

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2013-2014 Board of Directors | 2-3 |
| 2013-2014 Nominations and Elections Committee | 3 |
| General Forum Information | 4 |
| Sponsors | 7 |
| Session Topic Areas and Formats | 8 |
| Using the Forum Program Book and Icon Key. | 9 |
| Daily Events | |
| Monday | 11 |
| Tuesday. | 15 |
| Wednesday | 23 |
| Thursday | 59 |
| Friday | 107 |
| Affiliated Organizations Meetings. | 115 |
| Scholarly Paper Citations. | 119 |
| AIR Award Recipients. | 121 |
| Our Sponsors | 123 |
| Presenter Index | 132 |
| Maps and Floor Plans | 138 |
| Note Pages. | 144 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Monday | Scholarly Papers |
| Tuesday | Awards |
| Wednesday | Sponsors |
| Thursday | Presenter Index |
| Friday | Floor Plans and Maps |
| Affiliated Organizations | Notes Pages |

Welcome from the 2013-2014 Board of Directors

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • MAY 27-30, 2014

Dear Forum Participants,

On behalf of the AIR Board of Directors, we are excited to welcome you to Orlando, Florida for the 54th Annual Forum! You are among some 2,000 of your colleagues, all of whom share a passion for institutional research, effectiveness, assessment, planning and other related fields within higher education. As you page through the Program, notice that opportunities abound for learning, connecting and sharing. See the latest tools and technologies to improve and streamline practice with our exhibitors and sponsors in the Exhibit Hall. Learn about cutting-edge research within the profession. With more than 575 presenters, nearly 400 sessions, and 25 workshops organized in six topic areas—one conference has it all. That's the AIR Annual Forum! We appreciate that you are with us to celebrate our profession and hope to have the opportunity to greet you here in Orlando. Enjoy your time at the Forum—you are among the best and brightest in higher education!

Warmest regards,



Sandi Bramblett



Gayle Fink

AIR President



Sandi
Bramblett

Georgia Institute of Technology

AIR Vice President



Gayle
Fink

Bowie State University

AIR Immediate Past President



Julie
Carpenter-Hubin

The Ohio State University

Board Members at Large



Hansel E. Burley
Texas Tech University



Marne K. Einarson
Cornell University



Martha Gray
Ithaca College



Heather A. Kelly
(Board Treasurer)
University of Delaware



Dawn Kenney
Central New Mexico
Community College



C. Ellen Peters
University of Puget
Sound



F. Mauricio Saavedra
Cal Poly State
University, San Luis
Obispo



Alice M. Simpkins
Paine College



Elizabeth C. Stanley
(Board Secretary)
Zayed University
(Retired)

Nominations and Elections Committee



Julie Carpenter-Hubin (Chair)
The Ohio State University



Rachel Boon
Ivy Tech Community College



Timothy Chow
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology



Fred Lillibridge
Doña Ana Community College



Jan Lyddon
Organizational Effectiveness Consultants



Soon Merz
Austin Community College



Allison Walters
University of Delaware

General Forum Information

Affiliated Organizations

Affiliated Organizations (AOs) are independent of AIR, but share a common mission of data use for the improvement of higher education. While AOs are not chapters of, or legally connected to, the Association, AIR values and invests in relationships with these organizations. Many AIR members purchase memberships from multiple AOs for the professional development and networking opportunities each group offers.

AIR Bucks

Conference participants may collect AIR Bucks from Forum Sponsors in the Exhibit Hall. AIR Bucks can be used to purchase AIR merchandise available at the AIR Store.

AIR Store

The AIR Store, located at the Registration Desk, sells t-shirts and merchandise. Credit cards and AIR Bucks are accepted as payment (sorry, no cash or checks).

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Wednesday, May 28 | 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. |
| Thursday, May 29 | 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. |

Dinner Groups and Networking Meet-Ups

Meet new people and network with colleagues by joining dinner groups and participating in fun activities hosted by fellow AIR members on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Meet in the Rosen Shingle Creek Transportation Lobby to find a group and ride the free shuttle to and from Pointe Orlando. Shuttles depart Rosen 5:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m. The last return shuttle leaves Pointe Orlando at 12:40 a.m. For more information, visit the Forum App or AIR Registration Desk.

Evaluations

Forum participants are invited to evaluate conference sessions via MyForum and the Forum mobile app. A limited number of paper evaluations will be available. After the Forum, you will receive an invitation to participate in the overall Forum evaluation; please take time to respond. Your feedback is used to inform plans for future Forums.

Exhibit Hall—The AIR Networking Hub

Visit the Exhibit Hall, AIR's networking hub, located in Sebastian J/K to meet sponsors and learn about the latest software, products, and services. This is also the place to meet with colleagues and visit the Cyber Café. The Exhibit Hall is the site of the Poster Sessions, coffee breaks, daily lunch breaks, the Wednesday Welcome Reception hosted by the AIR Board of Directors, and the complimentary dessert break after lunch on Thursday. Be sure to check out the photo booth and caricature artist to create fun Forum mementos.

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Wednesday, May 28 | 9:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. |
| Thursday, May 29 | 8:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. |

Facilitators

Facilitating a session is an opportunity to build your professional network and give back to your Association. It is easy and has a big impact on the success of the conference. Facilitators ensure that sessions start and end on time, introduce presenters, remind participants to complete session evaluations, and notify AIR staff if any issues arise. You can sign up to be a facilitator through AIR's MyForum web application. More information is available on the AIR Forum website.

Forum Apps

Use the Forum Apps to search for specific sessions, build custom schedules, download presentation materials, access scholarly papers, take notes, evaluate sessions, and view hotel maps. Note that MyForum on the Web must be used to upload presentation materials. All Apps are activated with your AIR username and password.

iPhone and iPad App

<http://myforum.airweb.org/APPLE> or search Apple App Store

Android App

<http://myforum.airweb.org/ANDROID> or search Google Play Store

Other Mobile Devices

<http://myforum.airweb.org/MOBI>

MyForum on the Web

<http://myforum.airweb.org>

Local Information

After Hours. Rosen Shingle Creek provides Forum participants with free motor coach service to and from Pointe Orlando on International Drive the evenings of May 27-29. In addition to the numerous eateries and activities available at Pointe Orlando, a variety of restaurants, entertainment options, the Hyatt Regency Orlando, and the I-Ride Trolley are within an easy walk of the shuttle drop-off/pick-up location. Shuttles depart from the Rosen Shingle Creek Transportation Lobby (between the hotel lobby and the convention center) 5:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m. The last return shuttle leaves Pointe Orlando at 12:40 a.m.

Hyatt Regency Orlando. Transportation is provided between the Hyatt Regency Orlando and Rosen Shingle Creek daily during Forum meeting hours. Although we anticipate transit times to be shorter, please plan to board busses with sufficient time to allow 30 minutes from location to location. Busses will pick up and drop off from the International Tower at the Hyatt and from the Sebastian Lobby across from the Exhibit Hall at the Rosen. Forum participants may use the After Hours shuttle to travel between the Hyatt and the Rosen in the evening May 27-29. It is a short walk from the Pointe Orlando stop to the Hyatt (see After Hours details above).

Local Attractions. Information and specials are available for Forum participants from Visit Orlando, The Orlando Tourism Bureau. Visit the AIR Forum Travel page or <http://air.orlandomeetinginfo.com/> for discounts on area attractions.

Lunch and Breaks

Dedicated Lunch Time. The schedules for Wednesday and Thursday include 1½ hours for dedicated lunch breaks, networking, and Poster Presentations (co-located in the Exhibit Hall). Special menu pricing will be offered for lunch in all Rosen Shingle Creek hotel outlets at \$13; cash carts in common areas will offer a sandwich, chips, and a drink for \$13.

Coffee Break. Coffee will be served in the Exhibit Hall on Thursday, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Dessert. Please join us for a complimentary dessert break to thank our sponsors and close the Exhibit Hall on Thursday, 1:15 – 1:45 p.m.

Registration Desk

Forum Registration is located on the Lower Level of the Convention Center between the Sebastian and Panzacola meeting spaces. The Registration Desk also hosts the AIR Store.

Pre-Conference Registration Hours

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Monday, May 26 | 7:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. |
| Tuesday, May 27 | 7:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. |

General Registration Hours

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Tuesday, May 27 | 11:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. |
| Wednesday, May 28 | 6:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. |
| Thursday, May 29 | 7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. |
| Friday, May 30 | 7:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. |

Research in Higher Education Special Forum Issue

Scholarly papers presented at the 2014 AIR Forum are eligible for possible inclusion in the Special Forum Issue of RIHE to be released in March 2015. See page 8 for more information.

Session Recordings

For the first time, AIR will record select sessions at the 2014 Forum that will be available for purchase/download following the event. More information is available in your registration packet.

Wireless Internet

Wireless Internet suitable for checking email and using the online MyForum schedule tool and Forum mobile app is available in the Sebastian/Panzacola meeting areas and foyers. Laptops with Internet access are available in the Cyber Café in the Exhibit Hall – Sebastian J/K – during Exhibit Hall hours. Log in SSID: AIR. Password: 2014FORUM.

AIR Volunteers

Thank you! AIR expresses sincere appreciation for all of the individuals who served as reviewers, advisors, and contributors during the past year. The Association's programs and initiatives would not be successful without your time, dedication, and enthusiasm.

Please visit the AIR website and view the extensive list of individuals who shared their talents with AIR – more than half of whom are involved with Forum-related activities.

www.airweb.org/GetInvolved

Welcome AIR Members,

The Forum is a touchstone in the midst of numerous and varied journeys in institutional research. We gather to learn, connect, and share. It is wonderful to discover tools and ideas for doing our work, meet new people, reconnect with colleagues, and return to our offices rejuvenated and inspired.

The work and responsibilities of IR are wide-ranging, yet institutional researchers constantly listen, seek meaning, present core ideas, and facilitate others' understanding. Institutional researchers tell the data story.

In the spirit of adventure and opportunity inherent in storytelling, the AIR Executive Office sought a visual representation of the work of IR and the meaning of Forum. Members engaged in a conversation with a graphic facilitator to explain why they participate in the Forum and what IR is about. This rendering by the artist depicts that conversation.

Yes—one AIR member used an octopus as a metaphor for the field of IR. It takes many arms to juggle the tasks, responsibilities, and relationships required in IR! I hope that you enjoy this art as allegory, and take a moment to ponder why the octopus isn't showing its "full hand".


On Wednesday we look outside of IR to garner insight from an expert on explanation. I hope that the energy and creativity Lee LeFever brings to his work with Common Craft will help all of us in our efforts to navigate the telling of data stories and to realize the value of metaphors, especially when facilitating conversation and learning among stakeholders outside of IR.

The Forum is full of opportunities that stem from the collegiality that defines this event. Each year, more than 1,000 members share their time and talents with AIR in a variety of volunteer roles. Take a moment to visit the thank you page on the AIR website and to help us celebrate members' contributions. In particular, I would like to acknowledge two groups of individuals who have made significant contributions to the 2014 Forum: the Forum Program Committee (Gloria Crisp, Gerry Dizinno, Sandra Kinney, Ebenezer Kolajo, Sarah Luczyk, Jessica Thornton) and the Forum Strategy and Evaluation Committee (Kristy Bishop, Kathy Coy, Teri Hinds, Jim Lenio).

I am pleased to be with you in Orlando, and I look forward to hearing the stories you have to tell.



Randy L. Swing
AIR Executive Director



2014 AIR Forum Sponsors

Diamond Sponsor



Platinum Sponsors



Gold Sponsors

Concord USA, Inc. • Ellucian/Nuventive • Entigence Corporation • ETS • Evisions, Inc.
ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc. • IBM Business Analytics • iDashboards
IData Incorporated • Information Builders • Insightrix Research
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) • Public Insight
QS Intelligence Unit • SAP Americas, Inc. • Scantron
Strategic Planning Online • Tableau • Thomson Reuters • ZogoTech

Silver Sponsors

Academic Analytics, LLC • College Survey Services • EBI MAP-Works
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) • LiveText • National Student Clearinghouse
Rapid Insight Inc. • SmartEvals (GAP Technologies, Inc.) • Taskstream
The Outcomes Survey powered by CSO Research, Inc.

Bronze Sponsors

CLA+ • College Board • Data180 • Engineerica Systems, Inc. • EvaluationKIT
Gallup • GradesFirst • Gravic, Inc. – Remark Software • IASystem – University of Washington
IDEA Education • Incisive Analytics, LLC • IOTA Solutions • Noel-Levitz • PACAT • Tk20

Sponsor descriptions can be found on pages 123–131.

Session Topic Areas and Formats

Topic Areas

Sessions are organized by topic areas to help you design a schedule that meets your needs and interests. Topic areas are indicated in the abstracts with italicized descriptors—see Daily Events for details (pages 11-114).

Assessment: Accountability, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation (*Assessment*) includes case studies, methods, theories of assessment of student learning, accreditation, and program review.

Data Analysis and Research Methods for IR (*Analysis*) presentations are scholarly, theoretical, and/or focused on broad understandings of higher education issues or research/analytical methods. Emphasis is on the tools, methods, or data sources used or national policy issues.

IR Operations (*Operations*) focuses on the organization and management of IR offices and functions. Topics include tracking requests, organizing/archiving past studies, reporting to various stakeholders, staffing, resources, relationships with other operational areas, and legal standards.

IR Studies for Campus Decision-Support (*Decision-Support*) include case presentations of IR studies conducted for institutional decision support at campus, district, or system offices. Presentations focus on methodology, data sources, analytics, or results that inform decision making or inspire similar efforts.

IR Technologies (*Technologies*) used in conducting IR studies are featured and may include demonstrations.

Reporting and Transparency (*Reporting*) focuses on reporting to external entities and includes case studies of designs that improve efficiencies or practices for producing and tracking mandated reports. Also included are consortia and other data-sharing initiatives.

Session Formats

Discussion Groups (45 minutes) are highly interactive small group discussions moderated by session leaders who encourage participants to share their perspectives.

Panel Sessions (60 minutes) are moderated discussions with three to five presenters who represent different organizations or sectors and offer unique points of view on a topic.

Posters are on display in the Exhibit Hall from Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. to Thursday at 2:30 p.m. Presenters are available for questions and answers during the Poster Galleries on Wednesday (odd numbered posters) and Thursday (even numbered posters) from 12:45 to 1:45 p.m.

Speaker Sessions (45 minutes) are led by one or more presenters with time reserved for questions and audience participation.

Special Recognition

Affiliated Organization (AO) Best Presentations (45 minutes) are top performing sessions from regional and state IR conferences.

Charles F. Elton Best Paper Award This Award celebrates the scholarly papers presented at Forum that best exemplify the standards of excellence established by the award's namesake and that make significant contributions to the field of IR. A paper accepted for publication in any peer-reviewed journal will be named a 2014 Charles F. Elton Best Paper. The goal is to honor publishable papers and to acknowledge that the scholarship of IR is featured in a wide range of peer-reviewed journals. All scholarly papers uploaded to the Forum website by June 27, 2014 are eligible for the award. Visit <http://www.airweb.org/Membership/Awards/> for more information.

Research in Higher Education Special Forum Issue

AIR and Springer are pleased to provide free access for all AIR members.

airweb.org/publications

Scholarly papers presented at the 2014 AIR Annual Forum are eligible for possible inclusion in the Special Forum Issue of RIHE to be released in March 2015. Submit manuscripts with a note about the Forum Issue to <http://rihe.edmgr.com/> by June 27, 2014.



Using the Forum Program Book

Header lists the time segment and day of sessions listed on that page

Icons denote format of session

Tab denotes the day/event

Look for the daily Schedule at a Glance at the beginning of each day

Headers allow for easy identification of different types of events and sessions taking place in each time segment

Session Topic Area—See page 8 for detailed descriptions

Session Room Number—All events are in the Rosen Shingle Creek Convention Center unless noted

Icon Key

Icon Key



AO Best Presentation




Scholarly Paper (Download Available)



Sponsor

Track, manage, and demonstrate success
institution-wide with real-time analytics.



Drive improvement with powerful dashboards and analytics

Manage all of your assessment, accreditation, and e-portfolio activities in one central system with Taskstream. Our powerful analytics provide you with easy access to the data you need to drive improvement at your institution.

 **taskstream**
assessment | accreditation | e-portfolios

Program Highlights: Monday, May 26

7:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Pre-Conference Workshop Registration Open, Sebastian Registration

8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee required)

08:00 AM–04:00 PM

Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee)

Intensive Introduction to Data Mining in Institutional Research – 1966

Wekiwa 3

To improve the performance of their institutions, institutional researchers routinely sift through large amounts of data in seeking to identify correlations, patterns, and trends. This workshop introduces the basic foundations of data mining and apply data mining techniques through hands-on activities using a mock database. The presenter leads participants through the data selection and mining process, shares techniques to improve research quality and efficiency, and familiarizes participants with mining tools that are prevalent in the field. All participants also conduct hands-on activities that include extracting data from a transactional data warehouse and preparing data for analytical file formats, data audits, K-means clustering, and predictive modeling.

Presenter(s)

Sutee Sujitparapitaya, San Jose State University

IPEDS Keyholder Training – 1967

Wekiwa 2

This introductory-level Keyholder Training provides participants with a thorough introduction to the IPEDS data collection cycle and reporting requirements. Created specifically for newer IPEDS Keyholders, this workshop outlines the roles and responsibilities of a Keyholder and the resources available to assist in the IPEDS planning and reporting processes. The workshop also provides participants an opportunity to create an IPEDS planning calendar for the upcoming data collection cycle. Because this workshop is designed for newer Keyholders (less than two years), it also serves as a valuable professional networking opportunity for institutional researchers in their new roles.

Presenter(s)

*Yvonne Kirby, Central Connecticut State University
Kimberly A. Thompson, University of the Rockies*

12:30 PM–04:00 PM

Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee)**An Intensive Introduction to Business Intelligence and Analytics in Institutional Research – 1968***Wekiwa 4*

In spite of the increasing popularity of business intelligence (BI), the term means different things to different people. This workshop provides an introduction to the basic foundations of business intelligence, decision support, and predictive analytics in IR from a non-technical, end-user perspective. Topics covered include BI tools (Ex: COGNOS, OBIEE, SAS BI), dashboards, scorecards, predictive and visual analytics (Ex: SPSS, SAS Enterprise Miner and Visual Analytics). The presentation also includes tips and techniques for choosing the more appropriate BI and analytics tools to work with data from various ERP systems.

Presenter(s)

Thulasi Kumar, University of Connecticut
Tom Bohannon, SAS Institute, Inc.

Designing Effective Tables and Charts: Theory and Practice – 1969*Wekiwa 8*

Creating tables and charts is easy – all you need is software and some data. However, designing them for maximum effectiveness is much more complicated. To clearly communicate your message through tables and charts you need to actively make decisions about who your audience is, what you want them to know, and which techniques most effectively allow you to organize, highlight, and present your data. This workshop will present and demonstrate research-based best practices in the design of analytical tables and charts with a focus on clarity, comprehension, and communication. Participants will come away from the session with an understanding of what techniques work, what don't work, and why.

Presenter(s)

Mary Harrington, University of Mississippi
Tiffany Gregory, University of Mississippi

AIR Scholarships

Through the generosity of its members, AIR provides two scholarships that facilitate the professional growth and development of early career institutional research professionals.

The Julia M. Duckwall Professional Development Scholarship is named in honor of the late Julia M. Duckwall, a prominent AIR member and board member. The scholarship is awarded in the spirit of her tireless passion for advancing the field of institutional research.

The Edward Delaney Scholarship is named for the benefactor, Edward Delaney, who served as AIR President from 1992-1993, Chair of the 1990 AIR Forum, and as a NCES/AIR Senior Fellow.

AIR Congratulates the 2014 Scholarship Recipients:**JULIA M. DUCKWALL SCHOLARSHIP**

Kristin McKinley, Lawrence University
Elizabeth Owolabi, Concordia University-Chicago
Keri Samson, University of Dubuque

EDWARD DELANEY SCHOLARSHIP

Jill Meyer, Mount Mary University

www.airweb.org/Scholarships

Excel Macros Boot Camp Part I - From Basic Creation to Intermediate Programming – 1973*Wekiwa 9*

In this workshop, participants learn how to set up, run, and design Excel macros. This includes recording, running, editing, and using conditional logic and loop control statements. Participants also learn overall design techniques as well as commands that cannot be recorded. A workbook with partial code examples and practice problems (completed during the workshop) is provided.

Presenter(s)

Mark Leany, Utah Valley University
Tim Stanley, Utah Valley University

Forecasting in Excel – 1970*Wekiwa 6*

Providing timely and accurate forecasts to campus stakeholders can assist in the planning and development of physical, academic, and human resources. This workshop provides hands-on learning and discussion regarding the development and implementation of enrollment forecasting models within higher education institutions. This three-hour workshop provides participants with a brief history of enrollment forecasting techniques and examples of multiple models of enrollment forecasting such as trend lines, exponential smoothing, moving averages, and linear regression.

Presenter(s)

Wendy Kallina, Southern Polytechnic State University
Eric Atchison, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning

Introduction to Institutional Research – 1972*Wekiwa 7*

This workshop is designed for individuals who are new to the field of institutional research. In this workshop we review the typical roles and responsibilities associated with IR, highlight useful resources, and develop connections with others in the field. This is an informative and interactive workshop that is useful to new IR professionals.

Presenter(s)

Jim Lenio, Walden University
Crissie Grove Jameson, Walden University
Mary Sapp, University of Miami

Student Learning Outcomes for Institutional Success – 1971*Wekiwa 5*

Participants learn to lead groups in developing student learning outcomes and measures that strengthen programs at their institutions. The workshop includes suggestions for working with faculty and student support personnel. It highlights resources available to IR assessment practitioners. Learn how to guide faculty and staff in successful outcomes assessment at your institution! This session is best for beginners in assessing student learning outcomes or those who are struggling with how to measure learning outcomes effectively. It is applicable both to those in academic disciplines and in student affairs and support.

Presenter(s)

Paula Krist, University of San Diego

2015 AIR FORUM

SAVE THE DATE

MAY 25-29

COLORADO CONVENTION CENTER
SEE YOU THERE!

DENVER, COLORADO



VISIT OUR WEBSITE TO FIND OUT MORE: WWW.FORUM.AIRWEB.ORG

DEVELOP YOUR IR SKILLS



Data and Decisions Academy courses provide self-paced, online professional development for institutional researchers.

Hosted by the Association for Institutional Research, Academy courses build IR skills needed to support data-informed decision making.

Since the Academy opened in 2010, over 450 institutional research professionals have completed at least one Data and Decisions Academy course, with over 75% completing two or more.

www.airweb.org/Academy

Program Highlights: Tuesday, May 27

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| 7:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. | Pre-Conference Workshop Registration Open, Sebastian Registration |
| 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee required) |
| 11:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. | General Registration Open, Sebastian Registration |
| 1:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. | Tuesday Invited Presentation Sessions (included with your Forum registration) |
| 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | International IR Caucus, Wekiwa 8 |
| 4:30 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. | Graduate Student Gathering, Wekiwa 8 |
| 4:30 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. | NCES Synthesis of Technical Information Regarding the Postsecondary Institution Ratings System (PIRS), Gatlin A/B |
| 5:45 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. | Networking/Find a Dinner Group, Rosen Shingle Creek Transportation Lobby |
| 6:30 p.m. | Dinner Groups |

TUESDAY

Tuesday

7:00AM

8:00AM

9:00AM

10:00AM

11:00AM

12:00PM

1:00PM

2:00PM

3:00PM

4:00PM

5:00PM

6:00PM

7:00PM

8:00PM

Pre-Conference
Workshops

International IR
Caucus

Invited Presentation
Sessions

Networking / Find a Dinner Group

Dinner Groups

08:00 AM–11:30 AM

Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee)

Advanced Statistics for Institutional Research: Exploratory Factor Analysis – 1982

Wekiwa 6

This workshop focuses on factor analysis and its application within the field of IR. Factor analysis has been used as a statistical technique to establish evidence of the validity of many common assessments (e.g., NSSE, CIRP). Exploratory Factor analysis explores the relationships among variables to discover if those variables can be grouped into a smaller set of underlying factors. Often IR professionals are faced with the difficult task of summarizing numerous variables from a survey and want to reduce the data into a smaller set of factors. The workshop reviews the basic statistical principles of factor analysis and uses a case study example from a senior survey to analyze and interpret Exploratory Factor analysis using SPSS.

