

**OCCIRS Meeting  
Rogue Community College  
November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2007**

**Attendance:** Bryan, Rogue; BJ, LBCC; Judy, Clackamas; Robin, SOCC; Paul, Chemeketa; Dan, Umpqua; Laura, PCC; Tim, Mount Hood CC; Beth, Chemeketa; Paul, KCC; Brynn, COCC, Marilyn K, OCCWD; Majorie, Oregon Coast; Curt, Rogue CC; Jim S, ODE/Perkins; Al Newton, OCCWD; Jan, BMCC; Craig, Lane CC; Rob, PCC. Guest, Lynn from Tableau software company.

**Perkins:** Jim S reports on Perkins IV process. There were Perkins planning meetings this past summer/various task forces with different focus, including a focus on accountability and evaluation. Steve Kline facilitated the latter group. Attempt nationally is to have states report more alike to Congress. Administration wanted to stop Perkins because of lack of data on effectiveness. Very important that Oregon figure out how to show what is really going on with Perkins. Jim provided a handout on accountability and evaluation. Calls attention to page 3 showing performance indicators - there are 8 secondary Federal indicators and 6 postsecondary Federal indicators. States not required to have academic attainment, but Oregon wants to retain academic indicators. Note from Laura M/PCC, who was there, the group used the general guidelines offered up by the Feds; states tried to align with those measures. Jim says these proposed indicators have gained in meaning for the secondary and post-secondary levels. Will be encouraging schools to use this data as they write their performance measures. Technical skill attainment indicator still there as is student retention though treated slightly differently - now "student retention or transfer in education." Tech prep off the reporting table...explained by some program alignment. Tech prep still represented in the data elsewhere. Next calls our attention to page 5 - definitions of participant and concentrator. Most of the measures will use the "concentrator" data. Brynn encourages colleges and OCCWD revisit how each schools are collecting this data - are we doing this as consistently as possible? Much discussion about reality of student swirl behaviors and effect on the numbers. Laura M noted the potential effect of distance education. Page 9 1P1 - technical skill attainment - must be aligned to an industry set of standards (familiar to colleges). Emerging emphasis/question is are these third party assessments. This is the desired level of technical measurement that is desired in Perkins IV. With 2010-11 will come more state agreed on technical skill attainment measures. Until then, we'll report on these measures but use the old definitions. Probably good movement on naming these by the end of the year - state doing some data gathering on that different CC's are using now. Industry standards more of a national conversation; Oracle academy - one company engaged in national standard assessments - and state in discussion about accessibility of the data. Really, whole third-party assessment services of technical skill attainment all up in the air - including at the national level. There are many levels at which this aspect needs to fall into place. May need to consider pursuing a statewide initiative for third-party assessment - developing/implementing, possibly coordinating conducting. Next, more discussion about environmental factors affecting these indicators that are outside the control of the individual CC's - dramatically. If anyone has any question or feedback along the way - contact Laura M., MK, or Jim S.

Senate Bill 583 - related to use of SSN. DOE paying attention to, and are on the cusp of not reporting full ssn for k-12. The issue is match with ID post k-12... Notion of having a ssid follow student, but then challenge of match with wage for example - employment requires the 9 digit ssn, period.

**Qualitative Research:** Bj posed questions about CC use of qualitative research methods. Which CC's have used focus groups or indepth interviews in the recent past? How might they see such used in the future? What is their overall level of interest in qualitative methods, particularly to add insight to quantitative results in general and to get at the why's of certain student outcomes - what helps and what gets in the way of success for students. In general, there is minimal use of systematic, applied research qualitative methods (more typical is the sometimes use of a group to provide input into service/program design). Group professionally interested in learning more. There is also some general interest in exploring the bigger question of how as schools we can get a better understanding of what the student experience is - what facilitates success, what gets in the way (with different types of students, including those who leave). Bj and others will share examples/insights as gained. For a future agenda, maybe the Spring meeting.

