

SOUTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Minutes of Meeting

September 17, 1999

The South Texas Consortium for Institutional Research met at Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi on Friday, September 17, 1999, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

In attendance were:

David Andrus – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Ray Botello – St. Philip's College (SPC)
Mitchel Burchfield – Southwest Texas Junior College (SWTJC)
Evelyn Cook – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Ruth Creekmore – Texas A&M University – Kingsville (TAMUK)
Emily Dibble – San Antonio College (SAC)
Carol LaRue – Del Mar College (DMC)
Charles McGrew – Del Mar College (DMC)
Bill Morris – The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA)
Paul Orser – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Andy Rios – The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA)
Jerry Scheerer – The Victoria College (VC)
Ken Stevenson – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Gale Stuart – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Alan Tipton – Texas A&M University – Kingsville (TAMUK)
Christopher Vinger – South Texas Community College (STCC)

The meeting was opened at 10:00 a.m. The minutes were reviewed and approved.

Paul Orser spoke briefly about plans for the 2002 TAIR conference in Corpus Christi. Plans are going well and it looks like it will be a great conference!

Emily Dibble broached the subject of data warehouse plans by asking what other institutions are doing. A quick review found that TAMUCC, TAMUK, UTPA, STCC, and the Alamo Community College District campuses use the SIS+ portion of IA+ from SCT. SWTJC uses Colleague from Datatel, while VC, CBC, and DMC use some variation of home grown systems. Some members discussed the application called Intellisolve from Cognos as useful tool for working with data warehouses. Members discussed the issues relating to whether a warehouse should be planned for static report cubes versus dynamic query ability. David Andrus shared TAMUCC's experience testing Connx, which links the IA+ system to Visual Basic programming for reporting purposes.

The next agenda item was a presentation by Del Mar and TAMUCC on Transfer Tracking. Del Mar College wanted to learn how their FTIC were doing upon transfer to TAMUCC. Using the LoneStar+ application, Carol tracked Fall 1990-96 FTIC cohorts that went to TAMUCC. She focused on comparing students that transfer after graduating from Del Mar and those that simply transfer without a degree. She found that of the Del Mar graduates, 57% graduated at TAMUCC. However, only 42% of students that transferred without a degree to TAMUCC had graduated. She also reported finding a significant relationship between graduating and losing hours, with one half losing three hours or less.

TAMUCC compared their own with Del Mar transfers and other transfers. Del Mar had narrowed their analysis to FTIC because they have the most invested in those students. One of TAMUCC goals was to look at the success of programs. They would like to look at developmental later. David reported that he found no statistically significant differences between length to graduation, GPA, or placement in remediation among the three groups.

The next item of discussion was a report that David shared. He had obtained a free report from the Department of Education that reviewed predictors of success and graduation. The report was titled *Answers in the ToolBox: Academic Integrity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor Degree Attainment*. (It can be ordered at www.ed.gov, look under Ed Pubs or contact David for additional info.) The report stated that the strongest predictor was found to be the rigor of the high school curriculum (thus academic preparedness). The investigators identified five levels of rigor. Several factors were identified as contributing to a low chance of graduating. Those factors included ever being enrolled in reading remediation, students that are less than full-time, having a child before age 22 (for women), and completing less than 20 hours the first year. The report also discussed false starts. Calculus and demanding math were two high school curriculum factors that were related to high graduation rates.

In the discussion of the report, several members shared responses to these kinds of issues at their college. Emily related the findings of a study at SAC that studied success in developmental math based on reading placement. The study showed that 75% of developmental math textbooks and reading materials were at the college reading level. When she looked at students that were reading at college level, 41% passed developmental math, while only 26% of students passed developmental math if they were not reading at college level. With this information, she hoped some changes could be made to the sequence of courses students take in developmental. However, developmental math takes four levels so counselors are advising students to take math first. Since they do not have buy-in from the counseling and advising staff, any change in recommended sequencing cannot succeed. Other discussions centered on learning communities and the use of pre- and post-testing as a means to ensure accurate placement and assess progress.

Jerry Scheerer shared the next report on FTIC data that he had collected from the members. A discussion followed regarding possible trends or shifts in student populations. Several colleges noted a decline in the number of students in remediation.