Presenter(s)

Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College

Designing and Implementing Surveys to Generate Actionable Results – 1977

Wekiwa 4

Survey research is one technique for accumulating data to support continuous improvement processes. Designing surveys to generate actionable data is a science and an art, and begins with a clear sense of the goals of the survey and awareness of the population of interest. This workshop defines the essential components of creating meaningful surveys, including when a survey is appropriate; defining the survey purpose; crafting questions to reduce bias and ambiguity; number, structure, and ordering of questions; methods of implementation; and considerations for disseminating findings.

Presenter(s)

Debra Hagen-Foley, Lakeland College

Developing a Culture of Assessment for Learning – 1978

Wekiwa 3

This workshop focuses on the skills and knowledge IR and Assessment professionals need to be effective assessment leaders and to manage the change process at the program or college levels. The workshop challenges participants to think about the assessment of student learning from the program-level or college-level perspective and integrate the

basic principles of assessment, change management, and facilitation tools. The workshop activities take participants from the basic principles to an understanding of how those principles can be applied in the context of their individual colleges/universities. Although the primary focus of the workshop is on developing sound assessment practices, participants learn how to lead others in the process effectively by applying facilitation tools and basic change management principles.

Presenter(s)

Tammie Cumming, City University of New York - NYCCT

Ramon Moncada, New York City College of Technology - CUNY

Excel Macros Boot Camp Part II - From Basic Creation to Intermediate Programming – 1974

Wekiwa 8

In this workshop, participants learn how to set up, run, and design Excel macros. This includes recording, running, editing, and using conditional logic and loop control statements. Participants also learn overall design techniques as well as commands that cannot be recorded. A workbook with partial code examples and practice problems (completed during the workshop) is provided. Prior macro experience is not required, but participants should have a working knowledge of Excel. Excel Macros Boot Camp Part I is a prerequisite for this workshop.

Presenter(s)

Mark Leany, Utah Valley University

Tim Stanley, Utah Valley University

Fundamentals of Logic Models and Evaluation – 1979

Wekiwa 5

This workshop outlines key concepts and effective tools to design, review, and/or implement logic models with step-by-step suggestions on how to advance your logic models and evaluation plans. Participants also learn how logic modeling can be used as a tool to describe intervention strategies and learn how to develop evaluation questions as part of sound evaluation plans.

Presenter(s)

Rigoberto Rincones Gomez, Broward College

Liliana Rodriguez Campos, University of South Florida

IR Office Management Fundamentals: Productivity and Performance Tools – 1980*Wekiwa 9*

Using a case study approach, hands-on exercises, and facilitated group discussion, this workshop focuses on three best practice techniques—the functional audit, the activities inventory, and business process redesign—to assess and improve IR office work flow, productivity, and performance. Participants learn to balance competing priorities and to set measurable, realistic, and achievable goals.

Presenter(s)*Mary Lelik, North Carolina State University***Predictive Analytics Part 1: The Concepts, the Tools and the Process – 1981***Wekiwa 7*

Predictive analytics is a phrase that was heard in many of last year's AIR Forum presentations, but one with which many IR professionals have little or no experience. This workshop is designed to familiarize attendees with the concepts and terminology used in the field. Further, participants learn a structured process for how to perform a predictive analytics project and begin to think about how to apply predictive analytics in their own environments.

Presenter(s)*Rebecca Barber, Arizona State University*

08:00 AM–04:00 PM

Best Practices for Reporting and Using IPEDS Data to Improve Office Efficiencies – 1976*Wekiwa 2*

This workshop is designed for individuals who lead the IPEDS data submission cycle on their campuses and have done so for at least one full reporting cycle. Using IPEDS as a focus, participants learn IR best practices and technical efficiencies in data management through Excel (e.g., pivot tables, merging data, custom formulas, and filters); examine multiple options for IPEDS submission (manual entry, .csv file upload, and XML); and learn how to use benchmarking data to address key institutional questions and needs. Participants should have experience using the IPEDS Data Center to retrieve data and a working knowledge of Excel (e.g., how to create basic formulas and sort data).

Presenter(s)*Amy Ballagh, Georgia Southern University
Kristina Cragg, Ashford University***Introduction to Linear and Logistic Regression in SPSS – 1975***Wekiwa 1*

This workshop builds upon participants' foundational knowledge in statistics and SPSS. The presenters provide a conceptual overview of the assumptions and principles of multiple linear regression and logistic regression. Additionally, the full-day workshop offers some rules of thumb to consider when building regression models. Finally, participants are provided with a national dataset containing longitudinal information on college students to practice applying the concepts of linear and logistic regression through the use of SPSS.

Presenter(s)*Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Jessica Sharkness, Tufts University*

12:30 PM–04:00 PM

Pre-Conference Workshops (additional fee)**Best Practices for Qualitative Research – 1983***Wekiwa 5*

This workshop covers best practices in applying qualitative research methods to the study of higher education constituents/audiences based on 15 years of experience with a range of universities and constituents/audiences. While we cover qualitative research methods that reach more traditional constituents, including prospective and admitted students, as well as current and graduating students, we also demonstrate how qualitative research can be used to gain deep insight into non-traditional populations. Participants explore the applications of qualitative research to a wide array of institutional research projects while learning best practices, strategies, techniques, and tips from start to finish of a project.

Presenter(s)*Jennifer Mack, Huron Consulting Group
Megan Adams, Huron Consulting Group*

Dashboards in Excel: An Introduction – 1984*Wekiwa 3*

In this workshop, participants learn about various types of dashboards, how to create dashboards with high-quality graphs in Excel 2010/2007, and how to customize output to highlight the data's meaning. Topics covered include creating and formatting charts for time-series, ranking, part-to-whole, deviation, and nominal comparison relationships.

Presenter(s)*Craig Abbey, University at Buffalo***Getting the Most Out of Your CCSSE and SENSE Raw Data Files – 1985***Wekiwa 4*

With each administration of CCSSE or SENSE, the participating colleges receive access to the online reporting system and a data file consisting of responses for all participants at their college. While the online reporting system is a valuable resource for colleges, the raw data files offer colleges the opportunity to explore student engagement more deeply on their campuses. This workshop will focus on two questions that the Center for Community College Student Engagement has received most frequently over the past year. The first part of the workshop will focus on conducting analysis of trends over time. The second part of this workshop centers on how institutional researchers can dig deeper into promising practices on their campuses. This workshop will present different approaches to analyzing data including demonstrations of analyses conducted using Excel, SAS, and SPSS. Selected code will be made available to participants so they can conduct similar analyses using their own raw data files.

Presenter(s)*E. Michael Bohlig, CCCSE, UT-Austin, College of Education***Power Tools for IR Reporting: Hands-on Introduction – 1987***Wekiwa 6*

With increased emphasis on data-driven support in higher education, the need for improved, more advanced reporting has increased dramatically. The IR and IT staff from one regional university have been working with the new "Power" tools released by Microsoft® to meet these reporting needs – Power Pivot, Power View, Power Maps, and Power Query. All of the workshop exercises are done using Excel 2013 (with the help of Access 2013) - the only requirement for these capabilities. As is shown, these products have the potential to revolutionize data analysis and reporting in an IR office.

Presenter(s)*Alison Joseph, Western Carolina University
David Onder, Western Carolina University***Predictive Analytics Part 2: The Tools and the Technical Details – 1986***Wekiwa 7*

Knowing about predictive analytics isn't really enough to be able to accomplish it. This session provides an overview of the wide range of tools available and provide examples of common activities available in many of the tools. We dive deeper into understanding and preparing the data, the types of models that are available, what they can (and cannot) tell us, and how to tell whether your model is suitable. This is a hands-on session, during which we provide a data set that can be used with whatever tools you have available (or open-source tools if you prefer).

Presenter(s)*Rebecca Barber, Arizona State University*

PROFESSIONAL FILES

Maintain your excellence.

Share your expertise with the field. Publish your work in AIR Professional Files. Articles, grounded in relevant literature, synthesize current issues, present new processes or models, or share practical applications.

AIRWEB.ORG/PUBLICATIONS

01:30 PM–02:45 PM

Invited Presentation Sessions

Defining IR: Findings from a National Study of IR Work Tasks – 1996

Panzacola H2

In the first stage of the initiative to benchmark the various roles of IR, 1,400 elements collected from IR job descriptions and position announcements were shared with AIR members in a large-scale survey. Join us to learn about the study results to date, including the tasks AIR members highlight as key responsibilities. Feedback will be sought from attendees on potential future products related to this work, such as guides for internal training, materials for search committees, and IR job descriptions.

Presenter(s)

Fred Lillibridge, Dona Ana Community College
Darlena Jones, Association for Institutional Research
Leah Ewing Ross, Association for Institutional Research

How IR People Can Talk Like TED – 1531

Sebastian I1

Institutional Researchers are called upon more and more to present research findings to a wide variety of audiences, such as administrators, faculty, fellow institutional researchers, and outside constituencies, yet many in IR have little or no training in presenting. Expectations of presenters have shifted upward, as more and more exposure to outstanding presentations via the internet has raised the bar. In particular, TED Talks feature exceptional presenters with both entertaining and informative messages and have a wide distribution, with some of the more popular talks seen by millions of viewers. IR people can learn to talk like TED! The presenters are institutional researchers who gave a TEDxUCLA Talk and as part of the process were trained by TED Talk coaches.

Presenter(s)

John Pryor, Gallup
Erin Knepler, University System of Maryland

Implementing a Business Intelligence Solution to Improve Student Success – 1997

Panzacola H1

To improve student success, colleges need more than just best practices to produce results. College employees need access to 'real-time' information to make data-driven decisions. Since 2010, St. Petersburg College has focused its strategic efforts on student success, shifting personnel, financial resources, and energy in an intentional, data-driven way to:

- Help students finish what they start.
- Engage and train staff at all levels to support students in class and out.
- Produce graduates whose lives are changed by earning a degree or certificate.

Through specific initiatives within the "College Experience", College President, Bill Law challenged college staff and faculty to craft models of academic and non-academic support systems that would help "move the needle" on student success. In order to support faculty/staff engagement and empower internal stakeholders to determine levels of student success, Campus Provosts and Academic Deans were asked to provide input on how they wanted to view data. The Office of Institutional Research then teamed up with members of IT to develop a robust data system called Pulse BI based upon their requests. This presentation will describe IR's leadership in developing the Pulse BI system and supporting data dashboards, transferring data extraction expertise to staff members, and participating in regular focused conversations about student success improvement. Additional campus constituents will round out a panel discussion of how the initiative was implemented and discuss impacts and results.

Presenter(s)

Sabrina Crawford, St. Petersburg College
James Coraggio, St. Petersburg College
Daniel Gardner, St. Petersburg College

02:00 PM–04:00 PM

Special Event

International IR Caucus – 2035

Wekiwa 8

Join AIR members to learn from and network with IR practitioners from the U.S. and around the globe. The International IR Caucus will focus on global trends and challenges facing IR professionals, higher education systems, data quality, and other driving issues. Small group discussions will allow attendees to make meaningful connections with colleagues from around the world.

Conveners

Edward Acquah, Athabasca University, Canada
Stefan Buettner, University of Tuebingen, Germany
Noel Edge, Graduate Careers Australia
Maha Khlat, Qatar University
Darlana Jones, Association for Institutional Research

03:00 PM–04:15 PM

Invited Presentation Sessions

Bridging the Great Divide: Connecting Research and Policy – 1241

Sebastian I1

What is the relevance of my work? How can I help policymakers understand the research colleagues and I have undertaken for the common good? Why aren't they listening to me? At one point or another in their career researchers likely pose questions such as these to themselves. As often, the answers are unclear. This presentation was developed to assist researchers better understand the various aspects of connecting research to policymakers. It accomplishes this task by examining three critical aspects in the process of translating research to practicable information, starting with understanding your audience, moving on to a review of essential elements to communicate research, and concluding with thoughts on how to engage with an audience of policy makers and stakeholders.

Presenter(s)

Christopher Mullin, State University System of Florida

IPEDS Update – 1995

Panzacola H1

This session provides a general update on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). A review of the 2013-14 data collection year, information about changes for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 collections, and an overview of IPEDS Research and Development are provided. In addition, a brief overview of changes to the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) is shared. NPSAS examines how students and their parents pay for college.

Presenter(s)

Richard Reeves, National Center for Education Statistics

What Every IR/IE Rookie Should Know: Class of 2014 – 1233

Panzacola H2

Three institutional researchers representing a public research university, a public master's university, and a large, online institution will share their experiences, triumphs, and trials from their first six years of working in IR and IE. The target audience is newcomers to institutional research, those charged with establishing a new IR office and/or the assessment function at an institution, and those responsible for coordinating, planning, and assessment and helping others to use assessment results for continuous improvement. This presentation will also allow time for a question and answer session with the panelists as well as an opportunity for the audience to share lessons they learned during their initial experience of working in IR and IE.

Presenter(s)

Crissie Grove Jameson, Walden University
Angel Jowers, The University of West Alabama
Gordon Mills, University of South Alabama

04:30 PM–05:15 PM

Special Events

Graduate Student Gathering – 2036

Wekiwa 8

Graduate students are encouraged to attend this informal gathering to learn about the benefits of AIR scholarships, professional development opportunities, and other funding and volunteer opportunities. In addition, there will be time for discussion about the transition into the institutional research world and how AIR can help.

Conveners

Christopher Cullander, University of California-San Francisco

Jim Lenio, Walden University

Amelia Parnell, Association for Institutional Research

Darlana Jones, Association for Institutional Research

NCES Synthesis of Technical Information Regarding the Postsecondary Institution Ratings System (PIRS) – 1959

Gatlin A/B

Reporting

In August 2013, as part of a plan to increase college affordability, President Obama proposed the development of a new college ratings system to improve consumer access to useful information, and to help students and families better compare and select schools that provide the best value for their educational needs. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), as the U.S. Department of Education's non-partisan statistical agency, issued a Request for Information (RFI) in the Federal Register in December 2013, and held a Technical Symposium in February 2014 to address the statistical and methodological aspects of such a system. This session summarizes the technical feedback received through the RFI (which expired on January 31, 2014) for technical input on the Department's efforts to develop a PIRS, and from the Technical Symposium held by NCES on the same topic.

Presenter(s)

Richard Reeves, National Center for Education Statistics

AIR Grants

With support from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC), the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) operates a grant program that supports research on a wide range of issues of critical importance to U.S. higher education. Recipients of AIR Grants present their research at the AIR Forum.

AIR Grant Recipients Presenting at the 2014 Forum:

DISSERTATION GRANT PRESENTATIONS

Bernadette Doykos, Vanderbilt University

Matthew Giani, The University of Texas at Austin

Jihee Hwang, Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus

Ning Jia, University of Notre Dame

Jeremy Tuchmayer, North Carolina State University

RESEARCH GRANT PRESENTATIONS

Gloria Crisp, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Jennifer Delaney, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

David Hondula, Pavilion Research

Yingyi Ma, Syracuse University

Jeffrey Sklar, California Polytechnic State University

www.airweb.org/Grants

Program Highlights: Wednesday, May 28

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 6:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. | Registration Open, Sebastian Registration |
| 6:45 a.m. – 8:00 a.m. | @First Forum Networking Breakfast (Buffet), Butler Ballroom |
| 7:00 a.m. – 8:00 a.m. | Forum Participant Breakfast (Buffet), Gatlin A/B |
| 8:00 a.m. – 9:20 a.m. | Welcome and Wednesday Keynote, Gatlin A/B |
| 9:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. | Concurrent Sessions |
| 9:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. | Exhibit Hall and AIR Networking Hub Open, Sebastian J/K |
| 11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. | Panel Sessions |
| 12:15 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. | Lunch Break, Networking, and Poster Presentations, Exhibit Hall, Sebastian J/K |
| 2:00 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. | AIR Annual Business Meeting, Wekiwa 6 |
| 2:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. | Concurrent Sessions |
| 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Panel Sessions |
| 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. | Welcome Reception Hosted by AIR Board of Directors, Exhibit Hall, Sebastian J/K |
| 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. | Affiliated Organization Meetings |
| 5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. | Networking/Find a Dinner Group, Rosen Shingle Creek Transportation Lobby |
| 6:00 p.m. | Dinner Groups |

WEDNESDAY

Wednesday

7:00AM

Breakfast Buffet

8:00AM

Wednesday Keynote

9:00AM

10:00AM

Concurrent Sessions

11:00AM

12:00PM

Panel Sessions

Lunch Break, Networking
& Poster Presentations
in Exhibit Hall

1:00PM

2:00PM

AIR Annual
Business Meeting

Concurrent Sessions

3:00PM

Panel Sessions

4:00PM

Welcome Reception in Exhibit Hall
Hosted by AIR Board of Directors

5:00PM

Networking / Find a Dinner Group

6:00PM

Dinner Groups

7:00PM


8:00PM

Exhibit Hall
&
AIR Networking
Hub

Exhibit Hall Floor Plan—Sebastian J/K

Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Academic Analytics, LLC | 114 |
| Campus Labs | 220, 222 |
| CLA+ | 118 |
| College Board | 409 |
| College Survey Services | 417 |
| Concord USA, Inc. | 109, 111 |
| Data | 180 116 |
| Digital Measures | 201, 203, 300, 302 |
| EBI MAP-Works | 100 |
| Ellucian/Nuventive | 510 |
| Engineerica Systems, Inc. | 110 |
| Entelligence Corporation | 408 |
| ETS | 401 |
| EvaluationKIT | 112 |
| Evisions, Inc. | 506 |
| ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc. | 413 |
| eXplorance | 208, 210 |
| GradesFirst | 407 |
| Gravic, Inc. — Remark Software | 122 |
| Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) | 415 |
| IASystem — University of Washington | 500 |
| IBM Business Analytics | 420 |
| iDashboards | 120 |
| IData Incorporated | 505 |
| IDEA Education | 507 |
| Incisive Analytics LLC | 419 |
| Information Builders | 422 |
| Insightrix Research | 123 |
| IOTA Solutions | 512 |
| LiveText | 511 |
| National Student Clearinghouse | 102 |
| National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) | 108 |
| Noel-Levitz | 421 |



Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| PACAT | 501 |
| Public Insight | 121 |
| QS Intelligence Unit | 503 |
| Rapid Insight Inc. | 502 |
| SAP Americas, Inc. | 411 |
| SAS | 309, 311 |
| Scantron | 403 |
| SmartEvals (GAP Technologies, Inc.) | 106 |

Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|---|----------|
| Strategic Planning Online | 410 |
| Tableau | 509 |
| Taskstream | 508 |
| The Outcomes Survey powered by CSO Research, Inc. | 423 |
| Thomson Reuters | 104 |
| Tk20 | 405 |
| U.S. News & World Report | 321, 323 |
| ZogoTech | 504 |

06:45 AM–08:00 AM

Breakfast Opportunity

@First Forum: Newcomers to Forum Breakfast Gathering – 2043

Butler Ballroom

First-time Forum participants are invited to participate in a special Newcomers gathering. Each table will have a volunteer leader who will share tips about how to make the most of learning and networking opportunities at Forum. Join us to meet other newcomers and jump-start a successful Forum experience. Advance registration is not required.

07:00 AM–08:00 AM

Breakfast Opportunity

Forum Participant Breakfast

Plenary (Gatlin A/B)

Buffet line closes promptly at 8:00 a.m.

08:00 AM–09:20 AM

Welcome and Wednesday Keynote

Board Welcome

Gatlin A/B

The official Forum welcome conducted by the AIR Board of Directors includes acknowledgement of member volunteers, announcement of AIR award winners, and introduction of our keynote speaker.

Convener

Sandi Bramblett, AIR President, Georgia Institute of Technology

Keynote: The Art of Explanation - 2040

Gatlin A/B



What does it mean to explain an idea? Why is explanation so difficult? What is the Curse of Knowledge and what is the remedy? What are the Stepping Stones of Effective Explanations? How do you find the right language for your audience? Lee LeFever, founder of Common Craft and author of *The Art of Explanation*,

will share ideas and suggestions to help us explore the art of explanation for IR. In 2007, Lee saw an opportunity to explain technology using short animated videos. Since then his company has worked with the world's most respected brands, inspired the explainer video industry and earned over 50 million online views. Today his focus is helping others become more understandable through better explanations.

Speaker

Lee LeFever, Founder, Common Craft

09:30 AM–10:15 AM

Speaker Sessions

Assessing Outcomes: Unexpected Partnerships, Discussions Across Disciplines – 1720

Panzacola H3

Assessment

Seeking to assess interpersonal communication skills within the General Education program, faculty members moved from direct observation in Speech courses to also collect comparative data from new students in our Student Success course. These sources of data were strengthened with the addition of a student self-assessment and a related peer assessment using the IMPACCT online survey. Faculty led the process – from developing training for use of the rubric and conducting observations to developing cross-disciplinary analysis and discussion of data. Participants will learn about an approach for assessing elusive outcomes in a meaningful way and the processes that were developed to analyze and learn from multiple sources of data across disciplines.

Presenter(s)

Laura Blasi, Valencia College

Mia Pierre, Valencia College

Christina Hardin, Valencia College

Degree Qualifications Profile: A Primer for IR and Assessment Professionals – 1524

Panzacola H1

Assessment

The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) provides a framework of specific, rigorous learning expectations for



graduates who receive associates, bachelor's, and master's degrees that are measured through in-course assignments designed to elicit student behaviors that enable professional judgments about the degree to which various learning outcomes have been attained. This presentation explores the implications and roles of IR professionals in supporting or engaging with frameworks such as the DQP and also embedded assessments and competency-based education in terms of documenting student learning and fostering data-informed decision-making.

Presenter(s)

Natasha Jankowski, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

George Kuh, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Exploring how Course Evaluation Outcomes are Collected, Shared, and Used – 1411

Panzacola F1

Assessment

End of course evaluations are a widely used means of assessing student learning experiences and provide opportunities for faculty to refine their teaching and course content. However, the way institutions collect and share those results varies. Using data from the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement and Faculty Survey of Student Engagement administrations, this presentation examines how different types of institutions collect and distribute course evaluation results, how much students access course evaluation information, and how much faculty use course evaluation information to improve their courses and teaching. Student use of external evaluation sources (e.g., ratemyprofessor.com) to select courses is also be examined.

Presenter(s)

Allison BrckaLorenz, National Survey of Student Engagement

Alexander McCormick, Indiana University Bloomington

Leah Peck, Indiana University

Fun Ways to Engage the College Community and Share Information – 1607

Panzacola H2

Technologies

This session presents some unique ideas and practices that create a college culture that appreciates data. Since the IR profession relies on inter-institutional cooperation, it is important to brand yourself as a reliable, magnetic, and thought-provoking resource. This session shows a few ways to give back to the institution by communicating IR data in fun, factual ways. Topics include disseminating data for major institutional initiatives, a non-traditional fact book, IMPACT statement, our eminently successful weekly data communications, and other fun activities around institutional data (seriously!) Discussion is encouraged.

Presenter(s)

Donald Femino, Endicott College

Peter Hart, Endicott College

Interactive Retention Dashboards: Going from “No Way!” to “OK!” – 1367

Wekiwa 7

Assessment

At CSU East Bay Institutional Research, we give V.O.I.C.E. to data (Visual, On Demand, Interactive, Comprehensive, Easy). Using our data warehouse and Tableau, we created major-specific retention dashboards for entering and ending cohorts of students. We developed a methodology that give us simple yet comprehensive reports. That was the easy part. More difficult is getting the campus to accept and use the dashboards. Using a few simple strategies and a bit of leg-work we went from “No Way” to “OK”!

Presenter(s)

Amber Machamer, California State University-East Bay

Learning Outcomes Assessment: Enriching Success Metrics for Graduate Degrees – 1363

Panzacola F2

Assessment

Join us for an interactive session exploring the assessment of graduate academic programs (i.e., research degrees rather than professional degrees), including traditional metrics, student learning outcomes, and their intersections. Presenters explore the challenges and benefits of, and share their approaches to, integrating learning outcomes assessment into the repertoire of indicators used to cultivate, assess, and evaluate student and program success.

