIST data on the performance of Maricopa transfer students at ASU with that of students who did not take courses at any Maricopa colleges.

If these kinds of questions occur on a regular basis, it might be necessary to request a custom query from ASU that will help us in getting the required data. Georgia will follow up on this.

Amber suggested that the question should be sent to the deans of instruction as institutional researchers are not likely to know what questions they might have. The larger issue was also that rather than create a new query to overcome the problem of obtaining information on native students from ASU, the data sharing request should be made again. It was suggested that if a specific list of the kinds of data that Maricopa wants from ASU through ASSIST is sent, it will be easier to get access rather than ask for a blanket access.

The discussion on this generated a number of questions about tracking Maricopa students at Arizona universities.

- Do students who take certain courses with Maricopa such as ENG 101 do better in ENG 102 at the university than students who took ENG 101 at the university?
- Do students who take majority of their courses at ASU or Maricopa colleges perform at the same level, for instance have similar GPA in ENG 102?
- What are the demographics of students who attend ASU (those with limited CC exposure and those with a lot)?
- How many students who take certain courses go on to major in those fields?
- Are students who have degrees from Maricopa colleges more likely than those without degrees to go on to get a four-year degree?

Some IR directors talked about areas/questions of particular interest to them if new standard ASSIST queries are to be created:

- SM – track Gen Ed courses (compare students who took ENG101 at CC and ENG102 at UV to students who took both at UV; compare students who took pre-Algebra at CC and Algebra at UV to students who took both at UV).
 - Consider the level of coursework being tracked (lower level CC courses taken by students with limited CC exposure vs. upper level CC courses).
 - Answer question “Is a CC degree completer more likely to receive a BA than the CC transfer without a CC degree?”
 - Add financial aid as a standard demographic.
- EM – track students that completed AGECE coursework but did not receive the AGECE award.
 - Track students in a sequence of CC courses to a UV major.
- GC – add GPA to existing district transfer queries.

Brio License Update

-- Tracy Salter

The latest version of Brio is coming out this summer. The current version, 6.0, will no longer be supported after December as everyone is expected to move to 8.0. We don't know yet what the additional functionalities are but we can evaluate the new version before December.

IPEDS questions

-- Gerry Bradshaw

Gerry Bradshaw, District Manager, AA/EEO Recruitment, was invited to the meeting to answer some questions related to the NCCBP indicator on minority participation for employees at the MCCC. The NCCBP indicator asks for the percentage of employees who are minorities compared to the service areas. Gerry's office generates the three IPEDS human resources reports –EAP, Fall Staff and Salaries.

She said the reports are as accurate as possible for use for the NCCBP project. However, the EAP cannot accurately answer the question for part-time faculty, student workers, temporary workers, those on extended leave and anyone who works less than 50 percent FTE. Adjunct faculty are counted in the EAP but the demographic information on continuing part-time faculty

is especially difficult because they are not required to provide it every time they sign a new contract. The EAP also allows for the double counting of regular staff who work as adjunct faculty.

Gerry said the college IR directors should go with the data contained in the EAP because that is as good as they can get. She promised to “clean up the system” within the next one year and track as many adjunct faculty as possible to offer more accurate data to the colleges. The adjunct data file has about a 30% error margin – which includes those counted twice and those who do not identify their gender and ethnicity, and are counted as Unknown. She indicated that wherever possible, she does a “visual” identification of an employee, as it is legal. She also phones people to ask for self-identification, all in the effort to reduce the rate of Unknown especially in the adjunct category.

Linda raised concerns about the fact that in sending the IPEDS data to NCCBP, the colleges will be sending duplicated information. Gerry said government criteria, used in the collection of the data, do not allow for unduplication. She added that other systems will have the same challenges and the MCCCCD data are comparable for IPEDS purposes and should be for the benchmark project.

NCCBP (handout)
-- Donna Silber

Donna handed out a blank NCCBP form and called for questions and comments. Two issues were raised: the calculation for success rate (Question 7), definition of distance learning (17A) and non-resident aliens (13A). Jan wanted to know if distance learning referred to just Internet courses or includes courses delivered through other modes of distance education. Amber suggested that the concept should be defined because distance learning is not just about Internet courses.

The consensus was that the colleges should provide a feedback on these concerns to the NCCBP when submitting their data. Georgia will send these to the NCCBP staff.

ERD Update
-- Linda Hawbaker

- Linda will send an e-mail to the group to let them know where to go to for updates on ERD
- A dedicated staff, including two database administrators, have been put in place on DSS. Dan will take the lead on the project.
- The District has decided to stay on the Oracle platform rather than move to a SQL server platform since everything will eventually move back to Oracle following its purchase of PeopleSoft.

Linda said the first priority is to get IRIS migrated to the new students information system. And this would be a good time to expand the functionality of DSS. Jan said she would like to see athletics and honors coded in so we can get the data. Jeff asked for the ability to cross-tabulate ethnicity with zip code. Sue wants to be able to compare yearly trend by week, but need to add the zip code and 999 SIDs.

CPIII update (ADE Draft Survey)

-- Tracy Salter, Nancy Osborne and John Snelling

Nancy, Tracy and John distributed a draft of a survey sponsored by ADE. The survey is tracking students who entered the workforce, transferred to another postsecondary school or joined the military within three months of their leaving a community college. Nancy and Tracy reviewed the draft questionnaire from ADE and made changes aimed at generating higher response rates. IR Council members were given the draft survey and asked for feedback. While the data collection can be modified, the reporting must be done to avoid federal and state sanctions.

The survey raised again the problem of getting a data-sharing agreement with DES, who has constantly turned down the request on privacy and security grounds. Without this access, the group said, administering the questionnaire will be very difficult especially given the required response rate of 35 percent. No sampling is allowed; the whole population (3,944 for MCCCCD) must be surveyed. Deadline to submit the first report is November 10, 2005. From then on, it becomes an annual project.

Data Access/Use Draft Update

-- Georgia Gudykunst

Georgia distributed the latest version of the draft of the proposed administrative regulations on data access and use standards. She asked the group to review it and send feedback on the concepts to her by the end of July. The next step would be to edit the draft and send to several VP Councils in August for their comment. Faculty will also be asked for their comments. In the final step, the legal department will polish up the draft and frame it in an admin policy language and send to Maricopa employees.

FY Reporting – Need ABE/GED/Noncredit from Colleges

-- Donna Silber

Donna announced that FY reports were due for submission in three weeks. An issue was raised about what counted for non-credit hours and what didn't. For instance, do colleges count new student orientation as non-credit? Linda said there is a standard definition of what constitutes noncredit and what does not. It seems however that different colleges use different definitions.

(The issue continued after the meeting with René Willekens, who wasn't at the meeting, sharing by e-mail the definitions approved by the CEC [as per Dr. Anna Solley's and Georgia's memos]. This generated further post-meeting discussion on the issue.)

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12: 18 p.m. The next meeting will be on August 17, 2005.