

CDR Liaisons/Institutional Researchers Meeting

Van Hise Hall, Room 1820

Tuesday, October 16, 2007

10:00 – 2:00

AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. CDR Changes/Issues

Changes to the Central Data Request (CDR) were discussed beginning with a discussion about collection of students' or applicants' status as 1st generation college students. Several individuals indicated 1st generation status is collected/retained on their campus when collected from the application or another source. At least one campus indicated collecting 1st generation status from the financial aid application. Two campuses shared the way in which they use this data; creating the student profile and calculating retention and graduation rates on 1st Generation students. Additional campuses mentioned they want this data, and would use it if they had it. MILER representatives noted that each campus collects and stores this data in a different way, and that the lack of systemwide business rules prevents the collection of this data element systemwide. One participant noted that it could be added to the Multiple Applications and Admissions Database (MAAD), then transferred to the CDR when/if a student is admitted and enrolls, and that it must be collected on the application in order to address issues of access for the 1st Generation potential students. OPAR concluded that collection of 1st generation status will be added to the "CDR Issues List."

The group was asked if other Data Elements (DE) should be collected on the CDR at the UW System level. Family income was briefly discussed. It was noted that the Common Application Group considered collecting income, but decided not to because it may be viewed as a factor influencing the admission decision. One participant noted research indicating students' low level of knowledge regarding actual family income.

Fall enrollment figures were discussed due to the need for President Reilly to be able to report fall enrollment to the Board of Regents (BOR) at their November meeting. Campuses were asked whether in the future they would be able to provide CDR submissions one week earlier than the current 6th week submission date. Several institutions noted that earlier is always better as everyone is facing pressure to provide fall enrollments. Another institution was concerned that the earlier figures are first provided the more they will vary from the final due to removal of non-paying students and inclusion of students who register outside of the regular academic cycle (Extension, CAAP, etc.). The possibility of a 5th week submission will require further discussion.

A possible venue for further discussion of CDR submissions and processes from beginning to end is a review committee to identify any efficiencies and/or inefficiencies in the current process. Review of processes may range from rewriting the MILER interface to efficiencies in the submission and editing process. The last CDR Review was conducted seven years ago. An addition recommendation was to consider capturing enrollment activity as of the end-of-term. One participant noted that a more comprehensive/less artificial capturing of enrollments could occur at a later date, but most all agreed that the 10th day enrollment figures would still need to be produced.

OPAR staff provided an update on recent discussions about the CDR guidelines. It was noted that early/preliminary files from campuses are useful in understanding what is established in later files regarding campus census data information. Campus staff were asked if the guidelines reflect current business practices, and that if not, then OPAR needs to better understand business practices in order to establish better guidelines. It was noted by one campus that students who cancelled enrollment due to nonpayment are still in their file since the interface does not look at financial commitment – how should financial withdrawals be handled? MILER staff noted that due to a lack of common business practices across campuses, MILER has not been able to provide a common interface that will affect each campus’ population in the same way. Another campus staff member pointed out that a 10th day snapshot is fundamentally flawed because it does not reflect true activity on a campus. OPAR staff noted that the issues of the accuracy of a 10th day snapshot, how to best represent campus activity, and clarity of the CDR guidelines should be included in the issues discussed by a CDR review group (see earlier notes for more on this group).

Remedial reporting and verification was the next item discussed. It was reported that 10 institutions provided what appears to be complete data, while other institutions indicated that they have found discrepancies between their CDR data and their internal data. A discussion proceeded regarding the best practices campuses use to verify the data sent to the CDR about needed and completed remediation. The responses included: a campus Math department chair verifying the accuracy of the data and the Registrar’s Office doing the verification. One campus noted that in some cases their Registrar’s Office may go back and change the remedial required flag from Yes to No when provided with additional information about students’ need for remediation. Generally, remedial reporting only occurs after the term is completed, so one alternative would be to collect both the needed and completed remedial data elements on the post-term submission file.

Campus plans for PeopleSoft upgrades and implementations were discussed in terms of how they will/may affect CDR reporting and other systems including Financial Aid, MAAD, and TIS. MILER noted that campuses do admissions and Financial Aid upgrades at the same time. Also, in the future there will be a different Student Information System - Oracle Fusion. SQRs will no longer be supported so campuses and MILER will be required to “rewrite everything.” Implementation of Fusion is expected to occur sometime after 2010. Further discussion was suggested to be folded into the group reviewing the CDR processes and practices. MILER noted that the interfaces for testing in Version 9 will be available April 1st.

3. Race/Ethnicity

An overview of changes to race/ethnicity identification was given; including the new reporting categories and ability of applicants to indicate multiple selections. The changes have been implemented in MAAD as of this fall, and it is going well, but with some challenges. Campus representatives asked for guidance on handling write-in responses to the “Other Race” category (e.g. “French”). One campus noted that they were manually correcting some Other Race entries such as “Hispanic/White”. Some of the Other Race entries may also be resolved in the resurveying process. Another campus asked for the recommendations from the working group about how to indicate a primary race/ethnicity when 2 or more are selected. OPAR agreed to re-send this information and offered to provide notes and handouts from the Technical Working Group to any interested parties.