Presenter(s)

Laura Martin, University of California, Merced

Christopher Cullander, University of California-San Francisco

Performance Funding and Ohio Community Colleges: Data Successes and Challenges – 1570

Sebastian L1

Analysis

Ohio is one of the first states in the country to shift to 100% performance-based funding for community colleges. Analysis and review of data played a critical role in the model development. In this session, participants will (1) understand the basic framework of Ohio's performance-based funding model for community colleges; (2) learn about a process for identification and prioritization of risk factors based on student success data; (3) consider opportunities and challenges related to data elements not currently collected in their states; and (4) explore the policy environment and institutional culture changes needed for a state to shift to performance-based funding.

Presenter(s)

Laura Rittner, Ohio Association of Community Colleges

Penelope Parmer, Ohio Board of Regents

Laura Mercer, Sinclair Community College

Post-Graduation Plans and Goals: Experiences of Students Who “Have No Idea” – 1489

Wekiwa 3

Decision-Support

As calls for increased focus on undergraduate outcomes gained momentum, concern over students' post-graduation paths have dominated local and national discussions. President Obama recently underscored the concern, linking students' post-graduation outcomes to college ratings and potentially to federal funding. As state and regional data systems link students and employment, analysis of student outcomes in relation to their experiences during college and future goals provides a layer of analysis that can inform campus decision making. This presentation discusses findings from a study at the University of Minnesota exploring the connection between undergraduates' experiences and their articulation of post-graduation plans on the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) survey, with focus on the experiences of students indicating “no idea” about their plans and goals. The presentation also discusses connections with external data on students' work and educational outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Lesley Lydell, University of Minnesota

Program Review: Opportunity for Innovation and Change – 1184

Wekiwa 6

Assessment



In order to ensure educational effectiveness, institutions of higher education carry out program review. Program review gathers and analyzes assessment data with the aim of improving teaching and learning. This presentation describes the process of program review at one large university in California, and reports examples of innovative change and improvement change that came about as the result of program review.

Presenter(s)

Terry Bustillos, National University
Gary Barton, National University
Ron Germaine, National University

Revising an IE Assessment Rubric to Drive Evidence-Based Improvement – 1208

Sebastian I2

Assessment

Rubrics support examination of the extent to which the specified criteria have been reached and provide feedback to improve performance. This session illustrates how an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Assessment Rubric was developed, implemented, and revised at the University of Central Florida as a tool for scoring IE plans from academic programs and administrative and educational support services areas. Participants will understand the benefits of using an IE Assessment Rubric to include communication of

clear expectations, fostering mentoring, providing feedback, and increasing the use of IE Assessment to drive evidence-based improvement.

Presenter(s)

Patrice Lancey, University of Central Florida
Divya Bhati, University of Central Florida

SAAIR Best Presentation: “Who cares?” Student and Lecturer Experiences of Course Evaluation – 1961

Sebastian I3

Decision-Support



Student feedback plays an important role in the continuous improvement of teaching and learning at higher education institutions. Course evaluations are commonly used as a method of gathering student feedback. Not much is, however, known about the views and experiences of the stakeholders (i.e. students and lecturers) in the process. This study draws on research conducted during 2013 focused on student and lecturer experiences of course evaluations at the University of the Free State (South Africa). Qualitative data was collected by means of focus groups and interviews to determine student and lecturer experiences of course evaluations and what their suggestions are for improving the process going forward. Lessons learned from those who are most directly influenced by the course evaluation process and how these lessons can be used to improve this institutional process will be shared.

Presenter(s)

Anneri Meintjes, University of the Free State

So You Want To Be A Predictive Modeler? – 1218

Panzacola H4

Analysis

Predictive modeling is fast becoming a must-have tool in the IR world. Join me for a brief overview of predictive modeling, its statistical, philosophical, and ethical underpinnings, and how it can be used to improve decision making at your institution. The second half of the presentation focuses on a specific machine learning algorithm (Random Forest) and best practices when using it or similar modeling techniques. This presentation is written in a non-technical way suitable for practitioners looking for an introduction to the topic.

Presenter(s)

Reuben Ternes, Oakland University

Structuring Data to Measure and Improve Beyond-the-Classroom Learning – 1475

Sebastian I4

Assessment

The need to effectively measure the educational and developmental impact of beyond the classroom (BTC; co-curricular) activities is becoming increasingly relevant as financial constraints increase and students have more



options for online learning. A primary obstacle to these measurements is the lack of comprehensive, connected data systems to record BTC experiences in ways that enable useful analysis of impact and effectiveness. Through the lens of one large public research university, presenters discuss and provide examples of campus and departmental-level initiatives to record and measure BTC experiences and assessment results obtained through these methods.

Presenter(s)

Amber Fallucca, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Pamela Bowers, University of South Carolina-Columbia

The Dependability of NSSE 2013: A Generalizability Study – 1382

Sebastian L2

Analysis



The dependability of assessment instruments relies upon their abilities to accurately generalize to aggregated groups. This study used generalizability theory to assess the dependability of group mean scores of the new National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Engagement Indicators. The paper details the Engagement Indicators and examines the conditions in which the Engagement Indicators produce dependable group means that can be generalized to larger groups of students.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Fosnacht, National Survey of Student Engagement
Robert Gonyea, Indiana University-Bloomington

The Ones that Got Away: Employment Outcomes of Non-Completers – 1212

Panzacola F4

Analysis



In this age of accountability, colleges are judged based on how many students complete degrees or certificates, or (in the case of community colleges) transfer to baccalaureate institutions. Yet recent research shows non-completing students post successes that are not included in current accountability models, and probably should be. This session explores the concept of “Skills Builders,” or students who successfully complete career and technical education coursework, but do not earn credentials. Findings from three separate recent research studies are shared, all reaching similar conclusions: Skills Builders are a unique category of students who post significant wage gains and other important successes despite not having credentials. In this session, participants will gain an understanding of this population and how to quantify their successes to add to discussions of accountability.

Presenter(s)

K. C. Greaney, Santa Rosa Junior College
Kathy Booth, WestEd
Alice Van Ommeren, California Community College Chancellor's Office

The Use of Survival Analysis to Examine Student Cohort Dynamics – 1300

Panzacola F3

Analysis

This session focuses on the use of survival analysis to better understand the time series dynamics of student retention and graduation—the student life cycle. This approach provides a robust analysis of the student life cycle using the entire pattern of the time series and allows for fuller understanding of variable effects, including policy initiatives. Freshmen cohort data is used to illustrate the method with comparisons and analyses. SAS programs specifically designed for student life cycle analyses are presented. Data quality and methodological issues are discussed, and SAS programs are made available to attendees.

Presenter(s)

Lawrence Redlinger, The University of Texas at Dallas
Anna Moses, The University of Texas at Dallas
John Wiorkowski, The University of Texas at Dallas

Transforming Higher Education Data Into Insight – 1875

Wekiwa 5

Technologies



Higher education data (like data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System or IPEDS) is traditionally complicated and difficult to navigate, understand, or gain useful analysis from. Making sense out of the data from IPEDS requires knowledge of database structures, the use of clunky government tools and interpretation from the end user. In this session, you will learn how Public Insight has transformed this complex data into useful insight for institutional researchers across the country.

Presenter(s)

Dan Quigg, Public Insight, Inc.
Chris Lintner, Public Insight, Inc.

U.S. News & World Report's Academic Insights Platform – 1945

Wekiwa 4

Technologies



Academic Insights was developed for institutions to quickly access and analyze historical U.S. News & World Report rankings and data. With access to our proprietary and unpublished data sets, users can quickly identify competitive strengths and weaknesses in relation to peer institutions. We'll be unveiling our newest version of the platform and will walk through upgrades and answer any questions about the platform from the audience.

Presenter(s)

Evan Jones, U. S. News & World Report
Christopher Petrie, U. S. News & World Report



Understanding First-Year Students: Four Ways to Generate Data-Driven Insight – 1418

Sebastian L4

Analysis

Understanding the strengths, needs, and challenges unique to first-year students is key to creating strong programs and providing appropriate support and guidance. This process-oriented session presents four ways of disaggregating non-academic first-year student data that have facilitated discovery of actionable insights about relationships between incoming students' attitudes and behaviors and first-year success. Comparative analyses of sub-groups (e.g., self-identified "flourishing" v. "floundering" students, overachieving v. underachieving students, and survey-based clusters) suggests consistent differences between first-year students who thrive and those who do not. Processes outlined could be extended and/or generalized to facilitate comparative analyses of segments within any student population.

Presenter(s)

Steve Wygant, Brigham Young University
Danny Olsen, Brigham Young University

Using Excel in Institutional Research Efficiently and Effectively – 1365

Sebastian L3

Technologies

Evidence-based decision making requires transforming raw data into useable information. Data analysts can convert data to vivid and interactive visualization in a timely manner without having sophisticated programming skills. One readily available and affordable tool is Excel. Most IR professionals use Excel, but not everyone uses it to its potential. As institutional research questions become more and more complex, the presenter introduces techniques for simplifying analytic results without losing data and without the need for a full written report. Examples of describing data in different formats, such as heat maps, geographic maps, and dashboards that go above and beyond the standard chart are shared. Excel has become a tool essential for mastering the four data-driven tasks: data access, management, analysis, and presentation. The presenter addresses the advantages and disadvantages of using Excel to accomplish these functions.

Presenter(s)

Jamil Ibrahim, University of Mississippi Medical Center

Using Statewide Longitudinal Data: Perspectives from Both Sides of the Desk – 1361

Wekiwa 9

Analysis

In this session the presenters share experiences "from both sides of the desk" – as the researcher who has used P-20 data and the data manager who fulfills requests for P-20 data – to shed light on how institutional researchers can best use P-20 data to evaluate postsecondary outcomes. Participants

will learn about the background and national trends related to statewide longitudinal data systems, understand the multiple steps involved with effectively requesting these data for institutional research, and be exposed to the various types of statistical models made possible by P-20 data.

Presenter(s)

Grant Blume, University of Washington
Melissa Beard, Washington State Education Research and Data Center

10:30 AM–11:15 AM

Speaker Sessions

Accounting for Individual Mobility in Education and Employment Outcomes – 1254

Wekiwa 7

Analysis

How can we responsibly talk about employment outcomes when we know that our graduates often leave the state to find employment or seek additional education—information for which data are sparse or nonexistent? The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) just completed a pilot project to combine individual-level data covering K-12 education, postsecondary education, and workforce information across multiple states. In the process, the Data Exchange demonstrated that linking such data is legally possible, and that doing so reveals a substantial amount of information about outcomes that would otherwise be unknown to an individual state relying on its own resources—results that are increasingly important with the growing interest in data linking education and employment. This session reports on some of those findings, and also describes the key lessons learned along the way.

Presenter(s)

Brian Prescott, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Pearl Iboshi, University of Hawaii System
Andy Mehl, Idaho State Board of Education

Closing the Programmatic Assessment Loop: A Study of Institutional Impact – 1370

Panzacola H3

Assessment



Institutions are generally adept at collecting student learning outcome achievement data, but often neglect to use it for programmatic change and continuous improvement. They may have formal or informal assessment cycles that guide their assessment practices in light of accreditation requirements. Operationalizing the last step of Fresno Pacific University's (FPU) assessment cycle entailed the establishment of an institutional practice called programmatic data dialogue that closes the assessment loop

at the program level. The practice provides program directors and faculty with a forum in which to review their assessment documentation and analyze their program student learning outcome data results so they may use them in modification of teaching, for program review, and for reporting to internal and external constituents. This session presents the results of a study on the institutional impact of FPU's first programmatic data dialogue.

Presenter(s)

Joanne Weiss, Fresno Pacific University

Driving Success: Supporting Shared Responsibility for Student Retention – 1258

Panzacola F1

Assessment

Retention of qualified students is vital in visual and performing arts programs. By the nature of their pedagogical approaches, arts programs are typically expensive to offer. Concurrently, these programs are dependent upon the recruitment of students with specialized skill sets in order to offer a full complement of experiences that attract a sufficient student body to balance the cost-effectiveness ratio. Attrition, particularly by key individuals, can spell disaster for an individual department or program of study. This study examines a successful Early Intervention Program currently in place at a College of Visual and Performing Arts.

Presenter(s)

Michelle Kiec, Kutztown University

From Data-Mining to Data-Webbing – 1714

Sebastian L1

Technologies

The goal continues: to create a “panoramic” picture of student academic success. Separate datasets prevent a comprehensive understanding of student enrollment from being obtained. Following an initial effort to connect basic student information system data to external datasets, such as the NSSE, externally supported vendor applications, and internally developed surveys, initial progress is being made in delivering web-based graphical reports that can be used by internal faculty and staff and selected external stakeholders. Attendees will learn how to initiate a similar reporting process either with an advanced report writing tool or robust Excel formulas.

Presenter(s)

Julliana Brey, Carroll University

Grading Our Performance: The Development of a KPI Report Card – 1141

Panzacola H4

Assessment

Colleges today often find themselves data rich, but information poor. Yet information to help guide strategies and assess outcomes has never been more important. Learn

about one college's journey in addressing this issue by developing and implementing a system of key performance indicators (KPIs) to inform assessment and planning. Participants examine the process used to develop the KPIs, measures, and an institutional report card; investigate the grading methodology and initial results; and review strategies for making the KPI system action relevant.

Presenter(s)

Ann Murray, Laramie County Community College

High Impact Practices, Learning Outcomes, and Backgrounds in the SERU – 1486

Sebastian L4

Analysis

In theory, student engagement in high impact practices (HIPs) lead to gains in student learning outcomes. In this paper we explore student participation in HIPs and how those activities are linked to learning outcomes. In addition we look at students' backgrounds and how they interact with student experiences and outcomes. Data came from the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) administered in 2012. Employing the multiple indicators and multiple causes (MIMIC) methodology of structural equation modeling (SEM), we examine the impacts of students' learning activities on their perceived learning outcomes and cumulative GPAs, controlling their demographic backgrounds.

Presenter(s)

Yunhee Bae, TAMU at College Station

Mark Troy, Texas A&M University

High-Risk Targeting: The Interaction of R-squared, Effectiveness, and Budget – 1289

Wekiwa 9

Decision-Support



This session explores the issues IR offices face when asked to find “at risk” students as targets of interventions. Given our limited ability as a community college with no required admissions test scores to predict who is really at risk of dropping out, we examine the statistical interaction between our ability to predict dropouts after one semester, intervention treatment budgets, and intervention effectiveness properties. Colleges may be wasting money by targeting the wrong sets of students. Using sample analyses from a large, urban community college, this session shows participants how to analyze these target and treatment relationships and use this analysis to better communicate with administrators appropriate ways of selecting intervention targets.

Presenter(s)

Nathan Dickmeyer, CUNY LaGuardia Community College

Chunjuan Zhu, CUNY LaGuardia Community College

Incorporating External Data into the Program Review Process – 1355

Sebastian I1

Assessment

One of the most important tasks of a university is to evaluate existing degree programs and prioritize prospective program offerings in a systematic way. In this presentation, we explain how we assembled labor market, employer demand, student interest, and comparative peer institution datasets and used this information to identify, organize, and evaluate current and potential program offerings. We discuss the challenges and benefits of this external data to the existing internal program review process and the ways IR professionals can critically inform programmatic decision-making on campus.

Presenter(s)

Shannen Robson, Utah Valley University
Andrea Brown, Dixie State University
Tim Stanley, Utah Valley University

Is Anyone Minding the Store? Documenting Little IE – 1413

Sebastian I2

Assessment

The completion of annual plans and reports is a way to demonstrate completion and achievement of objectives and progress toward goals. Assessments of annual plans and reports are used to evaluate the effectiveness of key unit operations and initiatives. Results are associated with the quality of operations and the overall health of a unit. An analysis of these results tells a story about the unit. Therefore, the goal was to identify the story that the annual plans and reports told assessment personnel about the unit. The story was designed in the form of a scorecard. The scorecard was designed to present and share the analysis in an understandable and valuable manner. The intended outcome was for units to find meaning in the results and act upon any identified gaps. This presentation centers around the method that one institution used to involve its departments in a discussion about institutional effectiveness.

Presenter(s)

Christine Robinson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Lyterati: An Enterprise Faculty Information System – 1962

Wekiwa 4

Technologies



A critical component in measuring institutional effectiveness is to measure faculty members' intellectual contributions to the university.

Unfortunately little attention has been paid to track this information in an organized manner and is typically found embedded in CVs, faculty annual reports, and P&T dossiers. Lyterati is an enterprise level faculty information system that focuses on capturing faculty intellectual contributions through research, teaching, and service. Historical contributions

embedded in CVs are transactionalized and input into Lyterati before launch. Ongoing contributions are updated using a workflow based annual review and promotion and tenure system.

Presenter(s)

Tarun Sen, Entigence Corporation
Rumy Sen, Entigence Corporation

Making an Impact with Data in Higher Education – 2075

Wekiwa 3

Technologies



Tableau Software helps people see and understand data. Tableau's award-winning software delivers fast analytics, visualization and rapid-fire business intelligence on data of any size, format, or subject. The result? Anyone can get answers from data quickly, with no programming required. From executive dashboards to ad-hoc reports, Tableau lets you share mobile and browser-based, interactive analytics in a few clicks. More than 9,000 organizations, including some of the world's largest enterprises, rely on Tableau Software. www.tableausoftware.com

Presenter(s)

Shawn Pfaff, Tableau Software

Performance Management: Scorecards, Dashboards, and it Doesn't Stop There - 1876

Wekiwa 5

IR Technologies



Strategic planning can make the difference for a higher education institution, and Information Builders performance management technologies can help you communicate your strategic focus to the institution and align the work of the entire organization to that strategic plan. Learn how a strategy map, key performance indicators, and a detailed view of measures can help your institution drive results. Allow multiple levels of decisions-makers to be able to monitor and measure critical metrics, and then adjust priorities to meet institutional goals. This session is designed for both executives and IR analysts.

Presenter(s)

Tim Beckett, Information Builders
John Sulka, Information Builders

PowerPivot for Excel—Scratching the Surface – 1224

Panzacola H1

Technologies

This session introduces a powerful tool for Excel 2010 called PowerPivot. This tool is helpful for those with limited staff and limited budgets to purchase third party products who would like to perform powerful data analyses. Attendees will learn (1) where to obtain this free add-in, (2) advantages over traditional pivot tables, (3) how to import data from various



sources, (4) how to create a PowerPivot table, (5) how to create relationships with multiple tables in a single pivot table, and (6) how to use slicers.

Presenter(s)

Arlene Wimbley, Oakwood University

Practical Lessons Using Propensity Scores to Generate Comparison Groups – 1589

Panzacola F3

Analysis

Persistence research is often limited by the lack of a comparison group for testing the effect of participation in a program or receipt of a particular service. Propensity scores provide a post-hoc mechanism to generate a comparison group from basic enrollment data by matching non-participants to the program participants. I discuss generating predicted values from regression methods in SPSS and STATA, and the benefits and limits of resulting propensity scores for identifying a comparison group and evaluating program participation impact.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Lowman, University of Nevada, Reno

Predicting Risk: IR and BI Collaborate on Retention Dashboard – 1123

Panzacola H2

Decision-Support

Student retention is one of the most critical issues facing higher education today. Because postsecondary education has become increasingly necessary for success in the labor market, and colleges and universities have become increasingly dependent on tuition revenue to meet operating costs, low retention is detrimental to students and families, institutions of higher learning, and, ultimately, to society. This presentation details the development of the Risk Factors Dashboard, a practical solution for data-informed decision-

making on student retention at a public, minority-serving research university. In this session, participants learn about the synergistic way that empirical research was combined with IR application development to produce a dynamic dashboard solution. Participants engage in a discussion of ethical concerns and consider appropriate access controls for sensitive student information tools.

Presenter(s)

Tondra De, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Christina Drum, University of Nevada-Las Vegas

Predictive Validity of ACT for Class Progression from 2002 to 2009 – 1459

Panzacola F2

Analysis

This study compares the predictive validity of ACT on retention and progression between the 2002-2003 and 2009-2010 academic years in two universities at a time when initiatives focused on college readiness. This study's relevance to today's institutional research and enrollment management departments is in advancing the importance of class progression as an early "on track" indicator of college success. This session engages the audience in discussion of the relevance of the ACT benchmarks to early indicators of college success and of the most predictive measures of early college success.

Presenter(s)

Janet Holt, Illinois Education Research Council

Gerald McLaughlin, DePaul University

Report Creation: Making Wage Outcomes Accessible to Multiple Audiences – 1649

Panzacola F4

Technologies

The University of Texas System has a partnership with the Texas Workforce Commission to gather actual wage record data for the graduates of its fifteen academic and health institutions. These newly acquired wage data were combined with student characteristic information (FTIC/transfer status, first generation, Pell status, and time to graduation) and examined by degree level and major for up to five years after graduation. This session highlights successful strategies for reporting to multiple audiences—including students, parents, campus IR officials, university administrators, legislators, and Board of Regents. Special focus is given to the use of online, interactive dashboards to present these data. The UT System relies on SAS Visual Analytics as its primary online reporting tool. It allows for a user-friendly, visually appealing data experience that encourages the end user to explore the created wage and debt data sets in interactive and customizable ways.

Presenter(s)

David Troutman, The University of Texas System

Cathy Delgado, The University of Texas System



Reporting Program-Level Student Success Measures – 1594

Sebastian I4

Decision-Support

Over the years, the IR professionals at one university heard from various stakeholders about the desire for data on program-level success. Quite a bit of time was devoted to developing an extensive program-level retention and graduation report, which includes program-level tracking of cohorts over time to see how many were successful within their programs, how many were successful at the university but outside of their programs, and how many were lost completely to attrition. The report is built so that it can be produced in a highly automated fashion year-after-year. The presentation focuses on data elements employed and report presentation, includes a technical discussion of how the automated report was built using Excel, and provides an opportunity for attendees to take home the actual report framework, including SAS/SQL code, so they can produce this report on their own campuses, if they so desire.

Presenter(s)

Alison Joseph, Western Carolina University
David Onder, Western Carolina University

Student Satisfaction: Comparing Institutions on Key Indicators – 1400

Sebastian L2

Analysis

How does student satisfaction vary across key institutional indicators? Are students more or less satisfied when they pay more for tuition? Do students report higher satisfaction levels at institutions with better graduation rates? What influence does academic reputation have on students' perceived satisfaction with the school? Results will be shared from a 2013 study of 816,000 student records at more than 1200 institutions that completed the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, which were cross-referenced with IPEDS indicators. Implications for institutions' satisfaction analyses are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Julie Bryant, Noel-Levitz

The Impact of Undergraduate Interventions on STEM Student Outcomes – 1467

Sebastian I3

Analysis

National reports within the past decade have indicated that the U.S. is not graduating enough students in STEM fields. In response, federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and colleges and universities have invested heavily in interventions geared toward the retention of students in STEM fields. Supplemental Instruction (SI) and faculty support and mentoring represent two interventions intended to boost students' academic performance in STEM. This study uses propensity score matching to determine the

effect that SI and faculty mentoring have on students' STEM identities, commitment to research careers, and graduate school intentions. Preliminary findings indicate that both faculty mentorship and SI significantly and positively affect students' STEM identities and intentions to enroll in STEM graduate programs, but not plans for a STEM-related careers.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Sylvia Hurtado, University of California-Los Angeles
Bryce Hughes, University of California-Los Angeles

The Voluntary Framework of Accountability: Actionable Data for Colleges – 1240

Sebastian L3

Assessment

The Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) officially launched data collection for year one last October. Attend this session to find out more about the history of the VFA, the measures included in the VFA, and the suite of online tools developed for submitting and using the VFA. You will also hear how a small college and a centralized state-system office are using the VFA to help improve student success and become more accountable to internal and external stakeholders.

Presenter(s)

Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Christina Whitfield, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Bernadette Ferro, American Association of Community Colleges

Understanding Nonresponse in a Community College Faculty and Staff Survey – 1528

Wekiwa 6

Analysis

In recent years, researchers have experienced decreases in survey responses, yet we still know relatively little about factors related to response and the effect nonresponse has on survey results. This paper analyzes data from a large-scale satisfaction survey of community college personnel to uncover potential bias resulting from nonresponse and to test conditions that enhance the likelihood of response. In addition to providing evidence from their research, presenters offer participants practical information about response bias, ways to increase response rates, and tools to conduct similar studies on their campuses.