The final agenda item was a discussion of a joint survey for STCIR institutions. Few members were willing to give up their individual student satisfaction efforts to collaborate on a joint instrument like the one the Gulf Coast Consortium has. Gale questioned the overall goal by asking what is the research question. A show and tell ensued about supplementary data collection efforts that go hand in hand with admissions or other processes. All of the colleges shared their supplemental data forms to see what items each college was collecting. Carol was selected to lead a review of these forms. One goal was to look at demographic and student characteristics that are collected so know what we have access to when we are doing our research. If enough institutions collect the same data in a consistent manner, there is a possibility that we can all use such data items when looking at various relationships to student success.

The meeting closed at 2:00p.m. The meeting schedule for the year is listed below.

1999-2000 Meeting Schedule

September 17	Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
November 19	San Antonio College
February 9-11	TAIR Conference, San Antonio (time and day TBA)
April 14	Del Mar College, Corpus Christi
July 14	South Texas Community College, McAllen

Meeting times are on a Friday from 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., with the exception of the one hour SIG meeting at TAIR.

SOUTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Minutes of Meeting

November 19, 1999

The South Texas Consortium for Institutional Research met at San Antonio College on Friday, November 19, 1999, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

In attendance were:

Dennis Alejos – St. Philip’s College (SPC)
David Andrus – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Ray Botello – St. Philip’s College (SPC)
Maritha Burmeister – St. Philip’s College (SPC)
Evelyn Cook – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Emily Dibble – San Antonio College (SAC)
Paul Orser – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Lynn Sanders – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Ken Stevenson – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Gale Stuart – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Sonia Valdez – San Antonio College (SAC)
Christopher Vinger – South Texas Community College (STCC)

The meeting was opened at 10:00 a.m. The morning session began with several members sharing projects from their institution. First, St. Philip’s College presented a project in which they used mapping software to aid the planning of a new college in northeastern San Antonio. Maritha, Ray, and Dennis shared their insights on using a mapping product called Maptitude in conjunction with demographic data from Claritas. Claritas is a vendor of demographic and business data. One year contracts can usually be purchased for about \$2000 (individual reports can quickly add up in price). Maptitude was purchased via a grant for Historically Black Colleges, although it can usually purchased for less than \$300-500. With the demographic data, they were able to use Maptitude to identify the population in five-mile bands around several potential sites. This method proved useful for anticipating where future growth in the greater San Antonio might be able to support an additional campus.

In the next “show and tell” presentation, Maritha discussed St. Philip’s use of a student services management software called *On-Track* in conjunction with another program, *INSITES*, to measure the effectiveness of student services. *On-Track* is a student services tracking system developed by IBM for the Alamo Community College District. *INSITES* was developed by St. Philip’s College Planning and Research in 1991 as a student academic tracking system. *On-Track* is used to log student’s use of tutoring and other students services, while *INSITES* allows that information to be linked to other academic information to associate use of services with academic success. In one project, they used the two systems to measure success in a math course. By using GPA at the end of the term as an outcome, they initially found no effects until they associated the amount of tutoring students utilized. They are planning to expand the model to look at the various combinations of variables that may contribute to student success.

During the discussion of the project, Sonia and Emily noted that some of St. Philip’s systems have not been implemented district-wide yet. At SAC, the tutoring services are still using student id to identify students who use their services. Maritha continued that SPC had used pre- and post-testing in all of its developmental courses to measure gains, but they have moved to these other methods to study the number of levels needed for success in developmental.

Next, Gale presented the results of TAMU Corpus Christi's Graduating Student Survey. Gale pointed out that the top and bottom ten response items were mostly the same, which indicated little change from one year to the next. She noted one unusual difference, however. The few areas with negative responses were more strongly negative during the most recent administration of the survey compared to the year before. The same items drew negative responses, but they are suggesting a "happy commencement effect" for the earlier results. In the prior year, the survey was administered during graduation activities, and they hypothesized that students were more likely to give favorable responses at such a positive time. A PowerPoint slideshow with the presentation of the results is available on their web site. She also mentioned that they were moving to a 4-point scale to force positive or negative response, because they are unsure whether the midpoint has any clear or consistent meaning to the respondents.