**OCCURS/State Update:** Lots of validity checking taking place, more and more checking on all of the fields. Moving toward web-based reporting; this will have more built in validity checking. MK handed out some error reports to the individual schools. While this action had the immediate effect of making some of us cranky, we do overall value and appreciate the process and the necessity for it. This checking has substantially improved the cross reliability of the OCCURS files. Contact David L to have him explain the details of our errors. The overall request from MK is to just start moving on this in terms of thinking about it, but there no absolute response, correction required deadline. She is just getting our awareness/thinking and problem-solving going. Note, David did use original files

(not last August 10<sup>th</sup> submission or anything changed at desk audit for FTE process). So, some of the issues may be explained by the latter reality. David will work with us to test their emerging web-based system - probably in Winter.

FTE audit done. Thank you. A lot of work, particularly around apprenticeship, use of border state FTE.... [individual schools should check with MK about any lingering audit questions they may have]. The pace at which the FTE audit process occurred and when it was completed was similar to last year, but the hope is to finish it earlier in the future. The aim is to get the audit information out earlier next time around. OCCWD AND OCCURS very responsive, helpful, pleasant throughout - OCCIRS applauds and appreciates Marilyn K and others!! Audit valuable to cc's internally to help them identify what they are reporting, how, and why. Go out to website and print copy of FTE guidelines (there is a recently approved copy); put it in our OCCURS manual. These are new guidelines. Read carefully. Verbal description of types of courses we are getting at, etc.

Another detail for State reporting – MK and David will be writing a routine to make sure students don't have more than the limit on CWE - 440 hours in a lifetime.

### **National Student Clearinghouse**

National Student Clearinghouse: MK talked to Richard Reeves; he went through all the additional elements with MK. State happy to pay for the colleges. They like the additional data. MK would hope Oregon could move down this road. She will check with Frost and Richard as to NSC and Banner as well as let them know we as a state are interested, but will take a while to find our way as individual colleges/the upload we send to NSC. Note to us, these data elements are in the handout Richard gave us this past summer and on the NSC website. In general, OCCIRS generally supportive of additional data elements.

**OCCURS - Only want to see high school codes for high school completers.**

### **KPMs**

Take a look at our individual college numbers. Make sure it is looking correct; feel free to propose what the number should be. Sent to cc presidents yesterday. MK will provide version with column of explanations. These comments are due back to MK by Nov. 12, 07.

Much discussion about the limitations of the numbers.

What is it about this formula that makes it not work for our institution 100% ? We are to aim to be able to answer this question. Explain things that could positively or negatively explain the numbers.

Talked about the importance of doing the latter and documenting this formally as part of the process - not so much in detail for the legislature (just give legislature the results plus a general narrative explaining key issues to keep in mind and what this indicator is and is not, what it says and doesn't say, maybe even how it could be used or not), but for OCCWD and individual schools to benefit from having.

### **Wage Match**

Commitment to make time for this on next agenda. Desire to get back into this topic/direction.

### **Race/Ethnicity Reporting**

OCCWD needs to know individual school plans for when we'll be implementing.

2010 implementation for Fall enrollment.

2011 for completions by race/ethnicity.

OCCURS is ready this year if need be. Probably plans to do it for the 2009 year. Won't proposed to do away with the old field.

Encourages colleges to move ahead on this; bound to be implementation challenges.

A discussion we need to have is how to report out on these - but can put this off for a bit. Suggestion we can use Census definitions/approach as a template.

How can we get the ball rolling for all of us?

Hopes individual cc's to begin reporting to OCCURS - but not required until IPEDS requires it. In general, MK hopes schools start moving down the road.

Some discussion about how Federal Register and AIR report read differently in terms of expectation.

Observation about non-resident alien, and importance of being able to update that.

Interest among OCCIRS in preserving the capacity to get at race detail, not just multi-racial. No reason not to collect the separate fields. No reason to lose this data. Fear what is said/expected today may not be the same down the road then all the detailed data will be lost.

In Banner, there are positions to put in 15 different races (Paul at Chemeketa).

No word on Banner's work so far.

Put on next meeting agenda - keep it forward.

### **CCSSE Consortium**

Need to come up with up to 15 consortium questions. Judy Redder will give this process leadership.

Consortium is important/of interest to the state. Cam assigned someone to keep an eye on it until Amanda replaced - Donna, for now.

CIA and CSSA want to see OCCIRS recommendations.

Suggestion to: develop questions that would inform aspects of the KPMs; other demographics; preparedness -did they think they were college ready and then how were they assessed - at what level; keep in mind pathways expectations/strategies/initiatives.