Presenter(s)

Paul Umbach, North Carolina State University
Alessandra Dinin, North Carolina State University



11:30 AM–12:15 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Benchmarking Interdisciplinary Units – 1994

Table 4

Assessment



How do you benchmark the research activity of an interdisciplinary unit when research cuts across several disciplines and where there are only a few or no similar units for comparative purposes? Working with Academic Analytics, University of Vermont IR staff identified a set of research themes that portray the work done at the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics. Academic Analytics then identified faculty at other institutions conducting similar research and created virtual units at those institutions with similar research foci. Through custom weighting of data elements by discipline and by the research themes of the Institute's programs, Academic Analytics provided national benchmarking for the Institute with comparative units at both peer and aspirational peer institutions.

Presenter(s)

William Savage, Academic Analytics, LLC

Kendi Wooley, Academic Analytics, LLC

John Ryan, University of Vermont

Content Management (Managing Files, Documents, Records, and Other Digital Assets): Best Practices for IR - 2078

Table 2

IR Technologies

Managing files, documents, records, datasets, and other digital assets can be a bear for IR offices in light of countless requests for reports, analyses, and everything else needed by myriad stakeholders, as well as reporting and compliance demands. How do you handle these requests? How do you ensure effective follow-up? How do you manage version control for data and reports, including tracking and management of frozen files? How do you use metadata, taxonomies, and folksonomies to enable efficient retrieval of documents and information? How do you enable the retention and disposal of expired records? What do you do differently for digital vs. physical content? Join us for a conversation about best practices for content management in IR. Bring your ideas, questions, and a willingness to learn.

Presenter(s)

Kashif Imran, Association for Institutional Research

Developing and Implementing an Online Organizer to Assess Learning Outcomes – 1791

Table 6

Technologies

Responsive to the call for transparency in reporting across higher education, this discussion addresses challenges and strategies for developing college-wide online systems for organizing and sharing learning outcomes assessment over time. What are the challenges and opportunities we face when asked to share the results of outcomes assessment in ways that are meaningful within and across institutions? When building design teams across different divisions at our institutions, which strategies have worked best and what can we do to involve faculty members in meaningful ways? How can we understand and strengthen our design and development processes using formative evaluation methods?

Presenter(s)

Laura Blasi, Valencia College

Alex Larzabal, Valencia College

April McGuire, Valencia College

Forecasting Retention with the Online Learning Readiness Assessment – 1802

Table 3

Decision-Support

This discussion addresses, from a non-technical, end-user perspective, how predictive analytics can be used to identify at-risk students for early targeted support as they begin their curricula. What student information (student characteristics, assessments) is collected in the admissions process that may influence student retention and success? How can this information be used for early identification of students at risk of dropping out in order to provide them the support they need? The presenters illustrate how predictive analytics were used at a large open-access online university to identify at-risk students at the beginning of the curriculum. Participants reflect on how similar approaches could be adopted at their institutions and discuss how administrators and student-facing staff could use this approach for early targeted student support.

Presenter(s)

Loraine Devos, Ashford University

Chris Wang, Ashford University

Stephen Nettles, Ashford University



Navigating University Silos: Assessing Advising Across Disciplines – 1831

Table 7

Assessment



This discussion addresses the development of assessment of academic advising across programs and departments within a decentralized university.

This IHE contains a variety advising structures ranging from non-existent to highly engaging and proactive programming. After presenting one institution's challenges and solutions, we address the following questions: (1) What drives student success and academic advising initiatives? (2) How do universities and IR offices embark on assessment of these initiatives at an institutional level, especially in a decentralized institution? (3) What are best practices in advising and its assessment? (4) How do we educate faculty, administrators, and advisors about the educational roles of advisors, including the fact that advising programs also have the structure of a curriculum with learning outcomes? (5) What are current technologies in place to assist in establishing an institutional culture of assessment?

Presenter(s)

Meredith Dean, Virginia Commonwealth University

Outcomes Assessment in On-Ground, Online, and Multi-Site Environments – 1321

Table 1

Assessment

This discussion addresses the issue of student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment in institutions offering courses in a traditional, on-ground format; in an online, distance education format; and/or in a multi-campus environment. Practices employed for on-ground assessment programs may not apply to other delivery methods, yet data collected across various delivery modalities must provide for comparisons of student learning goals. Accreditation agencies require colleges and universities to demonstrate that differing modalities offer students comparable learning opportunities. Has your institution adapted SLO assessment from one format for use in another? How do we gain compliance from faculty in multiple locations? What technology have you found useful in implementing SLO assessment in multiple locations?

Presenter(s)

Debra Hagen-Foley, Lakeland College

Qualitative Data Analysis, Virtual Analysis Team Workspace, and Grounded Theory – 1808

Table 10

Analysis

How can qualitative interview data be incorporated into institutional research? What existing tools can IR professionals use to facilitate qualitative data analysis? Qualitative data pose unique and technical challenges. Especially for Grounded Theory Analysis, how can themes emerge from large quantities of data? How can existing

campus resources be repurposed to assist in Grounded Theory Analysis? This discussion addresses a qualitative analysis strategy that repurposes the university's Learning Management System's (LMS) MessageBoard as a virtual workspace for the qualitative analysis of interview data. Using this ubiquitous and secure technology for grounded theory analysis facilitates inter-rater reliability and allows for triangulation and involvement of multiple faculty and undergraduate researchers. This discussion will specifically address how inter-rater reliability and triangulation be facilitated through repurposing a message board as a virtual analytical workspace. Action-oriented results from the current iteration of the UCI Assessment Group Interview project highlights the ease of integrating qualitative methods into institution-wide qualitative data analyses.

Presenter(s)

Daniel Flynn, University of California, Irvine

Success of Students Who Place Into and Then Pass Remedial Math and English – 1788

Table 8

Decision-Support

Articles such as "Remedial College Classes Not Working" conclude that remedial courses waste time and money - without leading to student degrees - and are therefore not worthwhile. At UVU, students who placed into remedial-level Math and English had lower graduation rates than their peers. However, students who placed into remedial courses and then completed the courses succeeded at a HIGHER rate than other groups of students (including some who had placed higher in Math and English). In this discussion group, we address: (1) What were the results at UVU? (2) How does this compare with your institutions? (3) What are reasons why this might be the case? (4) How can we improve success of remedial-placed students? (5) What can we do to study this more? This should reveal some important data and help us better inform our institutions about students who place into remedial courses. I am looking forward to further collaboration with researchers from other institutions.

Presenter(s)

Mark Leany, Utah Valley University

Panel Sessions

IR and Data Collection in Decentralized Environments – 1652

Panzacola F4

Operations

Decentralized institutions present specific challenges in data collection: not knowing who holds data needed for a given project; combining data from multiple sources and systems, which may not be compatible; and data on similar topics being categorized, measured, and assessed differently by different offices or units. In addition to these operational



difficulties, there are political aspects to decentralization that can make it hard to carry out the work of institutional research and to effectively disseminate its output. Units may be reluctant to share data with a central office. Units may also be inclined to downplay or even ignore analysis that does not align with their own understanding of the issue at hand. The purpose of this panel is to discuss how IR offices cope with these various aspects of decentralization. Each participating office describes one or more of the specific challenges they face due to decentralization, along with their strategies for addressing them.

Presenter(s)

Shoshannah Cohen, University of Chicago
Karen Zaruba, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
William Greenland, University of Chicago
Lisa Metzger-Mugg, Northwestern University
William Hayward, Northwestern University

It's A Dangerous Business, Stepping Out Your Door: IR and Environmental Scans – 1175

Panzacola F2

Operations

This session features experienced IR professionals discussing their approaches to environmental scanning - keeping up with myriad local, state, regional, and national trends and policy conversations. As the era of accountability approaches its middle years, and institutional research offices are called upon to be increasingly "more", it's essentially for today's IR professionals to keep fingers on the pulses of both internal and external forces influencing our work. Local town-and-gown relations, state performance funding models, regional initiatives to facilitate degree completion, and national calls for increased accountability and transparency are just a few examples of the myriad topics to be discussed.

Presenter(s)

Teri Hinds, Voluntary System of Accountability & APLU
Cate Rowen, Smith College
Shari Ellertson, Boise State University

Moving from Faculty Surveys to Faculty Engagement – 1298

Panzacola F3

Assessment

This session is designed to help IR professionals think about engaging faculty in the process of survey administration and data usage. Providing both local and national perspectives on how survey data can be deployed to understand and support faculty, the session addresses some of the biggest roadblocks and most promising practices for understanding the experiences of faculty and engaging them in the process of sense-making and institutional improvement.

Presenter(s)

R. Todd Benson, COACHE - Harvard University
Tammie Cumming, City University of New York - NYCCT
Allison BrckaLorenz, National Survey of Student Engagement
Paula Maas, The New School

Speaker Sessions

CAIR Best Presentation: Six Stages of Growth for the IR Professional – 1919

Panzacola H4

Operations



The IR profession does have a career path! It has six stages which provide a clear career path for the IR professional. Many analysts in IR offices have a difficult time seeing a career path except one where promotions are solely based on years of experience: If an analyst "sticks around" long enough, he or she could become a director. This simplistic view masks a clear career path for all IR professionals. There are actually six stages of professional growth for the IR professional, beginning with a "data reporter" and culminating in a "visionary." Each stage along the way requires its own set of skills: interpersonal, analytical, and technical. Success in each stage is difficult without first succeeding in the earlier stages. This presentation will discuss each of the six stages and the characteristics and skills needed to succeed at each. In addition, keys for successfully moving through each stage will be presented.

Presenter(s)

Robert Daly, University of California, Riverside

Creating an Interactive Retention and Graduation Dashboard Using MS Excel – 1627

Sebastian I4

Technologies

Many institutions have approached the concept of data automation and reporting through the use of interactive dashboards. In higher education, a dashboard is useful to convey a visual display of information pertaining to retention and graduation rates, and an assortment of demographic filtering options also. In many cases, institutions employ external organizations to develop these dashboards. As a result, there are potential consequences that may be incurred: dashboards can be substantially costly, institutions may have less control over the structure and design of the dashboards, and there may be lack of emphasis on data analysis by the external organizations. In essence, this presentation focuses on designing an interactive dashboard that allows users to monitor the progress of students across multiple cohorts. Additionally, it emphasizes some of the benefits of institutions designing their own dashboards, such as cost-efficiency, accessibility, and flexibility.

Presenter(s)

Danilo Le Sante, Florida International University



Creating and Validating an Entering Student Survey – 1463

Panzacola H3

Decision-Support

Using valid instruments to identify incoming students' risk factors has become a vital step in connecting students to the support they need to attain academic success. This presentation describes the process of creating and validating a new entering student survey designed to identify risk factors for incoming beginners, transfer students, and returning adults within a specific institutional context. This presentation also explains how to deploy information to campus decision makers and academic advisors so that it is used to develop programs, policies, and interventions to meet students' needs and address concerns early.

Presenter(s)

Michele Hansen, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Steven Graunke, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis

Great Jobs and Great Lives: Gallup's National Study on Alumni Outcomes - 2077

Panzacola F1

IR Technologies



The Gallup-Purdue Index examines alumni outcomes on measures that Gallup has refined over decades: workplace engagement and well being. Findings from the first national administration of this survey, with over 30,000 college graduates across the United States indicate student support and mentoring and certain types of experiences were correlated with being engaged in your job and well-being. Broad groupings of institutional type, size, and control revealed no significant differences on these outcomes. This then begs the question, is success after college less a function of where you go, but what you do when you are there?

Presenter(s)

John Pryor, Gallup

Living with Smartphones: Does Completion Device Affect Survey Responses? – 1303

Sebastian I2

Analysis



With the growing reliance on tablets and smartphones for Internet access, understanding the effects of completion device on online survey responses becomes increasing important. This study uses data from the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP), a multi-institution online alumni survey designed to obtain knowledge of arts education, to explore the effects of types of device on responses. The type of devices that respondents use does seem to affect how they respond to the survey. Differences in the characteristics of those using the devices as well as how the devices affect survey completion, time spent responding,

willingness to answer complex and open-ended questions, and lengths of open-ended responses are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Amber Lambert, Indiana University-Bloomington
Angie Miller, Indiana University-Bloomington

Mend the Gap: Squeezing the Success Spread Between F2F and Online Learners – 1319

Wekiwa 7

Decision-Support

In 2010, Lewis and Clark Community College implemented a policy requiring a minimum GPA to enroll in a course offered online. The next year, a mandatory orientation workshop was required before a student could enroll in an online course. Both policies were designed to improve online course success rates, which were 10 percent lower than success rates in face-to-face courses. This data centric presentation will share Lewis and Clark's story with online success rates and the impact of these two policies in narrowing the success gap.

Presenter(s)

Dennis Krieb, Lewis and Clark Community College
Jon Tysse, Lewis and Clark Community College

NCES Initiative to Review the Functionality and Construction of the IPEDS Data Center – 1956

Panzacola H1

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is currently reviewing the functionality of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Data Center and is planning changes to enhance utility and data accessibility. This session highlights recent activities related to this initiative and features discussion about the degree to which the Data Center meets the needs of the IR community. Included are an overview of the review process, an update on findings, examples of potential solutions, and time for feedback from Forum participants.

Presenter(s)

Richard Reeves, National Center for Education Statistics

Predicting Student Success: An Application to Community College Data – 1573

Wekiwa 6

Analysis



Student success at Rio Salado Community College depends on properly identifying high risk students as early as possible. RSCC has incorporated predictive modeling into its internal Learning Management System, Rio Learn platform. Prediction classification rates are clustered in a ten tiles distribution for both development and validation samples. Moreover, a cumulative gains chart illustrates the predictive classifier effectiveness in identifying high risk students for development and validation samples. The model makes predictions at the course level for high enrollment



classes that are part of the GEAR initiative currently being implemented at the college.

Presenter(s)

Fermin Ornelas, Rio Salado Community College
Daniel Huston, Rio Salado College

Sticking with It: Grit and College Student Success – 1281

Sebastian I1

Analysis



Despite decades of efforts to bolster college student retention and persistence, graduation rates remained steady for most of the 20th century. High school grades and standardized tests predict college academic achievement and graduation to some extent, but institutions have also sought additional factors that may be useful in selecting students who are likely to succeed and identifying those who may be most at risk. This study explores the predictive validity of grit, defined as perseverance and passion for long-term goals, that may shape student success in college. We present research findings from three universities (N = 2,436 undergraduates) in which we show that grit consistently predicts college GPA, intent to continue within one's major and planned career, and intent to persist in college.

Presenter(s)

Nicholas Bowman, Bowling Green State University

Strategies to Improve Retention in First Year Online Graduate Courses – 1215

Sebastian L2

Decision-Support

This session focuses on two separate, but related initiatives that were recently piloted as part of an online institution's efforts to improve student progress and retention in the first year. Specifically, term to term retention and measures of student satisfaction and performance in a master's-level program following the implementation of each initiative were assessed. Both pilots involved using media in the classroom to build rapport, help set expectations, and provide resources for success. Findings indicated that while the first pilot did not result in significant improvement in retention, it did result in much higher understanding about the course and perceived impact on overall success. The second pilot resulted in significant improvement in retention, as well as high ratings of satisfaction. This research is important to understanding how to best support and retain first year students.

Presenter(s)

Jim Lenio, Walden University

Student Engagement, Academic Performance, and Persistence – 1219

Panzacola H2

Analysis

A number of studies have proposed that student engagement is associated with positive educational outcomes, such as increasing academic performance and persistence (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between CCSSE benchmark scores and desired academic outcomes in an individual college context, and to identify policies and practices to increase the institutional effectiveness. Regression and logistic regression were used in this study. The results suggested that active and collaborative learning was associated with GPA after controlling students' demographic information. Student effort was related to persistence. Further analysis is needed to test the models using the different student cohorts in our college.

Presenter(s)

Shuqi Wu, Leeward Community College

TAIR Best Presentation – Rethinking Retention: ID Card Data Impacts Student Engagement/Retention – 1161

Wekiwa 9

Decision-Support



UNT is one of a handful of institutions collecting campus-wide swipe data to better inform decision making and assess student outcomes of engagement and retention. Through the card-swipe system's ability to collect empirical evidence, the data can help show the overarching relationships between service usage, persistence, and engagement. In this session, the history of the system, processes of maintaining privacy and securing data, outputs, costs, and challenges are discussed. Findings are provided that pertain to student retention, engagement, and institutional usage of student support services. Data from the past two years collected more than 350K interactions, 300 unique overarching events, and 1100 sub-events. Attendees can explore whether or not this approach would work on their own campuses and will leave with strategies to expand IR's role in retention modeling utilizing direct evidence.

Presenter(s)

Jason Simon, University of North Texas
Pu-Shih Chen, University of North Texas
Amanda Moske, University of North Texas
Ah Ra Cho, University of North Texas

The Connection Between Unemployment and Graduation Rates – 1429

Sebastian L4

Analysis

With the advent of the Great Recession of 2007-2009, states and the federal government adopted or plan to adopt outcomes based performance funding models. The central idea lays in providing funding to institutions of higher education contingent on the achievement of certain outcomes, such as graduation rates. This study examines the relationship between the variations in the national unemployment rate (UR) and graduation rates. Studies testing the existence of the relationship between UR and graduation rates are notably absent from the literature. Therefore, the study advances the field of higher education as it relates to macroeconomic indicators and graduation rates. The main objective of the session is to shed light on the relationship between the national UR and its relationship with graduation rates. Additionally, the study emphasizes that this relationship impacts students with different characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity) in various ways.

Presenter(s)

Diana Barbu, State University System of Florida
David Tandberg, Florida State University

The Updated NSSE: Exchanging Ideas and Examples of Data Use – 1943

Wekiwa 4

Analysis

SPONSOR NSSE recently launched an updated survey and redesigned reports. This session provides an opportunity to highlight innovative uses of student engagement results and for participants and NSSE staff to exchange ideas about the survey project and new reports. Current and new users are encouraged to attend and share ideas!

Presenter(s)

Jillian Kinzie, Indiana University-Bloomington
Robert Gonyea, Indiana University-Bloomington

U.S. News Best Colleges: Inside Look at Last Year and the Upcoming Rankings – 1128

Sebastian I3

Assessment

The session reviews the methodology changes made in the 2014 edition of the Best Colleges rankings (published in September 2013). We explain how and why U.S. News made the various methodology changes, including placing more emphasis on outcomes and less emphasis on inputs, and expanding the use of the graduation rate performance indicator to include all schools. We discuss how we handled data misreporting by colleges, new ideas being considered for the upcoming 2015 edition of the Best Colleges rankings, and provide status updates on some of the other rankings being published, including Best High Schools, Best Online

Programs, and Best Graduate Schools. We talk about Academic Insights, a data analysis tool geared toward institutions and the institutional research community that uses U.S. News historical data. We explain how and why we give back to the institutional research community.

Presenter(s)

Robert Morse, U.S. News & World Report
Samuel Flanigan, U.S. News & World Report
Diane Tolis, U.S. News & World Report
Eric Brooks, U.S. News & World Report

Unlock Hidden Themes in Your Qualitative Data – 1877

Wekiwa 5

Technologies

SPONSOR In the age of online course evaluations and surveys, more and more qualitative data is being collected. With the advent of online course evaluations, the labor intensive collection and analysis of feedback became more efficient, yet the interpretation of text data remained unused to its full potential. With the use of text analytics, higher education now has a powerful tool at their disposal to take a holistic approach to unlocking themes and identify relationships in their qualitative data. Users now have the ability to mine a massive archive of feedback inputs, gathered from over 200 institutions and organizations. eXplorance and partner, Provalis Research, have been able to compile a robust dictionary that has become the foundation through which important information can be gleaned from a wealth of industry specific data. This technique provides an explosion of data points that is made available for analysis, providing the depth and breadth of insights unseen in the industry today.


Presenter(s)

Francois Beneteau, eXplorance

Using Multiple Measures in Course Placement – 1332

Wekiwa 3

Analysis

 Many students do not successfully complete developmental college courses due to debt, loss of time and money, or inaccurate placement into first-year courses. In this study we examine the issue of placement accuracy: How well do placement scores predict course success, and to what extent can predictions be improved by adding HSGPA? This question is addressed for both traditional- and nontraditional-aged students using data for 157,161 students from 157 community colleges and 96 4-year colleges. Prediction accuracy is evaluated for 11 types of first-year courses using 3 validity statistics: logistic R, accuracy rate, and intervention hit rate.

Presenter(s)

Julie Noble, ACT, Inc.

Using Qualitative Research to Understand How, Why, and What Does it Mean? – 1274

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

How do students make decisions that affect their time to graduation? Why do some students utilize retention support programs while others don't? What does academic probation mean from a student's perspective? Institutional researchers often rely on quantitative approaches that can reveal magnitudes, correlations, and trends. But questions about beliefs, behaviors, attitudes, and processes can best be understood through qualitative methods. Focus groups can be an efficient tool for generating this type of information. This session provides detailed steps for planning and facilitating focus groups, as well as tips for analyzing and presenting qualitative data for institutional decision-making.

Presenter(s)

Tekla Nicholas, Florida International University

12:15 PM–01:45 PM

Special Event

Lunch Break and Poster Presentations (Wednesday)

Exhibit Hall (Sebastian J/K)

A dedicated lunch break is co-located with the Poster Presentations. Special menu pricing will be offered for lunch in all Rosen Shingle Creek hotel outlets at \$13; cash carts in common areas will offer a sandwich, chips, and a drink for \$13.

12:45 PM–01:45 PM

Poster Gallery Q&A

The Poster Gallery Q&A for even numbered posters is Thursday 12:45-1:45 p.m.

15 to Finish: Towards a New Normal for Full-Time Enrollment

Poster 33

Decision-Support

The "15 to Finish" media campaign promotes a 15-hour credit load to finish on-time in four years. This poster presentation describes the analytical study conducted to provide a solid foundation for the campaign. Results of the media campaign are assessed by comparing cohorts of first-time freshmen from before and after the campaign. On-going efforts include

the development of a logistic model and decision tree to identify indicators of student success. Viewers will see videos from the campaign and learn about how a similar analysis could be replicated at their institutions.

Presenter(s)

David Mongold, University of Hawaii System

A Missing Data Imputation Approach to Predict Student Retention

Poster 11

Analysis

Student retention is an important issue in higher education. How to accurately identify students at-risk is challenging for institutional researchers. The general approach is to use existing data for students with retention outcomes (i.e., labeled cases) as training data to build a statistical model for predicting whether students will stay in school. Next, this model is applied to the new data for freshmen without the retention outcome (i.e., unlabeled cases). The current study suggests using both unlabeled and labeled students simultaneously to predict more accurate retention results. The comparison of the two approaches (conventional regression-based and the new missing data imputation methods) are illustrated using real student retention data from a comprehensive university.

Presenter(s)

Min Liu, University of Hawaii

Xitao Fan, University of Macau, China

ADHD, Creativity, and Persistence in College

Poster 29

Analysis

This presentation focuses on students who self-identify as ADHD and what this predicts about their other characteristics, including creativity and retention patterns. Eckerd College attracts a much higher percentage of ADHD students than the national average. The IR office discovered patterns in survey data and have worked with a psychology faculty member to understand them. The study's findings will be useful in identifying risk factors, protective factors, and opportunities for targeted intervention for students with ADHD who may face learning challenges as a result of their disorder. Our presentation showcases our prediction model that allowed us to focus on the ADHD flag in the Freshman Survey in the context of other research in this area.

Presenter(s)

Billy Evers, Eckerd College

Jacqueline MacNeil, Eckerd College

David Eubanks, Eckerd College

Analyzing Data Requests for IR Effectiveness and Planning

Poster 35

Operations

Many institutions use online data request forms very effectively to funnel ad-hoc data requests to the office of institutional research. Once the request is completed, it is most likely discarded or archived. Rarely are these data requests analyzed in aggregate. Analyzing these data can be very informative, ignite productive discussions about workflow and IR effectiveness, and lead to changes to improve the IR office. This is an important discussion because AIR members may be unaware of how these powerful data can be used to improve IR functions on their campuses. Viewers of this poster presentation will (1) have better understandings of the types of questions that can be answered by analyzing their own online data request form data, and (2) walk away with actionable steps they can take if they wish to analyze their own online data request form data in order to learn more about themselves.