MILER noted that a crosswalk table is used to map race/ethnicities in PeopleSoft SIS to the UW System submission format. One CDR Liaison asked how to communicate such changes to others on the campus in order to accomplish the requested changes. OPAR staff noted that this is the role of each campus CDR Liaison. However, this requires that CDR Liaisons are kept informed of all such issues. OPAR agreed to take actions to improve communication with all affected areas.

The next challenge is to resurvey current students and collect their multiple races/ethnicities on the CDR. The current timeline calls for this to begin in the 2008-09 academic year, starting with the summer 2008 submissions. Details will be included in the April update and discussed at the spring 2008 meeting. The goal of the resurveying is to create a consistent bank of information for currently enrolled students. The current proposal is that all campuses do the resurveying prior to fall 2009, using a common message and common format for the question and choices. CDR Liaisons noted that staff who might be in charge of this effort would vary at each campus; Registrar's offices at some, IR offices at others. It has not yet been determined if MILER staff will be available to provide a common PeopleSoft bolt-on to do the resurveying. Campuses that are able to write their own interface may be able or interested in sharing it with other campuses. Resurveying could be done via email survey, web survey, or as a required part of the registration process. UW-Milwaukee plans to make the resurvey a required part of registration, as they are concerned that students won't respond if they are not required to. One of the challenges is that currently, there is no mechanism that would save the race/ethnic info as it was prior to the resurveying. MILER also noted that they recently discovered that PeopleSoft no longer requires that a race/ethnicity be flagged as primary. However, campuses might want to continue to use the primary indicator to select a single race for this year's CDR reporting and for other single race reporting requirements.

4. Voluntary System of Accountability

A background of the climate and history leading to the current proposal for a Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) was provided. It is the result of pressure from the U.S. Department of Education for increased transparency and accountability in higher education, combined with pressure stemming from the proliferation of rankings of institutions of higher education. VSA is a reply to this climate developed via partnership between the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) with funding provided by a 2006 grant from the Lumina Foundation. Information from the VSA will be provided via an Internet-based reporting template called the *College Portrait*.

The purpose of the discussion was for UW System Administration to collect feedback before deciding to go forward with the VSA as a statewide system. It was noted that the UW System was one of the first in the country to provide a system of accountability reporting. The four working groups establishing the VSA have each included representation from UW System institutions. The VSA is not meant to be a marketing tool, but rather an extended fact sheet.

The *College Portrait* contains three basic sections of information; student and family information, student experiences and perceptions, and learning assessment data. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be used for the section regarding student experiences and perceptions since all UWs already participate in the NSSE for reporting in *Achieving Excellence*, the UW System-based accountability reporting. The Learning Assessment section requires one of three tools to be used, measuring basic learning outcomes. The decision of which tool to use will be left up to individual campuses.

The timeline of VSA reporting was reviewed next. It was noted that if the UW System is to be one of the first to adopt this, we will need to make the decision by early November 2007. UW institutions will be encouraged to participate, so the focus should be on making this work. In VSA reporting, different timelines are used for different processes. It is a gradual, or staggered, implementation. Learning Assessment may require the largest amount of work with the largest time for implementation. The UW System's plan for participation is to do a pilot and see how it works. Learning assessment data may be included within four years according to the timeline. While there is no enforcement body to proper VSA participation, it was noted that if a campus were to violate the precepts of VSA reporting one year, they may not be allowed to report the next.

The *College Portrait* template for VSA reporting was walked-through page by page. The first section, student and family information, reporting on "undergraduate success and progress rates" would involve information from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). It was recommended that the CDR (10th day reporting) set the cohort for the NSC data requests, so that data reported in VSA, on institutions' websites, and OPAR's website would be in-sync. A campus noted that official numbers produced by OPAR are could vary slightly from what is reported to the Common Data Set (CDS) – a large source of VSA data – therefore the VSA information may disagree with official UWS data. It was noted all UW institutions participate in the CDS.

It was noted that VSA is not designed for 2-year institutions, so participation by the UW Colleges may need to wait until a version of the VSA tailored to 2-year campuses. Discussion occurred whether VSA would use current fall or previous fall data, and many agreed that using previous fall data would be best, and allow for use of previous year's data in the cost calculator too, which would allow the cost calculator to be based on actual previous years' data rather than future estimates.

A discussion of the process followed, including an overview of the NSC information required and how that interaction may occur, with many of the details remaining to be worked out. Campuses may submit data to NSC with cohorts defined by OPAR. UW institutional participation in the NSC StudentTracker was discussed. It was agreed that many details of NSC Student-Tracker participation are still to be determined, specifically including: how the NSC request(s) would be submitted, who exactly would do the work (OPAR or campuses), and precisely what information would be required to be exchanged with the NSC in order to get back the information necessary for VSA participation.