Christopher followed with a presentation of a Student Flow Model from STCC. The flow model tracks FTIC students by program area to identify positive outcomes. Successful outcomes included retention, graduation or transfer. The model is used to measure retention over time and within the program, and to identify the patterns by which students exit the college.

Discussion after lunch centered on the measurement of student intent. Even though there were some points of consensus on this topic, there was much disagreement. Emily suggested doing a semester to semester tracking of student intent. The process and utility of this were debated. If students were to update this data every term, it is likely that it would need to be collected during registration (like phone or web registration) or when students make payment. David said that he learned that Del Mar College measures intent as both aspiration and expectation. Other members felt we needed to clarify whether we were asking for students end goal or their first purpose for being at the institution. This is much more of an issue for the community college members because they have diverse student populations with varying objectives – and they are held accountable when they do not graduate. Community colleges want to identify whether a student achieved their intent or objective if they leave the college without a degree or certificate.

At the close of the meeting, members made several suggestions for topics at the short meeting at TAIR. Topics included course schedule planning, standard reports and reporting cycles, and measuring institutional effectiveness (performance indicators and measurement). The meeting closed at 2:00p.m.

The meeting schedule for the remainder of the year is below.

February 11	TAIR Conference, San Antonio
April 14	Del Mar College, Corpus Christi
July 14	South Texas Community College, McAllen

Meeting times are on a Friday from 10 a.m. – 2 p.m., with the exception of the one hour SIG meeting at TAIR.

No minutes were recorded for the
[February 11, 2000](#) STCIR Meeting
held at the TAIR Conference
in San Antonio, TX.

SOUTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Minutes of Meeting

May 5, 2000

The South Texas Consortium for Institutional Research met at Del Mar College on Friday, May 5, 2000, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

In attendance were:

David Andrus – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Blanca Bauer – Texas State Technical College – Harlingen (TSTC)
Evelyn Cook – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Emily Dibble – San Antonio College (SAC)
Jorge Gomez – South Texas Community College (STCC)
Carol LaRue – Del Mar College (DMC)
Bill Morris – The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA)
Rebecca Richter – Del Mar College (DMC)
Andy Rios – The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA)
Lynn Sanders – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Jerry Scheerer – The Victoria College (VC)
Ken Stevenson – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Gale Stuart – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Christopher Vinger – South Texas Community College (STCC)

The meeting was opened shortly after 10:10 a.m. Rebecca (DMC) took the opportunity as host to introduce the president of Del Mar College, Dr. Terry Dicianna, who encouraged us in our work. Jerry (VC) started the session with an excellent overview a web survey development tool called *Inquisite*, from Catapult Systems. (Catapult Systems also wrote the software *e-Listen* for Scantron.) His presentation materials covered the basic functionality, which includes survey deployment via the web, e-mail, network, or diskette. Several useful links include the software's home page at <http://www.inquisite.com> and a draft C.E. Needs Assessment Survey that Jerry has made available for our viewing at http://www.vc.cc.tx.us/inquisite/CENeedsTest/ce_needs_assessment.html/. The software includes three major components that build surveys, collect the data, and provide analysis. It connects to MS Access if you want to move past the "canned" reports and do tasks that are more specialized. The members quizzed Jerry about functionality and ease of use.

The presentation on *Inquisite* also evolved into some general discussion of survey methodologies that each member uses. In regards to improving response rates and faculty participation with in-class surveys, Gale (TAMUCC) said that persistence, kindness, and chocolates helps to encourage cooperation. Bill (UTPA) shared that the Student Affairs Division at UTPA handles the ACT Student Opinion Survey and delivers it to selected classes every other year.

Jerry also presented some materials from THECB on the Accreditation Review Project. There was some general discussion about the benefits of seeking input into SACS review of accreditation procedures. The group of invited participants was relatively broad, but some members felt that the variety of Texas institutions was poorly represented.

Emily (SAC) started the next discussion by sharing an economic impact study from the Community College of Philadelphia. She was trying to encourage interest in a broader statement of economic impact like this study, but she also was hoping to find other interested members in South Texas to participate.

The Philadelphia study went beyond the basic dollar multiplier effects and incorporated business linkages (for industry training), community service, and other mission oriented impacts of the college. Several members noted that this had some similarity to the portfolio project for urban universities, which is sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation.