Presenter(s)

Marisol Arredondo Samson, Chapman University
Robert Pankey, Chapman University

Connecting the Silos: A Longitudinal Database of Student Success Factors

Poster 9

Decision-Support

Institutional researchers struggle to provide decision-makers with analyses they need to enhance student success. Relying only on cross-sectional data housed in the campus' student information system can limit the usefulness and predictive validity of student success information. Many times, multiple departments across campus house data collected from national surveys of students, general education assessment tests, personality and career inventories, academic intervention results, and community engagement tracking. These rich sources of student success data remain in silos, only to be gathered haphazardly for a pending accreditation review. This poster shares step-by-step procedures to develop a shared longitudinal database of student success data beyond the usual demographic and academic variables. Learn how you can transform your institutional research office into a one-stop resource that supports a coherent, meaningful, campus-wide student success study agenda.

Presenter(s)

Bonnie Jones, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee
Laura Hoffman, University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee

Differences in Minority Enrollment Following Federal Policy Enactments

Poster 37

Analysis

The purpose of this study is to investigate the enrollment patterns of African American and Latino students in comparison to White students before and after the enactment of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act (2007). I use difference in differences estimations to examine the enrollment of both minority groups using an institutional level analysis of four-year public postsecondary institutions. This adds to the field by providing a robust analysis of major federal postsecondary policy. The objectives of the poster presentation are to graphically show the method and provide a concise presentation of the study results.

Presenter(s)

Shavecca Snead, Florida State University

Does Environment Matter? Latino(a) Student Engagement on Different Campuses

Poster 23

Decision-Support

This poster highlights and compares the engagement experiences of Latino(a) students and other racial and ethnic groups at Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and other institutions. We illustrate how engagement differs by academic disciplines, in different institutional settings, and for different groups of students. Analyses include ANOVA and correlations illuminate differences in student engagement that institutions can address through targeted campus efforts. This poster addresses the influence of campus environment on minority student engagement for institutions and the importance for understanding these differences.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Nailos, NSSE, Indiana University
Heather Haeger, National Survey of Student Engagement

Efficiently Recoding Survey Data for Interactive Dashboards

Poster 43

Technologies

Current data display technologies such as Tableau allow analysts to prepare and disseminate survey data across multiple questions and response types. One challenge that must be addressed before migrating data into Tableau is the data file structure. Tableau requires that data be structured one row per answer choice per respondent. This poster instructs viewers how to use programming syntax to restructure data from SPSS into the necessary format. Viewers can utilize Tableau to craft interactive displays for complex survey data.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Ducz, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY
Sam Michalowski, College of Staten Island / CUNY



Enhancing Objectivity in Third-Party Evaluations Used in Higher Education

Poster 7

Analysis

Calls have been issued for the increased use of reliable and valid assessments that extend beyond cognitive ability in higher education student admissions processes to enhance higher education admissions decisions and candidate selection. Non-cognitive measures using third-party evaluations have been proposed as they can be useful in reducing the achievement gap and increasing admittance of ethnic minorities to higher education (Oliveri & Ezzo, in press). Their use introduces an additional source of error or variability: the rater. Various factors may impact raters' abilities to provide accurate assessments of applicants' noncognitive skills. We discuss multilevel factor analysis methods that can be used to increase precision in the interpretation of measures used in admissions based on third-party evaluations.

Presenter(s)

Maria Elena Oliveri, Educational Testing Service

Factors Associated With College Choice By Out-Of-State Students In The Midwest

Poster 13

Reporting

The purpose of this study is to seek factors associated with college choice by out-of-state students in the Midwest. This study hypothesizes that the number of programs, student-faculty ratio, the number of Nobel prize awards, average SAT/ACT scores, campus climate and location, and cost attendance influence students to attend out-of-state colleges because these factors are associated with educational value. The gravity model will be estimated in panel data using OLS. The data will be collected from U.S. News & World Report and IPEDS over the past 10 years. This session can provide ideas about Midwest college choice factors.

Presenter(s)

Teruo Yokoyama, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

Greek Organizations' Views of Intercultural Competency and Engagement

Poster 39

Assessment

As postsecondary institutions focus on internationalization efforts to develop globally competent students, they have engaged in comprehensive institutional policies and programs (e.g., QEP) to foster intercultural competency, especially among various student organizations. This study investigates the perceptions of intercultural interactions and opportunities for fraternity and sorority members at a large, public research intensive university in the Southeastern U.S.

Presenter(s)

Uttam Gualee, University of Florida

Impact of Math Placement on Student Performance in Calculus Course Sequence

Poster 53

Decision-Support

A review of the effectiveness of a math placement procedure is important since it effects all students seeking science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) degrees. This study evaluates the impact of math placement policy based on the scoring of Advanced Placement (AP) AB calculus and BC calculus exams on student calculus performance at a private institution. Using 2,333 undergraduate students who took calculus I, II, or III from 2009 to 2012, this study examines institutional data on student characteristics, AP scores, SAT scores, ACT scores, and calculus performance in last four years. A series of comparisons of regression models were performed as well to see what factors consistently influence student calculus performance.

Presenter(s)

Rita Xiaoyan Liu, Bucknell University
Kevork Horissian, Bucknell University

Investment in Student Feedback: Culture of Student Satisfaction and Success

Poster 45

Decision-Support

Thoughtful investment in student feedback, diverse organizations and unique contexts can yield creative patterns for space design and execution, with lasting impact. This poster highlights Binghamton's culture of space planning in relation to student feedback in unified movement that progressively emanates from students' spatial experiences in order to enhance student satisfaction/success. Economic impact of construction expenditures on local and state economy has also been estimated.

Presenter(s)

Nasrin Fatima, Binghamton University - State University of New York
Couper Gardiner, m.Arch Inc.

Mapping Student Perceptions of the Campus Physical Environment

Poster 51

Decision-Support

Campus physical environments impact student recruitment, retention, and even alumni donations. On many college campuses, however, one part of campus can look very different from other parts. In those cases, do all students see the campus the same way? Or do students' perceptions vary according to where they spend their time? We examined student perceptions of the campus outdoor environment at a large public university and tested for differences according to student "homes" based on student majors or residence halls. Mapping the results illuminated differences across the campus based on buildings and campus zones. The methods, results, and maps that are presented confirm within-campus variability of perceptions about campus environments, demonstrate the utility of GIS in exploring campus survey results, and highlight the potential of using spatial variables to examine the student experience.

Presenter(s)

Linnea Stafford, Kent State University
Thomas Stafford, Kent State University

Modeling Retention in the Major Using All Students Who are Enrolled

Poster 17

Decision-Support

Using the concept of in-migration and out-migration, institutional researchers can model retention in a department's majors that includes all students in the majors, not just those who arrive declaring specific majors and belonging to first-time full-time cohorts. The data can be used to describe the source of the current year's majors as well as the status of last year's majors with comparisons to university data.

Presenter(s)

Marcia Belcheir, Boise State University

Perceived Bias Against Asian American Applicants in College Admissions

Poster 25

Analysis

This study examines the effect of being Asian American on the probability of acceptance into Lehigh at the undergraduate level. The study addresses the concern that there is bias against Asian American applicants at elite institutions. A series of logistic regressions was used to estimate the effect of being Asian American on the probability of acceptance into Lehigh. The findings highlight the importance of including certain measures, particularly those of demonstrated interest, in the regression. When these measures are excluded, the results show a negative and significant effect of being Asian American. When the measures are included, however, the negative effect of being

Asian American is no longer seen. These results highlight the issue of omitted variable bias in regression analysis and also identify the lack of demonstrated interest as a possible hindrance to Asian American applicants in college admissions.

Presenter(s)

Margaret Munley, Lehigh University

Predictors of Graduate Student Borrowing: An Analysis of a National Sample

Poster 27

Analysis

The purpose of this study is to investigate the predictors of educational loan taking practices of graduate students. This study analyzes a nationally representative sample of graduate students enrolled during academic year 2011-2012 (NPSAS: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study) to examine the correlations between students' individual and institutional characteristics and their borrowing practices. This study will be of interest to college administrators as well as higher education researchers who are concerned about graduate student debt burden, time to degree, and graduate student attrition due to financial constraints. Implications for research and practice in graduate education financing and institutional planning are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Lian Niu, Iowa State University

Quantitative Analyses of a Culture of Assessment

Poster 57

Assessment

The importance of measuring a culture of assessment to improve faculty participation in IR activities related to accreditation processes is addressed. The poster is used to describe a novel survey to measure the culture of assessment and present data from case studies. The presenter discusses how the information could be used to increase meaningful faculty involvement.

Presenter(s)

Mary Miller, Baton Rouge Community College

Quantitative Reasoning: If Faculty Emphasize It, Students Will Do It

Poster 61

Assessment

This study explores disciplinary differences in faculty emphasis on quantitative reasoning (QR) activities and how those activities relate to broader skills and abilities faculty want students to develop. We also examine students' use of QR activities and how that relates to their faculty's emphasis. Not surprisingly, faculty in engineering, physical science, and business emphasize QR activities more than their education and arts and humanities counterparts. Interestingly, a similar pattern was revealed when examining students' frequency



of QR activities. When exploring the relationship between over 14,000 faculty and 40,000 students at 121 institutions, a statistically significant, positive relationship was found between students and faculty of the same discipline at the same institution. As one would hope, these findings suggest that what faculty members emphasize in their courses affects the time their students spend on QR activities.

Presenter(s)

Louis Rocconi, Indiana University-Bloomington
Amber Lambert, Indiana University-Bloomington

Revising the HEDS Research Practices Survey

Poster 41

Assessment

The Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium Research Practices Survey is designed to assess information literacy, including students' skills, attitudes, and approaches to using information sources in academic research. HEDS launched the survey in its current form in the Fall of 2008 and revised the survey in 2013 to identify and strengthen the survey's scales, improve the clarity of the items, and update the survey to reflect new library technology and current research practices. The presenters discuss the revision process, challenges encountered, changes to the survey's questions, and key outcomes. A review of this process may help provide ideas and guidance to other researchers revising their survey instruments. The presenters conclude by discussing the implications of the revision.

Presenter(s)

Hannah Spurrison, Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium
Kirsten Skillrud, Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium
Kathleen Wise, Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts
Charles Blaich, Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts and the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium

SI: Who are Most Likely to Participate and Who Would Receive the Maximum Benefits?

Poster 15

Assessment

Supplemental Instruction (SI) has repeatedly been shown to improve students' course grades, retention, and even graduation. However, there is a lack of understanding of the factors that affect SI participation and the factors that moderate SI effects. This study contributes to the current SI research by answering the following questions: (1) what are the factors that affect students' participation in SI? (2) What are the factors that moderate SI effects? (3) How do SI instructors and SI leaders affect students' SI participation and SI effects? The study employs a two-stage modeling approach based on the data of 3,205 students. Participants will learn (1) a statistical approach to address self-selection bias and variations in SI course instructors and SI leaders when evaluating SI participation and SI effects; and (2) the factors affecting SI participation and SI effects, particularly

the factors moderating SI effects and the roles of course instructors and SI leaders.

Presenter(s)

Hongtao Yue, California State University-Fresno

Student Success Predictive Modeling Using Learning Analytics

Poster 19

Decision-Support

Higher education, like business and industry, has amassed massive amounts of data that can be mined to better personalize students' experiences. Using analytic tools to better understand what the data are telling us has come to be known as learning analytics (LA). These technologies empower educators with the abilities to better understand learning experiences and to prepare current and future students for success. Therefore, we propose to develop a learning analytics predictive model to better understand background and motivational patterns of entering freshmen college students. Noel-Levitz student survey data and Rapid Insight Analytics software are featured.

Presenter(s)

Jere Turner, Manchester Community College
Hui-Ling Chen, Saint Anselm College

Template for Analyzing Efficiency and Effectiveness of IR/IE Offices

Poster 1

Operations

Under increasing pressure for accountability and further improvement, the professional role and expectations of IR have been evolving into a "change agent" (Swing, 2009) and "more than just data" (Terkla, 2008). In order to actualize these visions, we created an analytical template to examine the overall efficiency and effectiveness of IR/IE offices. We illustrate the five case studies of public and private, research and teaching, and four- and two-year institutions. The audience will learn how to utilize our analytical template to examine the overall efficiency and effectiveness of their IR/IE offices with office staff and senior administrators.

Presenter(s)

Hirosuke Honda, University of Maine at Augusta
Toshiyuki Shimada, Ibaraki University, Japan
Shigeru Asano, National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE)

The River – An Intriguingly Different Definition of What IR is All About

Poster 21

Reporting

As long as institutional research has existed, the definition of what it actually means has been in the flow. Many of us know about Pat Terenzini's elevator dilemma on sufficiently describing what IR means before the destination level has been reached. This poster presentation introduces you to an intriguingly different but simple definition of what IR is all about—a definition that not only works for one office in one country, but for all offices everywhere. It all starts with a river full of challenges, opportunities and imperfections...

Presenter(s)

Stefan Buettner, University of Tuebingen

The Three-Year Bachelor's Degree Program at Hartwick College

Poster 49

Decision-Support

A small private liberal arts and sciences college in upstate NY took a leadership role in creating an innovative three-year bachelor's degree (3YD) option starting in Fall 2009. It successfully graduated its first class of 3YD students in 2012. This presentation provides an overview of the program, student characteristics, and learning outcomes. The planning process, program rationale, and fundamentals, as well as future challenges, are also unveiled and discussed. The presentation intends to address some common concerns on IR professionals' minds as they contemplate their campuses' responses to the need for similar programs.

Presenter(s)

Minghui Wang, Hartwick College, NY

Transfer Student Experiences and Success at a Liberal Arts College

Poster 59

Decision-Support

Whittier College differs from other institutions in that we have a very high enrollment of Hispanic students. To better serve this population and other diverse groups of students transferring to Whittier College, an ad-hoc committee was convened by the president. The committee collected and disaggregated baseline information on a cohort of transfer students and assessed their progress in the academic pipeline toward graduation. Through data analysis and inquiry activities, the committee identified potential intervention points and developed short- and long-term goals to increase the graduation rates for transfer students. Findings and recommendations were presented to faculty and administrators.

Presenter(s)

Susana Santos, Whittier College

Using a Video Whiteboard to Present Attractive Research Results

Poster 55

Technologies

The LaGuardia Community College IR office has produced several whiteboard videos using VideoScribe software to present research results. Administrators and faculty have found that the videos help them understand the research better, and they appear to be more likely to view the videos than read the reports. This presentation discusses how to get started producing these videos, gives tips to speed learning, and provides helpful do's and don'ts.

Presenter(s)

Nathan Dickmeyer, CUNY LaGuardia Community College
Chunjuan Zhu, LaGuardia Community College/CUNY

Using NSSE to Understand Student Success: A Multiyear Analysis

Poster 31

Decision-Support



NSSE and student academic records are used to advance knowledge on retention, academic performance, and timely graduation. Logistic and linear regressions on student background and pre-college information, financial aid, previous college academic performance, and NSSE responses were conducted to predict academic success defined as: (1) first year fall-to-fall retention and end-of-first-year cumulative GPA, and (2) seniors' progression to graduation. This study confirms evidence presented in the literature showing that earlier academic success and engagement promotes later higher achievement. Nevertheless, pre-college characteristics do not account for all student outcomes in college. For first-year students, engagement is predictive of better performance and higher likelihood of retention. For seniors, higher levels of engagement and lower levels of perceived academic challenge predict shorter time to degree completion and on-time graduation.

Presenter(s)

Stefano Fiorini, Indiana University-Bloomington
Tao Liu, Indiana University Bloomington
Linda Shepard, Indiana University-Bloomington

When Data Surprises You: From NSSE to Focus Groups to Inform Program Review

Poster 47

Assessment

Program review provides an opportunity to assess and evaluate a program and to plan for future growth. This poster presents some surprising results from the NSSE for students in an honors program. These results were used to create two focus groups in order to examine the issue further. Results and preliminary or planned action are also presented. The poster shows how the NSSE results and focus group results informed the change and growth of the Honors Program at Franklin Pierce University.

Presenter(s)

Pamela Jackson, Franklin Pierce University



02:00 PM–02:45 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

A Qualitative and Survey Research Agenda Emerges, Advancing Student Success – 1859

Table 10

Decision-Support

With the ever-increasing call for accountability, IR offices are often relied upon to investigate the student experience. To effectively tackle these requests, a qualitative and survey research agenda designed to gather data for actionable decision-making is needed. This discussion covers how to develop a qualitative and survey research agenda aimed at supporting student success initiatives. Discussion will be structured around the following: What is the process for establishing a research agenda? What are the challenges faced by IR offices? How have internal collaborations enhanced the process? What are some of the outcomes that have emerged from these efforts?

Presenter(s)

Michael Bolen, University of South Florida
Valeria Garcia, University of South Florida
Shabnam Mehra, University of South Florida

Best Practices for Institutional Effectiveness – 1279

Table 2

Assessment

This issue is important to AIR members who are responsible for IE or assessment-related activities. The world of assessment is continuing to change and become more important and more complex. As our world changes, we must change accordingly by staying abreast of best practices and other trends. Further, it is important to share the knowledge that we gain in the our daily work with our colleagues. This forum provides the perfect opportunity for knowledge sharing among colleagues.

Presenter(s)

Kara Larkan-Skinner, Our Lady of the Lake University
Joseph Baumann, Blinn College

Co-Curricular Review Process for Student Support Units – 1232

Table 9

Assessment

This presentation focuses on the creation and implementation of a co-curricular program review process for service units at a large, online institution. We used the Malcolm Baldrige Process as a framework for our newly implemented co-curricular review process. Participants of this discussion will understand the basic components of the Baldrige process and how to use the criteria as a framework for reviews, such

as co-curricular reviews. Participants will discuss how to create and implement a co-curricular review and how to get stakeholder buy-in for the process. Guiding Questions: 1. Are your co-curricular (student support) offices/departments reviewed in some way? If so, how? 2. Is it important to your university/college to review them in a similar manner to the academic programs at your university/college? 3. What are the ways a co-curricular unit can be reviewed to ensure the unit is supporting the university/college vision, mission, and strategic goals? 4. What types of assessments and outcomes can be gathered and analyzed to ensure the co-curricular units are supporting the university/college vision, mission, and strategic goals?

Presenter(s)

Crissie Grove Jameson, Walden University

Does Previous College Experience Matter in Remedial Education Success? – 1818

Table 7

Decision-Support

The discussion addresses: (1) the importance of previous college experience in developmental education success within the parameters of five year longitudinal data sets; (2) the relationship between course taking patterns and developmental education successes within the parameters of different course taking pattern comparisons; and (3) the differences between developmental education and non-developmental education students within the parameters of their success and demographical characteristics.

Presenter(s)

Ozlem Kacira, Pima Community College
Maria Vasilieva, Pima Community College

Graduate Program Review Using National Data Tools – 1828

Table 4

Assessment

This discussion addresses the following questions: (1) What are the evolving IR roles for benchmarking graduate/professional programs? (2) What are the challenging issues and strategies in measuring effectiveness of graduate/professional programs? (3) Which national data tools are considered useful for program review? The discussion is timely given the demands for institutional planning and decision-making concerning graduate/professional programs. Presenters summarize what has been explored at a public research university. Participants are encouraged to share their own experiences as well as their ideas and suggestions.

Presenter(s)

Kyung-Im Noh, University of Connecticut



Ithaka S+R U.S. Faculty Survey: Instructors' Views on Student Research Skills – 1851

Table 8

Analysis

This discussion addresses how instructors engage with issues such as developing students' quantitative reasoning, information literacy, research skills, and critical thinking within the context of findings from the 2012 Ithaka S+R U.S. Faculty Survey. Discussion questions: (1) What do your faculty members see as their roles in support of student learning outcomes, both in terms of research and information literacy skills? (2) Which staff members or campus units are responsible for developing the information literacy and research skills of students? (3) How is that responsibility shared and assessed among a variety of campus units and staff members, including faculty members? (4) What are faculty members' perceptions of student research and information literacy skills, and are those aligned with institutional strategies regarding assessment and learning outcomes?

Presenter(s)

Alisa Rod, Ithaka S+R

Real World Examples of Solutions for Predictive Modeling for Enrollment and Retention – 2072

Table 1

Decision-Support



With enrollment trending downwards for many institutions, predictive modeling can provide a competitive advantage for those looking to address declining enrollment and also help ensure student success through analytic retention strategies. Join us to exchange ideas and share experiences, including several Rapid Insight customer experiences.

Presenter(s)

Chris Major, Rapid Insight, Inc.

The Graduate Experience for IR Professionals – 1205

Table 6

Operations

As demands for data analyses rise in our increasingly data-driven world, IR offices require individuals who are highly educated and skilled. Graduate education is an excellent way to master new technical and analytical skills, increase issues intelligence and contextual intelligence, and receive credentials that may be needed for advancement. This discussion addresses the topic of graduate education for IR professionals including master's, doctoral, and IR certificate programs. Questions for discussion include: (1) What are the differences between types of graduate programs (e.g., master's, doctoral, certificate)? (2) What are the benefits of graduate programs? (3) What are the challenges of graduate studies? (4) What are students' experiences like in

graduate programs? (5) What are the steps to applying and choosing a program?

Presenter(s)

Mark Umbricht, Pennsylvania State University
Justin Ortagus, Pennsylvania State University
Michelle Kiec, Kutztown University

Timing of Enrollment and its Impact on Online Student Success – 1815

Table 3

Decision-Support

Online higher education institutions often provide students with the flexibility of starting their programs immediately at any time of the year. In addition, an increasing number of traditional universities have begun offering online courses. What is the ideal time between registering for a first online class and starting that class? This discussion addresses the benefits and disadvantages of flexible course start dates. The presenters illustrate how the time between admissions and start of the curriculum at a large online university impacted student retention (N = 23,148 undergraduate students). Presenters and participants discuss how institutions should consider flexible course start dates in relation to student retention. The group will reflect on how institutions can use this time to engage students and better prepare them planning for their online learning experiences.

Presenter(s)

Loraine Devos, Ashford University
Amy Garczynski, Ashford University
Stephen Nettles, Ashford University

Using SAS in an Institutional Research Office – 1441

Table 5

Analysis

Statistical Analytical Software (SAS) is a statistical software package used extensively in many statistical fields. Institutional Research at the University of Mississippi Medical Center is committed to providing information of the highest quality that is both timely and easily accessible, and to facilitate and enhance decision-making, strategic planning, and assessment. In order to provide accurate, complete, and easily accessible information to its clients, the IR Department utilizes SAS to fulfill some of its functions. This application has developed a reputation of being powerful and full-featured statistical software that allows the user to manipulate and analyze data in many different ways. It becomes a tool essential for mastering the four data-driven tasks common to virtually any computing application: data access, management, analysis, and presentation.

Presenter(s)

Jamil Ibrahim, University of Mississippi Medical Center



Business Meeting

AIR Annual Business Meeting

Wekiwa 6

The Annual Business Meeting of the Association is scheduled at each year's Forum and all AIR members are invited to attend. The meeting is led by the current Board of Directors and attended by newly elected Board members as well. The Annual Report of the Board of Directors is released at the meeting to provide an overview of Board activities in the previous year. Also included is the official count of membership, election results, and the Board Treasurer's report to the membership about the association's financial position. Current Board members will be present to answer questions and discuss future plans for AIR.

Convener

Sandi Bramblett, AIR President, Georgia Institute of Technology

Speaker Sessions

Assessment and Data Collection in Community Engagement – 1256

Panzacola H2

Assessment

Community engagement at higher education institutions has had a long and rich history, with faculty and students in agreement that “giving back” to one’s community provides not only personal fulfillment, but also enriched learning experiences, opportunities for theory-to-practice models, and improved student engagement. This session describes the assessment practices in community engagement at a private, not-for-profit institution. Samples of assessment tools are reviewed, along with data obtained over the last three years from NSU’s annual Community Affiliates Survey. Data are reviewed from NSU’s annual student, alumni, and employee surveys for the last six years to show perceptions of the impact of community engaged practices on students and faculty. A model is provided for internal assessment efforts with input from community partners for session participants to consider at their home institutions.

Presenter(s)

*Barbara Packer-Muti, Nova Southeastern University
Donald Rudawsky, Nova Southeastern University*

Balancing Financial Aid and Revenue Utilizing a Predictive Enrollment Model – 1109

Sebastian L3

Decision-Support



Using Wingate University (NC) as an example, this session demonstrates how even small institutions with limited IR resources can build predictive enrollment

models that define the relationships between financial aid, recruitment goals, academic profile, student retention, and revenue. Attendants will learn (1) what research is necessary to define the relationships, (2) how the research can be conducted, (3) how to develop a predictive enrollment model based on this research, and (4) how such a model can assist an institution with the ideal financial aid strategy for achieving institutional goals.