IR Staff and campus CDR Liaisons next discussed the cost calculator included in the *College Portrait*. UW institutions will decide individually how to deal with the cost calculator. UWS staff noted that this piece is meant to be implemented within the first three months; however, if that timeline does not work out for an institution, this alone will not inhibit UWS participation. Campuses indicated that approaches to this issue vary, from purchasing a 3rd party product to using one provided for free (VA Tech's), and that accuracy of calculation increases with more information provided, but the burden of providing additional information may discourage use of the cost calculator.

Data are displayed in the *College Portrait* that report "Future Plans of Bachelor's Degree Recipients," so campuses were asked if these data are available. One attendee noted their campus has an undergraduate satisfaction survey that captures how a sample of seniors respond to that question. Another campus liaison stated they survey students who intend to graduate on their plans. The VSA's timeline allows two years before the future plans data have to be posted.

The NSSE component of VSA reporting was briefly discussed. One participant raised issue with the scale thresholds used to report the NSSE data. The basis of the issue being that in VSA the data are not reported in just the same way as the question is asked, hence leading to questions about how to arrive at the appropriate percent for the *College Portrait*. For instance, if a question asks students to rate their experience on a scale of 1 to 7, how does that translate into XX% of students who report their professors/teachers are supportive. It was noted that the VSA is working to place clear instructions for this interpretation.

The Learning Outcomes portion of VSA brought few comments from CDR/IR Liaisons. One liaison noted this will require input from Faculty Governance. UWSA representatives noted this has been discussed with Provosts and Faculty Reps, and discussions continue, however buy-in is necessary.

A CDR Liaison asked how the VSA *College Portrait* process/reporting will work. An attendee involved in the ongoing development of the *College Portrait* provided some information about the process. The *College Portrait* is no longer directly linked to the CDS, and now uses an MS Excel file with embedded macros to auto-generate charts as data are used to populate the file. In some cases it may be necessary to run a macro. Finally, all the charts are set, links made, and a PDF file is created and posted to a website.

5. UW System Strategic Framework Planning—Think Tanks

Due to consideration of time, this agenda item was not discussed. CDR/IR Liaisons were asked to review the handout in the meeting materials, and contact OPAR staff with any questions or concerns.

6. Campus Round Robin

CDR Liaisons and Institutional Researchers from each UW institution updated the group on campus projects and analyses.

7. IPEDS Update

The Fall IPEDS surveys are currently available in the web collection site and details in changes to this year's collection were provided in an earlier email correspondence. Due to the consideration of time, campuses were asked to contact OPAR staff directly with any questions or concerns. Campuses were provided an opportunity to ask any questions for the benefit of the group. One question asked was whether the U.S. Department of Education has acted on new Race/Ethnicity guidelines. Final guidelines had not, at the time of the meeting, been issued. However, subsequently, on October 19, Final Guidelines were posted to the Federal Register. Campuses will be kept informed as collection and reporting processes continue to move forward through the Race/Ethnicity Working Group.

8. IAIS Update

Attendees were given a brief update on the Instructional Analysis Information System (IAIS). It was noted that documentation for standard IAIS reports is available on the OPAR website. Documentation for Student Major Reports and adhoc analyses are available on request. It was noted that in the long run IAIS should provide for all funds costs, credit activity, and workload measures (opposed the current system limited to state-funded activity). A working group may be needed to assess implications on workload issues--activity per instructional fte staff--before a new version of reports representing all funds is added to the standard IAIS application.

9. Climate Study

Next, an update on the upcoming UW System Climate Study was given. Campuses participating in the pilot are UW-Colleges, UW-La Crosse, UW-Milwaukee, UW-Oshkosh, and UW-Stevens Point. This effort is lead by UWS Academic and Student Services (ACSS), the survey is in development, it is intended to be sent to ALL students, faculty, and staff in the UW System, a Diversity Leadership committee at each institution will promote participation, and the project is being led by Sue Rankin and Associates with a co-chair from UW System ACSS. Campuses responses included that fielding of the Climate Survey may impact NSSE participation as these data are both planned to be collected during the spring semester, and that the Climate Survey may increase the campus IR workload.

The Climate Survey discussion transitioned into a campus update about the Equity Scorecard project. Three campuses have posted Equity Scorecard findings on their websites. Additionally, one campus noted a retreat was planned with faculty/staff to share the data, another noted the data are being shared with Department Chairs to obtain feedback. A summary of the future of the Equity Scorecard process was provided next. It was noted that four or five campuses are starting the process during the current (2007-08) academic year. A train-the-trainer model is being investigated, whereby past participants may be trained in order to be able to train the next generation of participants.

10. Accountability Update

An update was provided regarding the UW System accountability report, *Achieving Excellence* (AE), and the accompanying institutional AE reports. It was noted that campuses that participated in the Equity Scorecard process are being asked to use this data in institutional AE reporting as fusion of diversity and accountability reporting. OPAR staff noted that new to the systemwide AE report are breakouts by gender, and an update was provided regarding the current ACT Alumni Outcomes data collection and future NSSE surveying.

11. Other

Methods of communicating with the CDR and IR Liaisons were reviewed. Information will be added to the OPAR website indicating members of various email lists.

Wrap-up and Thanks followed.

The End