Other discussions centered around course evaluations for electronic distance learning courses. Several member institutions do perform a separate or specialized course evaluations for DL, while others use just the regular faculty evaluations that are used in traditional format courses. Members discussed various experiences with student success in DL courses, with some institutions viewing success very positively and others expressing concern for student completion and success rates.

At the close of the meeting, members made several suggestions for topics at the next meeting in McAllen. Topics included a demonstration of STCC's survey processes and software, Gale offered to discuss highlights from the American Association for Public Opinion Research, and there was a request for discussion of IE successes and war stories. The next meeting was later moved to Friday, July 21, 2000 at STCC in McAllen. The meeting closed at 2:00p.m.

SOUTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Minutes of Meeting

July 14, 2000

The South Texas Consortium for Institutional Research met at South Texas Community College on Friday, July 14, 2000, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

In attendance were:

David Andrus – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Mitch Burchfield – Southwest Texas Junior College (SWTJC)
Brenda Cole – South Texas Community College (STCC)
Jorge Gomez – South Texas Community College (STCC)
Carol LaRue – Del Mar College (DMC)
Melissa Lance – South Texas Community College
Cindy Lerma – The University of Texas at Brownsville (UTB)
Bill Morris – The University of Texas – Pan American (UTPA)
Jerry Scheerer – The Victoria College (VC)
Carl Spratt – South Texas Community College (STCC)
Ken Stevenson – Coastal Bend College (CBC)
Gale Stuart – Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (TAMUCC)
Alan Tipton – Texas A&M University – Kingsville
Christopher Vinger – South Texas Community College (STCC)

The meeting was opened shortly after 10:10 a.m. The following is a summary of the major presentations and discussion items.

Demonstration of the STCC Survey Scanning Process – Carl Spratt

Carl provided some information on hardware and software issues that was used in selecting the current equipment in use at STCC for survey scanning. After trying to locally produce survey forms with Bubble Form Shop, STCC has moved to Teleform from Cardiff. The versatility in handling optical mark and optical character recognition through image scanning was the deciding point for STCC. Carl demonstrated the scanning functions and error correction process before answering questions from the group.

Presentation on Major Findings from AAPOR – Gale Stuart

Gale presented a nice summary of the sessions she attended at the American Association of Public Opinion Research in May. The summary of findings and presenters is attached (via e-mail). Gail said this was a combined national and international conference with researchers from NORC, Gallup, the Center for Survey Research (UM), and other major players in public opinion polling. She presented major findings on web-based surveys, response rate issues based on survey mode, and entertained questions from the group regarding other topics at the conference.

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Index – Gale Stuart

Gale (and David briefly) discussed some research efforts with the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey. Gale discussed that their was some widely varying levels of dissatisfaction with advising at TAMUCC, but no particular disaggregation was uncovering a single group of students that was more dissatisfied. After several attempts at slicing the data, they uncovered a pattern whereby students' level of dissatisfaction varies by their entry mode and level of advancement within their academic career. This more complex level of analysis helped when identifying some weak areas in the relatively complex advising system in use at the university.

General Discussion of Institutional Effectiveness and the Role of Each Member Office – group discussion

All members present discussed their office's role in facilitating and leading the institutional effectiveness process at their institution. Several members discussed how they view their role as consultative. Core curriculum assessment was also discussed briefly. Mitch reminded the group that research findings suggest that 70% of CQI efforts fail because they are imposed rather than adopted voluntarily. The discussion also led into connecting performance to funding. There was some sharing of news and speculation as to what the legislature might do in the upcoming 2001 session.

Setting Meeting Dates and Group Business

Christopher Vinger was left in the "honorary" position of "secretary for life" and was also graciously bestowed the title of chair for the 2000-01 academic year. Bill Morris (UTPA), Gale Stuart (TAMUCC), and Cindy Lerma (UTB) were all heartily supported ☺ as alternates should Christopher become unable to perform his duties. The meeting was concluded at 2:00 pm after the following meeting scheduled was adopted by the members.

2000-2001 Meeting Dates

Friday, September 15	Coastal Bend College
Friday, November 10	Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
Friday, February 16	TAIR, Clear Lake (Houston)
Friday, April 27	The Victoria College
Friday, July 13	The University of Texas – Pan American