Presenter(s)

John Petoskey, Wingate University

Building a Better Attainment Metric: The Student Achievement Measure (SAM) – 1172

Sebastian L4

Reporting

Learn about the Student Achievement Measure (SAM), a collaborative effort by six higher education associations to enhance transparency and to present a more comprehensive measure of student attainment. SAM tracks student movement across institutions to provide a more inclusive picture of undergraduate student progress and completion. SAM is a voluntary alternative to the federal graduation rate, which is limited to tracking the completion of first-time, full-time students at one institution. Through a shared website, institutions across sectors can deliver a more complete picture of student progress along the path to earning a college degree or certificate.

Presenter(s)

*Teri Hinds, Voluntary System of Accountability & APLU
Christine Keller, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges*

Chi Tester: A Tool for Linking Student Learning to Program-Level Outcomes – 1244

Wekiwa 7

Technologies

As accreditation requirements create further pressure for institutions to provide direct evidence of student-level learning, more creative methods are needed to meet the needs of faculty and staff responsible for this process. The Chi Tester Standards Reporting Tool is one such method for aligning student-level learning with programmatic learning outcomes. Specifically, the Chi Tester Standards Reporting Tool allows alignment of specific exam or assignment questions to programmatic outcomes. The tool also allows aggregation and numeric or graphical presentation of student-level results. This session included a demonstration, discussion of strengths and weaknesses, and mention of future directions.

Presenter(s)

Heather Chapman, Weber State University



Disseminating Actionable Results from Survey Research: Tips and Techniques to Design, Implement, and Interpret Meaningful Surveys – 1295

Wekiwa 5

Analysis

Surveys are used to collect information on a variety of topics, including student, employer, and employee satisfaction; course evaluations; interest in new programs or services; and factors in students' decisions to enroll or remain enrolled. Incorrectly designed, implemented, or interpreted surveys could result in dissatisfied stakeholders, incorrect decisions, and misuse of institutional resources. Conducting meaningful surveys requires more than the ability to ask questions. Researchers need the ability to identify when a survey is appropriate, an understanding of factors to consider in defining the survey approach, and means of increasing validity of findings. This presentation provides participants with an understanding of considerations in order for surveys to provide actionable information, including the importance of survey question types, wording and ordering, length, respondent and method selection, analysis, and reporting. Bring your survey, data, and questions for direct and immediate benefit.

Presenter(s)

Debra Hagen-Foley, Lakeland College

Evaluability Assessment: A Tool for Successful Program Evaluations – 1452

Sebastian I2

Assessment

The purpose of this session is to introduce institutional researchers and program evaluators to the process of an evaluability assessment and its role in completing successful program evaluations. An evaluability assessment is an efficient and systematic process to assess a program's feasibility and to determine whether a full-scale program evaluation would be beneficial. A previously conducted evaluability assessment on a program at a four-year public institution is presented as a case study that highlights the merits of utilizing an evaluability assessment and the steps necessary to complete it successfully.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Cortes, University of Florida

Exploring the Student Experience in an Online Research Community – 1867

Wekiwa 4

Technologies



Retention and recruitment are key issues for post-secondary institutions. However, they are complex and nuanced, making them difficult to explore fully with traditional research methods such as student surveys or focus groups. Using an online research community, Insightrix Research began a dialogue with students in order to better understand their experiences at Canadian institutions and thoughts on a number of subjects: their expectations of the institution they were attending, any issues they felt were not being addressed by their school, and difficulties that could cause them to leave their program or institution. The unique methodology used allowed an intensive, in-depth exploration of these topics. We also dug deeper in an attempt to get at their thought process before they chose their institution, exploring who was influential in their decision, the admission process itself, and the effect of the various institutions' communication efforts both before and after admission.

Presenter(s)

Briana Brownell, Insightrix Research Inc.

Following Up On University “Leavers”: Attrition and Degree Attainment – 1308

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

While there is no shortage of scholarship on student retention and attrition, much less attention has been paid to the “leavers,” including where they go when they leave and whether or not they eventually earn post-secondary degrees. The purpose of this study is to better understand the academic outcomes of students who leave a state university in Florida. The findings of this research have implications for researchers looking to track students over time and across institutions and for higher education administrators looking to develop programs to advance more at-risk students to successful completion of post-secondary degrees.

Presenter(s)

Kathy Padgett, State University System of Florida

Identifying Research Strengths through Bibliometric Analysis – 1578

Panzacola F4

Technologies

Bibliometric analysis is an important part of research evaluation. This session provides an overview of how bibliometric analysis was used to support a university's hiring and investment plans. Using the Global Research Benchmarking System and Scopus data, techniques to identify strength areas and collaboration patterns using Tableau, Circos, and NodeXL are discussed and demonstrated. The resulting graphics take a large volume of



data and create visualizations that are easy to understand and highlight relative strengths and collaborations patterns.

Presenter(s)

Rachel Link, University at Buffalo
Craig Abbey, University at Buffalo

Institutional Research: From Data Gatherers to Knowledge Generators – 1950

Wekiwa 3

Technologies



Institutional Research offices are often reactive, spending much of their time gathering data to satisfy internal requests and comply with state/federal requirements. To use data effectively on campus, however, requires IR to take a more proactive role, turning data into information. In this presentation, we provide specific examples of how IR staff at several colleges have made the leap from data gatherers to knowledge generators, highlighting best practices and lessons learned along the way.

Presenter(s)

Natalie Kistner, ZogoTech
Michael Taft, ZogoTech

Leveraging Social Networks for Multicultural Student Engagement and Success – 1426

Panzacola H3

Decision-Support

Social network analysis (SNA) is a theoretical and methodological approach that focuses on the connections between people, groups, and organizations. Through SNA data collection and analysis techniques, researchers mapped and measured the connections that students establish with their institutional agents on campus. SNA allowed us to explore and further measure the quantity and quality of the connections through students' structures of relationships to better inform decision-making process at the administrative level. In this session, the analysts demonstrate how SNA can be used to conduct assessment and research projects.

Presenter(s)

Aurelia Kollasch, Iowa State University
Sylvester Gaskin, Iowa State University

Low-Income Students and Future Alumni Involvement: Is there a Relationship? – 1262

Sebastian 14

Decision-Support



"No-loan" policies have been used by selective colleges and universities to increase the enrollment of low-income students in the past decade. Existing research is both limited and mixed regarding whether low-income students adversely impact alumni giving. Using data from administrative databases at a single institution, this study focused on three alumni outcomes: volunteering, donating, and donation amount over a ten-year period, and included sub-sample analyses before and after a "no-loans"

policy was instituted. The objective of this session is to discuss the data collection process and the main findings to illustrate how institutional researchers can support data-informed decision making pertaining to institution-specific initiatives. This study also has important implications regarding the role of alumni involvement as another set of outcome measures for college students.

Presenter(s)

Jerold Laguilles, Springfield College

MacGyvering a Dashboard in the Absence of a Data Warehouse – 1243

Panzacola F1

Technologies

As Virginia Commonwealth University embarked on a new strategic plan in 2012, the need for readily available information on university performance measures increased rapidly, while the resources to render and deliver the information remained constant. The Board of Visitors and the university's executive leadership wanted data visualizations that succinctly told the story of how the university was doing over time, against stated goals, and compared to peer institutions. Lacking the time and resources to build a data warehouse, how can a decision support/institutional research office use what's available to get good information quickly into the hands of university's executive leadership?

Presenter(s)

Gokhan Yucel, Virginia Commonwealth University

Multiple Levers, Multiple Settings – 1929

Panzacola F3

Decision-Support

Over the last thirty years, there have been historic increases in enrollment in higher education. However, disparities in college access persist among students from traditionally underrepresented college-going populations and their more privileged peers. Existing studies suggest that students accumulate information and support from various sources across their multiple environments. I seek to expand the understanding of how students tap into cumulative networks to navigate the complex college access process. This study creates a more complex understanding of the student experience and identifies remaining institutional gaps that contribute to the continuing disparities in college access.

Presenter(s)

Bernadette Doykos, Vanderbilt University



Non-Academic Program Review at a Community College: Methods and Practices – 1412

Sebastian I1

Assessment

Ensuring institutional effectiveness goes beyond what takes place in the classroom. Assessing the efficacy of a college's academic programs is one aspect of institutional effectiveness; assessing the efficacy of non-academic programs is the other. Non-Academic Program Review (non-APR) is a process for assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of a college's programs, offices, and/or initiatives that may not specifically be academic in nature. Participants in this session will gain a deeper understanding of how non-APR, when conducted alongside APR, helps a college build a solid foundation for deriving insights for institutional renewal and resource allocation and planning.

Presenter(s)

Dereck Norville, Hostos Community College - CUNY
Richard Gampert, Hostos Community College - CUNY
Lily Rozaklis, Hostos Community College - CUNY

Online Course Evaluations: How to Achieve an 82% Response Rate – 1727

Panzacola H4

Decision-Support

A decline in response rate is a huge concern for the IR community. Learning how to get your audience's attention can be extremely challenging and frustrating. In an effort to improve our response rate, California Baptist University changed the look and feel of course evaluations by going completely online and making it a simple process for the instructor and student. This session includes examples of how we got faculty buy in, implemented online course evaluations in class, and how we got a response rate of 82% by spending \$10 on marketing and nothing on small incentives.

Presenter(s)

Kendra Johnson, California Baptist University

Taking CCSSE to Ground Level to Guide Actions: A Transformative Tale – 1371

Sebastian L2

Assessment

Using CCSSE or other nationally-normed surveys is a common practice in most colleges and universities, though taking the measurement to the classroom level to gauge effects of actions may not be as commonplace. Texarkana College, an Achieving the Dream Leader College, did just that. TC used the overall CCSSE results to understand a critical gap in students' active and collaborative learning. TC extensively trained faculty to use more active and cooperative teaching techniques in classrooms and to measure the impact of these practices, and used locally-developed surveys that included questions based on CCSSE items. In this session we share how this worked and also how the

faculty collaborated in the process and used the results to make further improvements.

Presenter(s)

Jan Lyddon, Organizational Effectiveness Consultants
Jamie Ashby, Texarkana College

Triangulating Data for Enrollment Management – 1665

Sebastian I3

Decision-Support

Do you have a valid predictive model of enrollment trends at your institution? We don't either, but we have learned a lot from our surveys of applicants who were admitted but did not enroll, combined with data from institutional sources and the National Student Clearinghouse. We share some examples of our analyses of non-enrolled applicants and non-returning students, using readily available tools such as SPSS and MS-MapPoint. We hope you will leave with ideas for approaches and techniques you can use at your own institution, along with our contact information for when you find the perfect predictors!

Presenter(s)

Patricia Gregg, Georgia Perimeter College
Erin Cobbett, Georgia Perimeter College

Using Event History Analysis to Understand Transfer Student Success – 1534

Panzacola F2

Analysis

This study uses event history analyses to study factors associated with community college transfer student persistence within the University of North Carolina System. We seek to fill gaps in the literature on community college transfer students by exploring how time-varying (e.g., financial aid packages, credits accumulated) and time-invariant (e.g., race, gender, pre-transfer performance) factors affect persistence at baccalaureate institutions. Session participants will gain a clear understanding of how to apply event history analysis to institutional data and the factors associated with the pathway to the baccalaureate for community college transfer students.

Presenter(s)

Paul Umbach, North Carolina State University
Jeremy Tuchmayer, North Carolina State University
Renee Clark, North Carolina State University
Ashley Clayton, North Carolina State University

Who Wants to Finish in 4? A Cluster Analysis of Retention Program Reach – 1691

Panzacola H1

Decision-Support

Finish in 4, a new retention initiative of the University at Buffalo, provides an institutional commitment of resources and guidance to help undergraduates complete the bachelor's degree in four years. What is the appropriate reach



of such a program? This presentation describes a cluster analytic approach to identifying students who are more likely to pledge the Finish in 4 program and to evaluating which of these students are more likely to succeed when armed with the program's resources. Adding this approach to descriptive program assessments can provide rich context for discussions of program success and planned growth.

Presenter(s)

Lauren Young, University at Buffalo

03:00 PM–03:45 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Can You Hear Me Now? Approaches to Transparent Online Communication – 1810

Table 3

Operations

This discussion addresses how to determine if your current online communication efforts are effective and transparent by exploring the following questions: How are decisions made regarding the presentation and organization of assessment data online? Are your intended audiences able to access and use assessment data? How do you know? How do you overcome barriers to transparent communication of assessment results online? How can approaches such as analytics and usability testing be leveraged to enhance online communication?

Presenter(s)

Robert Dumas, University of Illinois

Degree Completions Report and Benchmarking Your Data using StudentTracker – 2068

Table 5

Decision-Support

SPONSOR

We will provide an overview of the most recent national reports published by the Clearinghouse, including our Signature Report on Degree

Completions, with a special emphasis on using Clearinghouse reports for your own benchmarking purposes. We will also provide an overview of the data elements currently available through StudentTracker, and will discuss the analytical resources that the Research Center has recently added to the "Working with our Data" page of the Research Center website. Topics covered in these resources include the frequency of FERPA directory information blocks, detailed coverage statistics by state and institutional sector, lookup tables for imputation of CIP codes and degree levels, and the frequency with which institutions are reporting the optional "A2" data elements. Discussion will also include user feedback on the StudentTracker detail file, and examples of

how StudentTracker data can be applied to answer various research questions.

Presenter(s)

Jason DeWitt, National Student Clearinghouse

Field of Study and Labor Market Outcomes of STEM Doctoral Recipients – 1807

Table 1

Analysis

This small group discussion addresses the following questions relevant to research, policy, and practice in higher education and the preparation of workforce in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Considering the significant investment by individuals and society in preparing STEM doctoral recipients, how important it is for them to experience continuous and focused educational and career pathways? Based on your research and institutional practice, do you think there are differences in these pathways by gender, race/ethnicity, and immigrant status, and why? Should universities conduct systematic data collection on the labor market outcomes of STEM doctoral recipients to better understand various aspects related to return on educational investment (e.g., earnings, job-education matching, occupational attainment, career growth, job satisfaction)? Is this important, and if so, for whom?

Presenter(s)

Throy Campbell, University of Texas at Arlington

Renewable Energy: Motivating IR Personnel in Difficult Financial Times – 1323

Table 4

Operations

This discussion addresses barriers to and motivational strategies for IR workplace performance. Three primary questions will be discussed: (1) What motivational barriers do IR staff experience as workload increases and compensation stagnates? (2) What strategies have been and will be effectively employed to overcome these barriers? (3) What organizational and intrinsic resources are needed to renew IR energy and motivation to assist the institution in achieving its goals?

Presenter(s)

Mary Millikin, Rogers State University

Toward National Standards for Career Outcomes Data Collection/Reporting – 2031

Table 2

Reporting



Institutional accountability for college student career outcomes is currently a top priority from the kitchen table, to the Chancellor's office, to the White House.

Students and their parents are scrutinizing the return on investment in higher education and want reliable and comparable data to inform their decision-making regarding degree paths and schools. National standards for career outcomes data collection and reporting do not currently exist. Join this discussion to explore current federal, state and local initiatives around career outcomes data collection/reporting standards and consider the scope and purpose of national standards and the role of institutional research in outcomes data collection and reporting.

Presenter(s)

Matthew Berndt, CSO Research, Inc.
Max Wartel, CSO Research, Inc.

Panel Sessions

Streamlining External Reporting: Comparing College and Third-party Approaches – 1520

Panzacola F4

Reporting

IR offices need immediate solutions to streamline reporting to external entities. In the first part of the panel, IR staff from three very different colleges share a common process by which they streamline data collection, management, and reporting for external entities. In the second, the founder of a free education search site describes innovative use of the web and crowdsourcing to create a common data library to fulfill collection, reporting, and analytic goals. The last part opens the dialogue between panel members and the audience to evaluate the streamlining solutions presented, and to discuss the pros and cons of each method and ways that they can be improved to maximize individual institution's usability.

Presenter(s)

Sam Michalowski, College of Staten Island / CUNY
Erin Bailey, Holy Family University
John Katzman, The Noodle Companies, LLC
Heather Roscoe, Northeastern University
Heather Kelly, University of Delaware

Using Survey Data to Support Assessment and Curriculum Planning – 1460

Panzacola F2

Assessment

This presentation offers perspectives from several campuses on the effective use of survey data to support assessment of student learning outcomes and curriculum planning. Each

institution has made use of a common instrument, the Global Perspective Inventory, for several years and offers insights on how to translate the results of a national survey such as the GPI into recommendations for curricular change. In addition, examples are provided on how to combine data from multiple national surveys such as the GPI and NSSE to yield information that goes beyond what any one instrument can provide in isolation.

Presenter(s)

James Kulich, Elmhurst College
Yanli Ma, Elmhurst College
Susan Ikenberry, Guilford College
Larry Braskamp, Global Perspective Institute Inc.

Speaker Sessions

Achieving Transparency in Program Review through Electronic Exhibit Rooms – 1464

Sebastian L2

Assessment

There has been a fundamental shift in the conceptual framework for program review. Higher education and its accreditors have moved from a traditional input-based model to an outcomes-based model; from description and advocacy to evidence-based analyses and planning; from audit to collective inquiry and reflection; from conducting an effective program review to using the results effectively. And, of course, there is heightened attention to improve the quality of student learning. Facing the need to engage faculty and provide programs, reviewers, and accreditors with program review findings, Fresno Pacific University created sophisticated electronic exhibit rooms to disseminate data and increase transparency. This session demonstrates how exhibit rooms successfully facilitate the reporting of program review data, programmatic student learning outcomes achievement, and assessment.

Presenter(s)

Joanne Weiss, Fresno Pacific University

Bringing Course Evaluations Back into the Classroom Using Mobile Devices – 1625

Sebastian L3

Assessment

Georgia Gwinnett College has added a new option for course evaluation completion that allows students to complete course evaluations on their mobile devices. This capability has the potential to allow almost all students to complete course evaluations in class and all at the same time. This provides the ease and immediacy of paper evaluations with the efficiency and accuracy of online evaluations. Response rate data collected prior to the implementation of this new methodology are compared with the most recent data from the mobile device completion trials. Discussion includes the development of this plan, informing faculty and getting



them on-board with the new process, implementing this process in the classroom, and the results of the comparison of the response rates of the electronic versus mobile course evaluation cohorts.

Presenter(s)

Austen Krill, Georgia Gwinnett College

Building a Mountain of Evidence: Informing Strategy for Success – 1568

Sebastian I2

Decision-Support

This session focuses on how one university's institutional effectiveness department was built from the ground up since its creation in 2009. Despite its relative lack of history, a wide array of enrollment and student success data have been accumulated that serve as the basis for benchmarking and trend-line analyses. Also since its inception, the department has been a key player in helping to shape and guide the university's shift in philosophy and culture toward a "culture of success."

Presenter(s)

Paul Rusinko, Columbus State Community College

Kris Coble, Franklin University

Closing the Gap for First Generation, Underrepresented Minority Students – 1583

Wekiwa 6

Analysis

With the recent emphasis on improving national college completion rates, there is a need to examine the completion of first generation (FGS) and underrepresented minority students (URM). In this study, using longitudinal data provided by CIRP and National Student Clearinghouse, the presenters examine institutional characteristics that facilitate student success for these specific populations. Furthermore, the presentation provides examples of best practices by highlighting institutions that are successfully retaining and graduating FGS and URM students at better than expected rates, using input-adjusted data. Implications for practice are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Abigail Bates, University of California, Los Angeles

Theresa Stewart, University of California, Los Angeles

Joseph Ramirez, University of California, Los Angeles

Sylvia Hurtado, University of California, Los Angeles

Adriana Ruiz Alvarado, University of California, Los Angeles

Communicating Student Success: Using Data for Planning and Improvement – 1088

Sebastian I1

Assessment

Harper College developed a Student Success Report to support the College's strategic plan and Achieving the Dream (AtD) student success initiatives. The report provides the college community with actionable data for planning

interventions and improving student success. Using a variety of sources (i.e., AtD, IPEDS), the report provides both visual and narrative representations organized around four key categories: entering students, successful progression, completion and transfer, and workforce and employment. These categories are analyzed at the aggregate level by several measures and are disaggregated by selected target demographics. We present the processes, data, feedback, and communication strategies we employed when developing and sharing the Student Success Report, with a goal of helping attendees consider how a similar report might be developed and shared at other institutions.

Presenter(s)

Darlene Schlenbecker, Harper College

Katherine Coy, Harper College

Joseph Maxon, Harper College

Community College Benchmarks in Planning, Accreditation, and Improvement – 1191

Sebastian I4

Reporting

Accessible, comparative data for making decisions about staffing and programming, and for accreditation documentation, are critically important. This session includes an overview of two important tools for community college decision-making and benchmarking: the Cost and Productivity Project and the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP).

Presenter(s)

Patrick Rossol-Allison, Johnson County Community College

Michelle Taylor, National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute

Lou Guthrie, Johnson County Community College

NILOA's Provost Survey on Assessment Practices: Implications for IR – 1516

Panzacola H1

Assessment

The National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) second national survey of provosts conducted in 2013 revealed fresh insights into the state of assessment practices and student learning outcomes work at two- and four-year colleges and universities. This session highlights key findings about campus assessment activities, including institutional support for assessment and how learning outcomes results are being used (or not) to inform institutional improvement efforts. Results and discussion will emphasize implications for institutional research and consider the organization of assessment functions on campus.

Presenter(s)

Jillian Kinzie, Indiana University-Bloomington

Natasha Jankowski, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

PNAIRP Best Presentation: Marketing Your Surveys to Improve Response Rates – 1917

Wekiwa 4

Analysis



The decline in survey response rates is an increasing concern in IR. In an over-stimulated world, getting the attention of intended audiences is particularly challenging. This session addresses the application of traditional marketing techniques to IR, including studying your target population, conducting A-B tests to measure the effectiveness of your approach, and developing persuasive messaging that influences human behavior. The presenter has more than 12 years of higher ed marketing experience and enjoys applying this expertise to her work in IR.

Presenter(s)

Erin Aselas, Bastyr University

Predictive Analytics: A New Tool for Student Retention – 1701

Sebastian L1

Analysis

Predictive analytics is a recent import from computer science, and one that differs from the statistical methods of social science most familiar to IR practitioners. This session explains and demonstrates the development and use of predictive models for student success by the Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) Framework. We present a model of the second-year retention of associate-seeking students with predictors, risk scores, attribute importance, and measures of model performance, such as sensitivity, specificity, precision, false discovery rates, and lift curves. Additionally, we will examine how model performance varies as different measures of retention are selected as target outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Heidi Hiemstra, Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework (PAR)
Jeff Grant, PAR Framework
Cody Davidson, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education

Promising Practices and Student Engagement at Community Colleges – 1432

Panzacola H3

Analysis

This study presents an in-depth analysis of the relationship between promising practices and student engagement, extending the results from the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) 2013 “A Matter of Degrees: Engaging Practices, Engaging Students” national report. The analyses presented in the national report utilize data from the 2012 administration of CCSSE and the Survey of Entering Students (SENSE). The current study includes data from the 2013 administration of these surveys and uses multilevel modeling to account for the nested nature of the survey data.

Presenter(s)

E. Michael Bohlig, CCCSE, UT-Austin, College of Education

Seeing is Believing: How Institutional Data Comes to Life with Visual Analytics – 1910

Panzacola F1

Technologies



Your institution faces stiff competition. Other colleges and universities are vying for the best students to enroll and graduate. Knowing which students truly fit with your institution's criteria and will be most likely to graduate can be hard questions to answer. Wouldn't it be nice to have a crystal ball? Data visualization will get you close and at a blistering speed. Best yet, it's for everyone. This presentation will give you a sneak peak of SAS® Visual Analytics so you can see institutional data like never before. Questions that might have taken weeks to answer will now take seconds. You'll get the picture – and fast without burdening IT. And you'll have access to self-service reporting with on the fly hierarchy creation so you can drill down to answer your most pressing questions. Seeing is believing. You'll have to join us to experience it for yourself.