#### Consortium Members this time around:

OCC

Lane

Umpqua

Treasure Valley

Tillamook

Southwestern

Clackamas

Klamath

PCC

Chemeketa

COCC

LBCC

Columbia Gorge

Rogue

(not Mt. Hood, not BMCC, Clatsop?)

Team to come up with questions to run by: Judy as lead coordinator, Laura, BJ, Craig, Brynn. We'll run by the whole IR group. Individual schools will check with others at their institution as needed.

### **Tools of the Trade, Sharing –**

- Robin B w/ SOCC invited Tableau software vendor Lynn Smith to give a demonstration of software.
- [www.tableausoftware.com](http://www.tableausoftware.com)... excellent presentation using cc data. Detailed notes on software below/end of this minutes document.
- po.linnbenton.edu - Institutional Research page has new College Wide Success Indicators
- LBCC also handed out graduate follow-up report - most recent.
- LBCC shared faculty learning environment survey.

### **Topics for Consideration in the Future:**

- Learning/Program Outcomes and what schools are trying/learning.
- Keep wage match on the agenda, and CCSSE.

- Dual credit study.

### Detailed notes on Tableau for those who are interested.

Origins of Tableau and what the tool is.  
 Work with a lot of large companies; awards galore.  
 Has academic pricing. Born out of Stanford, late 90's.  
 Rich educational focus. Lots of work with 2- and 4- year colleges and k-12.  
 Visual exploration tool... consuming large amounts of data in a more simple way than typical with other software. VISUAL TOOL.  
 Desktop tool with server component.  
 Not a charting wizard or report development tool - different. Insight/multi-dimensional, and time saving.  
 Take data and gain insight - the real value of Tableau.  
 Tableau is a reverse paradigm of analysis.  
 Drag and drop style.  
 Unlimited ability to connect to different worksheets/data sources. Instant visual demonstration with drop and drag.  
 Very automated.  
 Doesn't import data of it's own, simply connects to the dataset (has interfaces that speak the language of the different data sources).  
 Automatically goes to numbers and visuals... takes data out more quickly. Can slice and drill very fast. Easy to add filter criteria.  
 Very easy to create visuals depicting trends.  
 Exploring visually - numbers and charts.  
 Again, can work with multiple data sources at once.  
 Can publish readily out to a website with Tableau server - can publish to users/add new users etc.  
 And, it gives you options of what to put out there.  
 Will even let you put the results out there as an Excel file. Allows you to create more dashboards.  
 Maximizes dashboard perspective.  
 Easy to include and exclude.  
 Real time.  
 Can copy and paste images to Word/PowerPoint etc. Can publish to PDF... ready dump to annual reports if you wish.  
 Offer free trials. Go to the website to download own version of Tableau.  
 Tableau Personal and Tableau Professional.  
 Trial is Professional version of the product.  
 Standard calculation functionality.

Has mapping capability. Can also look at underlying data for a particular map point; ability to show all the data associated with these points, independent of the purpose of the original analysis (still easy to go get the other data... split seconds).  
 Easy to change parameters.  
 Free training for organization and technical support as well as upgrades (?)  
 Feature of "bins," "bucketize."  
 Can keep tableau workbooks, don't need to redo the analysis just connect to new source... saves dashboards, opens and refreshes itself.  
 Tableau reader is going to be a free product that will allow you to distribute info and have others read and to some extent otherwise consume it in a limited way (sort of a mini-tableau delivery model).  
 First year includes maintenance, upgrades, training.  
 After that the upgrade/maintenance in year two is \$270... Continues upgrade and support.  
 Tableau server product is different cost.  
 License by user. Three users, three licenses.  
 Promotional discount for volume - buy five get one free. Buy ten get five and so on.  
 Server version pricing - ball park... for group of 15 people around \$15,000. Server fee plus a connection fee. Lots of fee options.  
 Read only. Not any write back access to any data sources. Doesn't change your original data.  
 For large amounts of data can extract into Tableau... just speeds the analysis versus just the connection. This would reside in Tableau in the form of an extract, but this would have to be initiated.  
 Has data manipulation log/annotation.  
 Will show percentage change.  
 Standard deviations.  
 Lots of font/formatting capability - can change colors, put college logo in, etc.