Presenter(s)

Philipp Busby, SAS Institute

The Behavioral Typology of First-Time Students in Three Community Colleges – 1450

Wekiwa 5

Decision-Support

This study focuses on the application of Bahr's cluster analysis of the behavioral typology of first-time community college students at three community colleges in California by combining the students' course-taking patterns with detailed institutional-level data and limiting the tracking of students' progress within two years of initial enrollment so that early intervention is possible for the students on different pathways. Attendees will learn how cluster analysis can be applied to their work in an easy-to-use manner and also be informed of the policy application for conducting this much-needed study at the college level.

Presenter(s)

Lu Liu, University of La Verne
Dustin Tamashiro, Pasadena City College
Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Mt. San Antonio College

The Dean of Information: An IR Theoretical Framework for the Profession – 1502

Sebastian I3

Operations

This paper focuses on the institutional researcher as an institutional leader, over and above providing traditional reporting and support. IR practitioners hold authority over the institution's data. The author combines effective leadership theory with the Theory of Planned Behavior and agile management theory to produce a framework for IR leadership. This framework should help the IR professional be more than a data custodian. It should help the IR professional



adopt both a transformative and facilitative leadership stance as needed in order to help the institution reach its goals.

Presenter(s)

Hansel Burley, Texas Tech University

The Effects of Institutional and Cohort Characteristics on Retention Rates – 1105

Panzacola H4

Analysis

Retention and graduation rates are an important part of college-search web sites and accountability systems. They have also been used as indicators of institutional quality and effectiveness in numerous studies. Retention and graduation rates are most useful when compared over time and across institutions. However, these comparisons can be confounded by differences in entering student cohorts and differences among institutions. This research examined the effects of institutional and cohort characteristics on one-year retention rates using random-effect, fixed-effect, and hybrid regression models. The use of fixed-effect and hybrid models allowed researchers to account for omitted variables in the analyses. Results indicated that omitted variable bias was a significant issue and that traditional regression methods may overstate the effects of institutional characteristics on retention rates. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Gary Pike, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis
Steven Graunke, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis

Understanding the Role of First-Year Experiences in College Completion – 1675

Panzacola F3

Analysis

Despite numerous academic studies and policy interventions focused on improving college completion, many colleges and universities suffer from perennially low completion rates. This session is targeted toward participants interested in the first-year experience and first-year programs intended to increase student persistence and degree completion. In this session, presenters highlight findings from a multi-institutional completion study and provide participants with a calculator tool to estimate cohort completion rates based on students' pre-college characteristics and first-year college experiences.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Matthew Case, California State University Chancellor's Office

University of Florida Student Flow Tracking System – 1574

Panzacola H2

Decision-Support

How do you bring together data from multiple sources, cohorts, and years into a comprehensive system to answer strategic and analytic questions quickly? You create a student tracking system! Creating a comprehensive student flow

tracking system has been a goal for many years, but difficult to achieve with disparate data systems around campus, no additional funds to purchase software, and limited staff and time. A goal of one year was set to accomplish building this system. This session shows the difficulties in achieving this system, the ultimate success in producing a tracking system in SAS as well as SQL to query the student flow website, and provides some examples of behind-the-scenes, more in-depth analyses on such topics as STEM retention and graduation rates by college.

Presenter(s)

Noelle Mecoli, University of Florida
Qinglin Pei, University of Florida
Michael Gargano, University of Florida

Visual Analytics to Support Collaborative Organizational Learning – 1572

Sebastian L4

Technologies

During the time of increasing accountability and transparency in higher education, the interest among colleges and universities in analytics has grown. Academic analytics applications are viewed as central solutions for supporting optimization of student success, achieving institutional effectiveness, and contributing to the collaborative organizational learning. This session demonstrates a toolset of online interactive dashboards designed and developed to effectively distribute information and provide opportunities for exploratory data analysis to campus leaders and decision-makers. This analytics solution in a visual form allows such tasks as tracking students' progress towards graduation, identifying at-risk students, and targeting underperforming groups.

Presenter(s)

Dmitri Rogulkin, California State University-Fresno

04:00 PM–05:00 PM

Special Event

Welcome Reception Hosted by AIR Board of Directors

Exhibit Hall (Sebastian J/K)

Join us in the Exhibit Hall for a festive reception featuring entertainment and refreshments. Network with colleagues, meet the AIR Board of Directors and Staff, and visit with our Sponsors to learn how to improve the effectiveness of your office with the newest tools, techniques, software, products, and services.

05:00 PM–06:00 PM

Affiliated Organization Meetings

Association for Institutional Research in the Upper Midwest (AIRUM) – 2016

Wekiwa 4

Members of AIRUM and other interested AIR members are welcome to attend an informal gathering to visit with colleagues, discuss topics of interest, and learn about the upcoming fall 2014 AIRUM annual meeting. AIRUM consists of members from Iowa, Minnesota, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Plan on joining your colleagues for dinner/social hour after the meeting. Convener: Ron Huesman

California Association for Institutional Research (CAIR) – 2010

Wekiwa 3

CAIR business meeting and open forum for issues concerning California higher education. The CAIR 2014 conference will be a topic of discussion. Convener: Bryce Mason, President

Mid-America Association for Institutional Research (MidAIR) – 2021

Wekiwa 7

This informal gathering and networking opportunity is for MidAIR members, prospective members, and other interested colleagues. MidAIR consists of members from Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Oklahoma. We will also have information on the MidAIR annual conference, which will be held Nov. 5-7, 2014 at Holiday Inn, Country Club Plaza in Kansas City, MO. Meet here for dinner group plans with other MidAIR members. Convener: John A. Clayton, President-MidAIR

Northeast Association for Institutional Research (NEAIR) – 2065

Wekiwa 9

NEAIR, the Northeast Association for Institutional Research, is an organization for IR professionals in the northeastern US. All current members and those interested in learning more about the organization are invited to attend. Convener: Laura Uerling and Heather Kelly

Pacific Association for Institutional Research (PacAIR) – 2058

Suwannee 19

Aloha! Join fellow PacAIR members for a brief meeting and “talk-story” time. Anyone interested may attend. We will be gathering a dinner group right after our meeting and you are welcome to join us. Convener: Kathy Pulotu

Pacific North West Association for Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP) – 2020

Wekiwa 6

This casual gathering is open to interested colleagues, prospective members and members alike who would like to network with regional peers and hear the latest from the Pacific Northwest Association of Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP) executive team - including an update on PNAIRP's 35th annual conference being held at the Seattle Sheraton, November 5-7, 2014. This AIR affiliate primarily serves colleagues from Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Idaho, British Columbia and Yukon, however we welcome IR professionals from all regions. An informal group dinner is likely to follow. Convener: Erin Aselas, PNAIRP Vice President

Rocky Mountain Association for Institutional Research (RMAIR) – 2017

Wekiwa 10

Please join fellow RMAIRians at our semi-annual business meeting. We'll update members on progress related to our strategic plan implementation, our 501(c)(3) status, and upcoming RMAIR conferences, as well as elect emeritus members. Following the meeting, we'll head to a local restaurant for dinner. Convener: Ann Murray, President

Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR) – 2018

Wekiwa 5

SAIR members, as well as anyone who works at institutions in the SAIR region (AL, AR, DE, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV) -- are encouraged to attend this meeting to network with colleagues, discuss current activities of the SAIR organization, and learn more about our fall conference in San Destin, FL. Convener: Mary Harrington, SAIR President



Program Highlights: Thursday, May 29

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. | Registration Open, Sebastian Registration |
| 8:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. | Concurrent Sessions |
| 8:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. | Exhibit Hall and AIR Networking Hub Open |
| 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. | Coffee Break, Exhibit Hall, Sebastian J/K |
| 11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. | Panel Sessions |
| 12:15 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. | Lunch Break, Networking, and Poster Presentations, Exhibit Hall, Sebastian J/K |
| 1:15 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. | Dessert Reception, Exhibit Hall, Sebastian J/K |
| 2:00 p.m. – 4:45 p.m. | Concurrent Sessions |
| 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. | Panel Sessions |
| 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. | Affiliated Organization Meetings |
| 5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. | Networking/Find a Dinner Group, Rosen Shingle Creek Transportation Lobby |
| 6:00 p.m. | Dinner Groups |

THURSDAY

7:00AM

8:00AM

9:00AM

10:00AM

11:00AM

12:00PM

1:00PM

2:00PM

3:00PM

4:00PM

5:00PM

6:00PM

7:00PM

Concurrent Sessions

Lunch Break, Networking
& Poster Presentations
in Exhibit Hall

Concurrent Sessions

Networking / Find a Dinner Group

Dinner Groups

Panel Sessions

Panel Sessions

Exhibit Hall
&
AIR Networking
Hub


Dessert in Exhibit Hall

Thursday

Exhibit Hall Floor Plan—Sebastian J/K

Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Academic Analytics, LLC | 114 |
| Campus Labs | 220, 222 |
| CLA+ | 118 |
| College Board | 409 |
| College Survey Services | 417 |
| Concord USA, Inc. | 109, 111 |
| Data | 180 116 |
| Digital Measures | 201, 203, 300, 302 |
| EBI MAP-Works | 100 |
| Ellucian/Nuventive | 510 |
| Engineerica Systems, Inc. | 110 |
| Entigence Corporation | 408 |
| ETS | 401 |
| EvaluationKIT | 112 |
| Evisions, Inc. | 506 |
| ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc. | 413 |
| eXplorance | 208, 210 |
| GradesFirst | 407 |
| Gravic, Inc. — Remark Software | 122 |
| Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) | 415 |
| IASystem — University of Washington | 500 |
| IBM Business Analytics | 420 |
| iDashboards | 120 |
| IData Incorporated | 505 |
| IDEA Education | 507 |
| Incisive Analytics LLC | 419 |
| Information Builders | 422 |
| Insightrix Research | 123 |
| IOTA Solutions | 512 |
| LiveText | 511 |
| National Student Clearinghouse | 102 |
| National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) | 108 |
| Noel-Levitz | 421 |



Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| PACAT | 501 |
| Public Insight | 121 |
| QS Intelligence Unit | 503 |
| Rapid Insight Inc. | 502 |
| SAP Americas, Inc. | 411 |
| SAS | 309, 311 |
| Scantron | 403 |
| SmartEvals (GAP Technologies, Inc.) | 106 |

Company Name Booth Number

| | |
|---|----------|
| Strategic Planning Online | 410 |
| Tableau | 509 |
| Taskstream | 508 |
| The Outcomes Survey powered by CSO Research, Inc. | 423 |
| Thomson Reuters | 104 |
| Tk20 | 405 |
| U.S. News & World Report | 321, 323 |
| ZogoTech | 504 |

08:30 AM–09:15 AM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Assessment Strategies Intended for Success – 1853

Table 5

Assessment

This discussion addresses successful assessment strategies that may be implemented to promote and enhance an institution's annual process. Presenters share throughout the discussion best practices utilized, benefits of assessment and its impact on academic programs, and differentiation of evidence used for measuring student learning outcomes. Moreover, it answers the following questions: How can linking academic programs to the university's mission demonstrate the institution's commitment to improving and examining student learning? What are strategies used to increase assessment practices and strengthen accountability in the campus culture? What are strategies used to enhance the assessment process at the participants' institutions?

Presenter(s)

Tanjula Petty, Alabama State University
Christine Thomas, Alabama State University

Bigger is Not Better: Practical Reasons Surveys Should be Smaller – 1820

Table 10

Analysis

This discussion addresses how the principles of probability and statistics relate to the design of student opinion surveys. Once fully understood, these principles can empower IR professionals to make more informed choices about sampling. In practical terms, this often means being confident in smaller samples. If you are looking for a solution to oversurveying on your campus, this discussion is helpful. Discussion questions include: (1) What decisions or policies at your institution are based on student survey data? (2) How accurate does the data have to be to support your decisions? (3) To what extent does added precision of larger samples allow you to take action or draw conclusions you would not make with smaller samples? (4) What different approaches will you undertake for your campus surveys as a result of this discussion?

Presenter(s)

Andrew Zehner, Purdue University

Challenges of Collecting Post-Graduation First Destination Data – 1616

Table 1

Assessment

Post-graduate success is becoming an increasingly important metric as public discourse focuses on the rising cost of higher education. The recent effort of the Obama administration to

create a "college scorecard" that includes employment data highlights the necessity for colleges to collect accurate and meaningful information about their graduates. Yet there is currently no single definition of post-graduation success and no single way to measure it. As a result, there is variability in "success" measures across (and within) institutions, rendering comparisons meaningless. Guiding questions are: How do you define and report post-graduation first-destination information? Who collects these data? Do you work with other offices on campus? What approaches does your IR office take to gather information on student "first destinations" and other post-graduation data? How have your alumni, university, and/or the public responded to your attempts to collect these data or to how the data are obtained?

Presenter(s)

Lauren Conoscenti, Tufts University
Jessica Sharkness, Tufts University

Creating a Culture of Assessment at a Community College – 1699

Table 6

Assessment

This discussion addresses strategies and challenges in the development of an institutional assessment culture at a community college. Questions: (1) What were the specific conditions on your campuses that you believe were conducive to starting your respective cultures of assessment? (2) What do you find to be the most effective strategies for engaging faculty, staff, and students in assessment? In other words, what specific tools or resources seem to initiate the most buy-in or sense of belonging? (3) Given the limited time and resources that are concerns for most college campuses, how do you approach or respond to negativity or a sense of exhaustion surrounding assessment processes? (4) What future changes or enhancements would you like to make to your assessment processes? What resources would you need to accomplish them?

Presenter(s)

Kate Griffin, Campus Labs
Susi Hamilton, Cascadia Community College
Nixie Hnetkovsky, Illinois Eastern Community Colleges

Developmental Education Students and their Non-Cognitive Skills Gained – 1566

Table 3

Analysis

This discussion addresses developmental education innovation within the community colleges. What do students report regarding their development of non-cognitive skills gained in self-paced developmental math courses? What do students report regarding their development of non-cognitive skills gained in traditional developmental math courses? What do you do to use the findings for curriculum change and to implement support strategies?

Presenter(s)

Qing Mack, Asnuntuck Community College



Do Students Use an Opportunity to Reduce Time in a Remedial Math Program? – 1798

Table 8

Decision-Support

(1) The discussion addresses the question: In what circumstances does the accelerated format of developmental education programs work in community colleges? (2) The discussion addresses the completion time frame – desirable and real – of an accelerated developmental education program in mathematics. (3) The discussion addresses the question why students who completed the accelerated developmental education program perform better in college-level classes than those who completed the traditional developmental education.

Presenter(s)

Maria Vasilieva, Pima Community College
Ozlem Kacira, Pima Community College

Old Dog and New Tricks – Post-IR Career Choices and New Skill Sets – 1449

Table 7

Assessment

There are plenty of choices for IR professionals as they move up the career path in higher education. This group discussion explores these options and examines what kinds of new skill sets, apart from IR skills, one needs to be equipped with in order to advance in his/her career. The discussion focuses on these questions: (1) What are possible career options that capitalize on the skills and experiences acquired doing IR work, and what are the new skill sets these options require? (2) What are the challenges and opportunities for these options, and what are the salary implications? (3) What would be the time to start a post-IR career—while an analyst or director? (4) What are further career options?

Presenter(s)

Chengbo Yin, Rutgers University-Newark

Using Alumni Surveys to Supplement Student Outcomes Data – 1604

Table 4

Assessment

When implemented rigorously, alumni surveys play a key role in the student learning outcomes data collection puzzle. This discussion group explores the role of alumni surveys in the institutional assessment movement, including case studies of the implementation and follow-up to selections of the more than 150 alumni surveys completed by a research company for higher education institutions and best practices at institutions nationwide. The goal of this discussion group is to share information and best practices for the use of alumni surveys to supplement additional student learning outcomes data collection methods. Specific questions to be discussed include: (1) How does your institution use alumni surveys to contribute to student learning outcomes data? (2) Are there other purposes for which your institution uses alumni

surveys? (3) What challenges have you identified to using alumni surveys to supplement additional student learning outcomes data?

Presenter(s)

Amy Moynihan, Hanover Research

Using an Employer Survey to Support Success of Programs or the Institution – 1813

Table 9

Analysis

Participants of the discussion address different approaches in collecting employer contact information, what to include in the instrument, and how the results can be used to strengthen their programs and/or institutions as a whole. A sample employer survey is provided to participants. (1) What are different approaches for collecting employer contact information from students? (2) What should be included in an employer survey? (3) What can you do with the data collected from employers? (4) How can data from employers help improve programs and classroom content? (5) What are the limitations to consider when implementing an employer survey?

Presenter(s)

Laura Ribich, Walden University
Crissie Grove Jameson, Walden University

Speaker Sessions

A Comparison of Labor Market Outcomes of Community College Transfer and Four-Year Native Graduates – 1927

Sebastian L2

Analysis

Pathways to the baccalaureate degree are immense, yet understanding how the choice of postsecondary entry affects post-graduate outcomes is complex and not well understood. This study employs various propensity score matching models to explore how choice of postsecondary entry affects post-graduate wage income. Utilizing the 2008 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study, this paper seeks to fill gaps in the literature on the returns to schooling by examining how post-baccalaureate wage income may differ between community college transfer and four-year native graduates.

Presenter(s)

Jeremy Tuchmayer, North Carolina State University

Against All Odds: A Successful Learning Community for At-Risk Students – 1213

Panzacola H4

Assessment



Learning communities are a high impact activity that can influence students' likelihood for success.

Colorado State University (CSU) created the Key Learning Community (Key), which targets students that have historically lower graduation and retention rates. The majority of Key students are under-represented (first generation, low income, and students of color) and/or students with lower levels of academic preparation. This presentation introduces the structure and purpose of Key and shares the results of an institutional assessment of Key's impact on graduation and retention. Since participation in Key is not randomly assigned, this analysis utilizes propensity score matching to estimate Key's treatment effect. Results show that Key has a positive impact on graduation and retention for all students, but Key is incredibly effective for students who come to CSU with the lowest affinities for success.

Presenter(s)

Heather Novak, Colorado State University

Assessing Assessment: Strategies for Effective Feedback – 1255

Sebastian I2

Assessment

It's time to assess the effectiveness of your institutional assessment system. You know what you are looking for, but are you ready to have uncomfortable conversations about assessment plans that can be stronger? This session includes strategies for providing feedback to faculty and other institutional personnel about how to improve their assessment plans and to better use their results. Examples and practice are provided.

Presenter(s)

Paula Krist, University of San Diego

Collaborations for IR and the Office of Marketing and Communications – 1260

Wekiwa 6

Operations

IR counts objectivity and dispassionate analysis among its foundational values. Offices of marketing and communications are concerned with promoting the institution and conveying emotional appeals to different audiences. Are there opportunities for constructive collaboration? We present four scenarios in which one office was able to assist the other in meeting its objectives. We discuss the process and results of the collaboration, both favorable and occasionally with unanticipated consequences. Finally, we offer our perspectives on what type of institutional climate, office

environments, and personal qualities are needed to make this an effective partnership.

Presenter(s)

Sharron Ronco, Marquette University

Maureen Howard, New Mexico State University

Correlation, Prediction, and Causation – 1446

Panzacola H3

Analysis



Everyone knows the mantra "correlation doesn't imply causation," but that doesn't make the desire to find cause-effect relationships disappear! This session addresses the relationship between correlation and prediction, and takes up the philosophical question of what "causation" can be thought to mean and how we can usefully talk to decision-makers about these issues. These ideas are immediately useful in analyzing and reporting information to decision-makers, and are both practical and optimistic. The goal is to answer the question "what's the next best thing we can try to improve our situation?" There is some math involved, but it is not necessary to understand the main ideas.

Presenter(s)

David Eubanks, Eckerd College

Creating a Methodology for Cost per Degree: Challenges Faced in Florida – 1292

Panzacola H1

Analysis

While some methodologies existed for calculating cost per degree, there was not a nationally recognized standard. Conversations undertaken for developing a performance funding model created a need for Florida's public universities to calculate cost per degree. The purpose of this presentation is to examine the process for developing a methodology for calculating cost per degree for Florida's public universities, including frameworks considered and decision points. Participants explore new frameworks for cost per degree and gain tools they can utilize in future cost studies.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Nabors, State University System of Florida Board of Governors

Data Mining of Admission Data to Predict New Student Enrollment – 1640

Sebastian I4

Analysis

By implementing Gradient Boosted Trees (GBT) model on admission data available in Spring, this study successfully predicted the fall enrollment of new students at a four-year public institution. The GBT model was compared with other predictive techniques, such as CART and CHAID trees, logistic regression, and neural network. A step-by-step



implementation process is discussed to provide a practical guide for IR and enrollment management practitioners.

Presenter(s)

Geoffrey Martin, University of Toledo
Ying Liu, University of Toledo

Enhancing IR Reports with NSF-NIH GSS Data – 1615

Panzacola F4

Decision-Support

The NSF-NIH Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering provides a rich source of data about graduate education and postdoctoral researchers in the U.S. The purpose of this session is to provide a new perspective on the range of analyses that can be conducted, including mapping distributions of graduate enrollment in particular fields across the U.S., and peer analysis of the data on graduate student enrollments and funding in selected fields.

Presenter(s)

Patricia Green, RTI International
Kelly Kang, National Science Foundation / National Center for Science & Engineering Statistics
Peter Einaudi, RTI International

Entry and Degree Attainment in STEM: The Intersection of Race/Ethnicity and Gender – 1935

Sebastian I1

Analysis

This presentation provides evidence to show that racial minorities are well-represented at the entry to STEM fields, thus providing strong testament to the interest of racial minorities in STEM fields. However, they are left behind during college, and many left without a STEM degree, or any degree whatsoever. We emphasize that although racial minority students may seem to be left behind during college in STEM fields, the problem dates further back to pre-college.

Presenter(s)

Yingyi Ma, Syracuse University

Evaluating Graduation Rates at Two-Year vs. Four-Year Open/Minimally Selective Colleges – 1523

Sebastian I3

Analysis



Community colleges are often maligned regarding their relatively low longitudinal student outcomes. A common concern is that students who first enroll at community colleges are less likely to complete degrees when compared with students who begin at 4-year colleges. But there are crucial differences among the groups: community colleges enroll more diverse populations of non-traditional students – in particular, more minority, low-SES, first generation, and part-time students. These differences are often left out when policymakers evaluate colleges'

performances. This study employs longitudinal evaluation using BPS (2004:09) to estimate the effect of institutional type on the likelihood of degree completion, controlling for schools' selectivity by comparing minimally selective or open admission institutions in the two- and four-year sectors. This comparison allows for evaluation of a sector effect on similar student groups while holding demographic and financial covariates constant.

Presenter(s)

Erez Lenchner, CUNY LaGuardia Community College

Faculty Still Matter to Student Engagement! – 1269

Panzacola H2

Analysis

This study is a follow up to Umbach and Wawrzynski's (2005) much cited work connecting faculty teaching practices to student engagement. It relies on data from the same two national surveys used in the previous study. However, both the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement and National Survey of Student Engagement were significantly updated in 2013. As a result, our findings, which come from an updated and expanded set of measures for both students and faculty members, (1) confirm the prior study's findings by showing that students report higher levels of engagement and learning at institutions where faculty members use effective educational practices more, and (2) show previously untested relationships between faculty practices and student engagement.

Presenter(s)

Thomas Nelson Laird, Indiana University-Bloomington
Amber Lambert, Indiana University-Bloomington
Cynthia Ahonen, Indiana University-Bloomington
Amy Ribera, National Survey of Student Engagement

Results of a Survey of Student Enrollment Intensity – 1445

Panzacola F3

Analysis

This session presents the results of a recent study of enrollment patterns at a sample of public community colleges and four-year degree-granting institutions that demonstrate that nominal "full-time" students often take fewer than 15 credit hours per semester. It then attempts to reframe issues of completion and attrition from a perspective informed by recent behavioral economics. In particular, it suggests that students typically take less than 15 credits per semester, not because it best reflects their needs or education goals, but because the 'choice architecture' (roughly, the presentation, framing, labeling, and default options that institutions, federal, and some state financial aid policies present to students) raises the probability that students will make enrollment choices that practically guarantee they will fail to complete their degrees in a timely fashion (Johnson et al., 2013; Kamenica, 2012).

Presenter(s)

Nathaniel Johnson, Postsecondary Analytics, LLC
Mike Baumgartner, Complete College America

Retention Analysis of First Time in College Student Engagement – 1257

Panzacola F1

Analysis

Many colleges and universities are gearing retention efforts toward students who are at risk of early departure. For years, student characteristics captured at the application stage have been used to identify factors that may impact retention. Those factors, in addition to new variables representing student affairs involvement, were used to build a decision tree model predicting retention in the second fall term for first time in college (FTIC) students. Using second fall term retention as the outcome, the model identified student profiles that contributed significantly to student retention.

Presenter(s)

Yi Zhang, Nova Southeastern University

Student Subgroups and Admissions Decisions using Test Score and/or HSGPA – 1242

Sebastian L3

Decision-Support



This study examines the differential effects on student subgroups of using the ACT Composite (ACTC) score and high school GPA (HSGPA) for making admission decisions. Subgroups investigated include race/ethnicity, gender, and income groups. The study was based on data for over 137,000 freshmen from 259 two- and four-year institutions and over 498,000 students who reported ACT scores to one of the colleges, but did not enroll there. Using hierarchical logistic models, this research estimates the probability of success using ACTC, HSGPA, and both measures jointly. Across subgroups, the joint use of ACTC and HSGPA resulted in greater prediction accuracy than when either predictor was used alone. The joint use of these measures tended to reduce over/under-prediction and helped institutions make better decisions about which students are good candidates for enrollment and which of their admitted students are likely to succeed their first years in college.

Presenter(s)

Edgar Sanchez, ACT, Inc.

Tableau and the Democratization of Data: Power and Problems with Sharing – 1608

Sebastian L4

Operations

When we adopted Tableau, we were delighted to plunge into the creation of beautiful dashboards, empowering end-users to slice data views in ways previously unprecedented on our campus. However, this increased sharing brought three problems. The first is data politics. We needed “a single source of truth.” Who gets to define this truth? And what if we disagree? Second, the hard work of telling the truth as we navigate inconsistencies in data fields arising from business practices that change across years. The third is student privacy. We need to share aggregate data while protecting

sensitive elements and ensuring FERPA compliance. We share these challenges and our responses as we strive to produce useful, meaningful, and responsible dashboards.

Presenter(s)

Bridgett Milner, Indiana University-Bloomington

The Impact of Survey Quantity and Quality on Informed Decision-Making – 1703

Panzacola F2

Analysis

This session presents the findings of a study of community colleges and universities to assess the impact of quantity and quality response rates on informed decision-making. The presentation provides IR professionals a critical analysis of why individuals respond to surveys and to what extent their responses are of value (quality) to an organization in terms of collecting, analyzing, and utilizing survey data in a holistic approach to decision-making and outcomes. A mixed-mode survey methodology was used to collect the sample population dataset. Attendees will better understand how the respondents perceived and responded to surveys to improve institutional survey methods/outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Kenneth Scott, Trenholm State Technical College

Mimi Johnson, Trenholm State Technical College

Novadean Watson-Stone, American Public University System

Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling to Determine Faculty Salary Outliers – 1490

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

The university is committed to ensuring that faculty salaries are competitive in relation to market value and equitable in relation to gender and race/ethnicity. To evaluate faculty salary equity, a workgroup responsible for developing a model to evaluate faculty salary equity by both gender and race/ethnicity was created. A regression model using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was developed, using academic rank, years in rank, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic discipline as the independent variables to predict faculty salaries. HLM is a complex form of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression that is used to analyze variance in the outcome variables when the predictor variables are at varying hierarchical levels. Details of the study methodology and results are presented. Important considerations in the design of a faculty equity study are discussed in addition to the identification of inherent limitations of the study.

Presenter(s)

Rebecca Patterson, University of Louisville

Robert Goldstein, University of Louisville



Why is Data Management So Important? – 1944

Wekiwa 5

Reporting

SPONSOR If your school continues to struggle with institutional reporting, then come join our community. IData is leading a growing band of schools towards better data management practices. Have you stopped to think about why your school continues to struggle with institutional reporting? Often, the finger is pointed at the reporting tools available. Rather than focusing on issues with your reporting tools, it is time to focus on your data management processes. The time is now to change how you approach institutional reporting. Do not let that reporting project start without establishing some new processes. Do not roll-out that new reporting tool without having a way to train people on the data. These and other tips and techniques are discussed in this presentation.

Presenter(s)

Scott Flory, IData, Inc.

09:30 AM–10:15 AM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Banner for Institutional Researchers – 1409

Table 3

Technologies

The annual Banner for IR round table discussion is for IR practitioners about the use of Ellucian/Banner on our campuses. Our shared knowledge and networking allows us to create solutions to common problems and to potentially come away with new ideas about the tools we use or tools we are considering. The session usually includes power users and beginners. Please come with suggestions and questions for our user community.

Presenter(s)

Ellen Boswell, Metropolitan State University of Denver
Margaret Cohen, George Washington University
Lisa Muller, University of Wyoming

Doctoral Studies to Employment: Does Institutional Investment Matter? – 1850

Table 8

Analysis



Universities have increasingly invested in graduate education and students, but does institutional funding matter in shaping students' career paths? We analyzed data on 27,000 respondents from the Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR). Findings include the odds of entering industry, relative to education, decreased by 24% when respondents' sources of support were institutional; odds of entering the government/non-profit sector, relative

to education, increased by 33% when respondents' sources of support were external; and institutional funds were not significant in predicting employment in the government/non-profit sector. In our discussion, we ask: (1) How many of you are studying graduate education and students? What are the policy concerns/goals at stake? (2) What data have you used to study affects of institutional resources on graduate-student outcomes? Have policies since changed? (3) How many of you have used SDR data? How did it inform your institution's resourcing graduate programs and students?

Presenter(s)

Karen Webber, University of Georgia

Engaging Faculty in the Use of Assessment Data Across Campus - 1881

Table 9

Assessment



Join us for an interactive discussion with two institutions that are successfully engaging faculty in assessment and the use of data for improvement. The presenters discuss the similarities and differences between their methodologies, strategies they have utilized, and lessons learned. They also share examples and resources, such as electronic exhibit rooms used to share data, and faculty workshop agendas focused on discussing assessment results and using the data for curricular improvements.

Presenter(s)

Trudy Milburn, TaskStream
Joanne Weiss, Fresno Pacific University
Fang Du, University of Mount Union

IR Affiliated Organizations: Governance, Roles, and Relationships – 1635

Table 6

Operations

State, regional, and international institutional research affiliated organizations (IRAOs) have long served as important parts of the professional institutional research community. Changes in the professional environment, however, present both challenges and opportunities to those organizations. This discussion group presents an opportunity for IRAOs to consider these challenges, learn how other organizations are addressing them, and collaborate in meeting them. The discussion group addresses, broadly speaking, the legal organization and governance of IRAOs, their roles in the IR profession, and their relationships with each other and with AIR. The discussion is moderated by leaders of RMAIR, GAIRPAQ, and the Overseas Chinese AIR.

Presenter(s)

Jeffrey Johnson, Utah Valley University
Katherine McGuire, Agnes Scott College



LGBTQ Student Experiences in STEM Majors – 1447

Table 4

Assessment

This discussion addresses the ways that institutional researchers can investigate the experiences of LGBTQ students within STEM majors on campus. Do LGBTQ students feel supported within their STEM fields of study on their campuses? If so, in what ways? If not, what initiatives can campuses implement to increase support? What are the retention and graduation rates of LGBTQ students in STEM fields? How can we investigate this accurately? This open discussion shares best practices and current literature that can assist institutional researchers in their support of diversity on campus.

Presenter(s)

Timothy O'Malley, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)

Revisiting Retention: Logistic Regression and Structural Equation Modeling – 1384

Table 1

Analysis

Student retention remains an important issue in higher education given its impact on cost efficiency and graduation rates for institutions. Participants will learn how analytical methods were applied to investigate freshman retention and achievement and will engage in discussions about how to address issues and challenges involved in the process. Discussion focuses on four questions: What analytical techniques are available to investigate retention? What cognitive and affective factors are significant predictors of retention? How are these factors related to academic performance? What can an institutional research/assessment office do to best support institutional efforts to improve student retention and achievement?

Presenter(s)

Zhicheng Zhang, George Mason University

STEM – Is the Definition Used on Your Campus the Same as on Mine? – 1711

Table 7

Reporting

STEM for U.S. competitiveness; STEM for better employment opportunities; STEM for better social equity; and STEM for homeland security! With the ever-increasing interest and emphasis on STEM disciplines at both the state and national levels, the definitions of STEM have mushroomed. How many STEM definitions are you keeping for your office? What are the differences between one STEM definition and another? Does your institution have the same STEM fields as mine? Those are just some of the questions posed during this group discussion. This group also explores and evaluates feasibilities to form a national coalition in developing a more cohesive definition or a set of definitions for STEM program

classifications that truly reflect what STEM fields are to our regions and our institutions.

Presenter(s)

Meihua Zhai, University of Georgia
Heather Kelly, University of Delaware

Trials and Tribulations of Federal/State Reporting for Non-Traditional IHEs – 1419

Table 10

Reporting

This discussion addresses challenges faced by non-traditional IHEs in reporting data to federal and state entities. This group encourages AIR members from various non-traditional IHEs to share their experiences, challenges, and best practices related to both federal and state reporting. Non-traditional IHEs, for the purpose of this group, are those schools that offer online/distance education or are proprietary in nature. In this session, the following questions are discussed: (1) What challenges have you faced in reporting to either federal or state entities (including state authorization reporting)? (2) What suggestions do you have for best practices in reporting to either federal or state entities? (3) How does your IHE manage data reporting with regard to state authorization/state licensure authorization?

Presenter(s)

Sondra D'Aquisto, Jones International University
Bobby Baca, Jones International University

Understanding the State of IR Around the Globe – 1622

Table 5

Operations

In 2010, the white paper discussion group on 'Going Global: Institutional Research Studies Abroad' called for an IR peacecorps. In 2011, we established the Network of International Institutional Researchers (NIIR), and since 2012 we have IR ambassadors. However, in discussions with practitioners across the globe, some questions arose: How can we find out how IR is developing abroad? Which elements are done? Who is doing them? Does this differ within educational systems? Can a global study help to find answers and lift 'home IR' to the next level? This session gives first multinational insights in IR and new definitions for 'IR'.

Presenter(s)

Stefan Buettner, University of Tuebingen

Using CIRP Data for Assessment and Accreditation – 2067

Table 2

Assessment



Indirect measures of learning and development can be valuable in assessment and accreditation processes. This session will discuss how CIRP survey



items can be used to address accreditation guidelines and discuss future directions for the surveys.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Dominique Harrison, Higher Education Research Institute
Ellen Stolzenberg, University of Southern California

Speaker Sessions

“Do you have those numbers for me yet?” – 1946

Wekiwa 5

Technologies



Give your executives a dashboard with drill-downs, pivots, and a number of other ways they can perform their own analysis. Excel isn't sustainable and “Big BI” is too complex and expensive. Executives need an at-a-glance tool where they are empowered to find the information immediately.

Presenter(s)

Jon Salmon, iDashboards
Brian Stevens, iDashboards

A Graphical Model to Explore Relationships among Student Success Factors – 1104

Panzacola H1

Analysis

The enrollment at our small, rural two-year technical college has been falling since 2010. In order to tackle this problem, we need to understand how student success factors are associated with each other. R-language was employed in this study, and we developed a graphical model (Bayesian network model) that can represent the cause-and-effect relationships among the factors for student retention and/or persistence. The model revealed several hidden associations that we did not anticipate. These findings suggest how we can improve our student persistence plan to help our students toward their success at this college.

Presenter(s)

Koji Fujiwara, Bemidji State University and Northwest Technical College
Douglas Olney, Bemidji State University

A Risky Business: Using Average Net-Price for Accountability – 1672

Panzacola H2

Assessment

This session discusses limitations of using average net-price as an indicator of college cost. Net-price appears on both the College Affordability and Transparency Lists and the College Scorecard, tools developed by the USDOE for parents and students to make decisions about college and to publicly hold colleges accountable for cost and quality. Research presented shows how the calculation of net-price can

mask vast differences in cost for middle and lower income students and can incentivize colleges to lower their ranks on the highest net-price list by reducing aid to middle income students. Institutional researchers will be able to educate their home college administrators and leaders on the limitations of using average net-price and help their home institutions communicate with college stakeholders about net-price.

Presenter(s)

Brianna Moore, California College of the Arts

Course Load and Student Success: The Benefits of Higher Course Loads – 1311

Sebastian L3

Decision-Support

Inspired by a presentation at the 2013 AIR Forum, researchers at Nova Southeastern University replicate and extend the work from the University of Hawaii System on the impact of course load on student retention and grade point average. First-time, full-time undergraduate students attempting more credits in the first term had higher retention rates and grade point averages. Most importantly, this relationship was demonstrated at the lowest levels of academic preparation as measured by standardized test scores and high school grade point averages. This presentation demonstrates the methods used to extend the prior work through inclusion of regression analyses. We also discuss the implications of these results and how they are being used at Nova Southeastern University.

Presenter(s)

Donald Rudawsky, Nova Southeastern University
Arie Spigel, Nova Southeastern University

Data-driven Support for Students on the Path to College – 1993

Sebastian I2

Analysis

Our study centers on developing a decision-support tool that may enable positive choices to strengthen students' prospects for college education. The research consists of quantitative data analysis, qualitative data collection and analysis, and interface prototype development. We analyze and model data from the Virginia Longitudinal Data System, accessed in partnership with the Virginia Department of Education, to link students' “academic trajectories” to postsecondary institutional enrollment. Simultaneously we collect and analyze information from individuals in support roles for high school students in the college planning process. Data and findings from both stages of the project are being integrated into a web-based tool that offers a novel portal for improving college readiness.

Presenter(s)

David Hondula, Pavilion Research



Delaware Instructional Costs and Revenue: A Match Made in Boston – 1653

Sebastian I1

Decision-Support

Skyrocketing tuition costs and a struggling economy has led to increased scrutiny of the higher education industry by legislators, trustees, and the general public with no relief in sight. As such, the focus institution took a reflective approach to consider the effectiveness of the financial tools available to decision-makers. One outcome of this reflective approach was the integration of Delaware Faculty Productivity data and institutional revenue data to develop a comprehensive view of the academic enterprise. Additionally, a modified version of the Boston Consulting Group matrix was effectively implemented to convert the data into knowledge among senior administrators on campus. This session describes the steps of the processes and the resulting visual presentation of the information.

Presenter(s)

Michael Cogan, University of St Thomas
Christina Teeter, University of St. Thomas

Direct Assessment: Maturing Competency-Based Learning – 1309

Panzacola H3

Assessment

Direct assessment programs require measurement of learning at the student level. This session presents the institutional context, key business processes, and infrastructure supporting the first federally-approved direct assessment program for both undergraduate and graduate students. Specifically, it focuses on methods for improving competency-based curricula via institutional standards, course-level assessment practices via a fully-embedded assessment model, and visualizing student learning via a competency map. Initial evaluation data are presented on the efficiency and success of this program. Participants are challenged to analyze their institutions' readiness to offer direct assessment programming and to formulate strategic plans to improve curricular and assessment practices.

Presenter(s)

Jeff Grann, Capella University
Kimberly Pearce, Capella University

Enabling Academic Program Prioritization with Program-Level Financials – 1305

Sebastian L4

Analysis

Financials are crucial to understanding the health of academic programs—an area in which IR professionals are increasingly being asked to provide data—but few have specific advice on how to operationalize these constructs. University accounting systems do not often assign costs to programs—a point hinted at by Robert Dickeson in his recent book on academic program prioritization. The presenter

shares an approach to program financials using common IR data. It overcomes many hurdles and may represent some costs more accurately than university accounting systems—or at least more easily and with greater comparability across programs. Participants will be able to express reasons why program level financial metrics are difficult to calculate as well as walk away with two real-world approaches to construct financial metrics.

Presenter(s)

Bryce Mason

From Insight to Action: Using Predictive Analytics for Student Success and Revenue Growth – 2048

Wekiwa 9

Technologies



What if we could combine predictions about student behavior with business rules to determine the most appropriate action the student or staff member should take? What if we could run scenarios on simulated data to determine which approaches will yield the greatest return on investment? With predictive analytics, institutions can derive insights about students and determine contributors to key outcomes, but it is the process putting these insights into action that may present a challenge. Aligning outreach efforts more efficiently and cost-effectively is critical to increases in enrollment and revenue. Utilizing IBM SPSS Predictive Analytics Solutions for Education, colleges and universities have the ability to leverage multiple data sources and determine how to allocate resources to maximize retention interventions and student incentives. In this session, attendees will learn about the possibilities for transforming rich, analytical insight into targeted, effective actions.

Presenter(s)

Nicole Alioto, IBM Corporation
John Norton, IBM Corporation

How the Abundance of Data and Performance Based Funding are Impacting IR - 2079

Sebastian I1

Assessment



The role of the IR on campus is changing due to many pressures; massive amounts of data, performance based reporting, and accountably measures. With data more accessible and prolific, the need to tie data directly to planning and outcomes is necessary for an institution to be effective. This session explores the challenges we face as we strive to increase BI maturity in higher education from answering queries of “what happened?”, to driving improvements, to institutional performance and effectiveness. We also look both at how this change is impacting, and presenting an opportunity, for the IR role to be more influential on campus.

Presenter(s)

Dave Raney, Nuventive
Henry DeVries, III, Ellucian



IAIR Best Presentation: Using PSM to Test the CC Penalty Assumption – 1902

Sebastian I4

Analysis



The presentation highlights the findings from a recent quasi-experimental study conducted by the Illinois Education Research Council focusing on a state-wide cohort of community college transfer students and a comparison group of rising juniors from four-year colleges. It also provides background information on methodological considerations related to the propensity score matching process.

Presenter(s)

Eric Lichtenberger, Illinois Education Research Council

Identifying Critical Courses that Predict Dropout – 1617

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

All courses with high failure rates are not the same: some are of greater concern than others because failure in them predicts large numbers of dropouts. We describe (step-by-step) how to identify courses in which failure is a strong predictor of dropout, and courses that produce high numbers of dropouts and thus lead to decreased retention and graduation rates. We also distinguish courses as predictors of academic vs. motivational reasons for dropout to improve targeting of interventions. Finally, we show how use of these data led to curricular revision in our historically most-failed course.

Presenter(s)

Consuelo Boronat, Florida International University

Maximizing Your Institution's Resources for Student Success – 1163

Wekiwa 3

Decision-Support

Attendees at this session will learn and discuss how community colleges can use benchmarking and activity-based costing to make better resource allocation decisions to benefit student learning, persistence, and completion. Many student success initiatives start as small pilot projects, but fail to reach broader student audiences due to lack of resources or the unwillingness to reallocate. To succeed, higher education administrators, faculty, and staff need to not only understand the potential impact of projects on student success, but also the costs of different initiatives.

Presenter(s)

Patrick Rossol-Allison, Johnson County Community College
Lou Guthrie, Johnson County Community College

MIAIR Best Presentation: DataFest- Encouraging Awareness and Use of Data Resources – 1948

Wekiwa 6

Operations



At the Davenport University IR website, any employee can access detailed information regarding student demographics, survey results, enrollment, courses and faculty. However, many staff members are not aware of this resource and few use the information to make informed decisions. A themed IR open-house was held to better communicate the data resources that are available to University faculty and staff. "DataFest" featured hands-on informational booths, games, prizes, and food. Decorations and costumed IR staff members added to the fun and excitement of this successful event.

Presenter(s)

Kathy Aboufadel, Davenport University
Steven Stromp, Davenport University

OCAIR Best Presentation: Application of Social Network Analysis in Institutional Research – 2037

Sebastian L2

Analysis



IR professionals have been constantly adopting and adapting to new analytical tools and research methodologies. Besides traditional inferential statistics of regression and exploratory statistics of data mining, data visualization should emerge as another important technique in Institutional Research. This presentation introduces Social Network Analysis (SNA) by demonstrating three analytical works on topics highly relevant to IR. The approach of SNA in exploring data and presenting results can make the delivery of key aspects of a data set and its related issue more intuitive and effective, so to improve understanding and encourage engagement.

Presenter(s)

Ning Wang, University of Georgia

On Demand Interactive Dashboards—PowerPivot, a Free and Simple Tool – 1221

Sebastian I3

Technologies

This session discusses the free PowerPivot Excel add-in for dashboard development. This tool is especially important for recurring data requests that require much slicing and dicing. The ability to manipulate data on demand and create a connection for automatic refreshing makes this tool truly empowering. Provide data on student profiling, course and faculty evaluations, and retention and graduation rates using a more powerful data analysis tool.

Presenter(s)

Rosa Belerique, California State University, Long Beach

Open-Source Data Visualization: Introducing “Processing” as a Tool for IR – 1529

Panzacola F3

Technologies

“Processing” is an award-winning open-source computer programming language built for visual designers. Processing uses a simplified code structure that allows those new at programming to develop sophisticated visualizations easily. (In fact, many schools use Processing as their introductory programming language.) As a programming language, Processing has infinitely more flexibility than more conventional data visualization tools – it is limited only by the user’s imagination. This presentation introduces participants to the language, demonstrates the development and deployment of some simple visuals, showcases various higher education visualizations (primarily using IPEDS and other NCES data), and discusses possible applications.

Presenter(s)

Tim Stanley, Utah Valley University

The For-Profit Sector: Graduation Rate Performance and Default Rates – 1732

Panzacola F1

Analysis

This study provides empirical evidence of the for-profit sector’s effectiveness and contribution to the private and public good by assessing the sector’s performance through input-adjusted predicted versus actual graduation rates and default rates. Using IPEDS data and data on colleges’ three-year default rates, the study examines the relationship between graduation rates and various characteristics (e.g., sector, selectivity, student demographics, financial aid profile, and others) through regression analyses. This research addresses important policy issues of educational cost and effectiveness at postsecondary institutions, particularly in light of the recent call for a new rating system in higher education by President Obama.

Presenter(s)

Dmitry Suspitsyn, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education

The Impact of Change of Major on Time to Bachelor’s Degree Completion – 1934

Panzacola F4

Analysis

This study examines the impact of changing major on bachelor’s degree completion time, emphasizing changes to and from science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and non-STEM majors. Results of multilevel discrete-time hazard models applied to national survey data reveal a complex association between changing major and graduation risk that significantly depends on many student-level and institutional-level characteristics. Students who began college as STEM majors and switched early to non-STEM majors had the highest risk of graduating over time and took the least time to graduate, while students who began in a non-

STEM field and changed to a STEM major after the third year took the longest to graduate. Although students who changed majors later in college typically took longer to graduate than students who persisted in their declared major, their risk of graduating after six years was not significantly different from that of students persisting in their major.

Presenter(s)

Jeffrey Sklar, California Polytechnic State University

Using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning: The Process of Norming – 1539

Wekiwa 7

Assessment

This highly interactive session focuses on creating an assessment rubric and a subsequent activity in norming participants on the newly created rubric. The artifacts we directly assess are something everyone likely has an opinion on: chocolate. Because the focus is a non-academic area, we can better pay attention to the kinds of language we use and decisions we make when creating and using rubrics. We will also elicit observations on the process that serve participants well when they work with rubrics on their return to their own campuses.

Presenter(s)

Neil Pagano, Columbia College Chicago
Jonathan Keiser, City Colleges of Chicago

Using Six Sigma Methodology for Conducting Student-Retention Research – 1090

Panzacola F2

Analysis

Many institutional researchers are in the trenches supporting various student success initiatives on our campuses to identify better ways to retain and eventually graduate more students. Communicating the factors involved in student-retention research, improvement strategies, and results attributed to selected courses of action with both internal and external audiences can be daunting. One of the standard, quantitative, problem-solving methodologies—Six Sigma—offers a comprehensive framework for organizing information, examining factors, and presenting results, particularly on process-oriented and data-driven projects, such as the ones typically associated with student-retention research. This session introduces the Six Sigma methodology and uses an ongoing first-year student-retention study to illustrate how this framework and its five standard DMAIC phases may apply and be replicated at other institutions for examining and improving processes.

Presenter(s)

Timothy Chow, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology



Using Web-Based Models and Templates for Continuous Institutional Effectiveness, Sustainability and Improvement – 1879

Wekiwa 4

Decision-Support



This session describes assessment models and web-based templates for the documentation of a) program assessment, (b) instructional support, (c) student support and (d) administrative support assessment. It discusses how these online web-based tools can be developed and utilized to identify and

Presenter(s)

Howard Taylor, Concord USA Inc.
Michael Ralph, CUPAS

10:30 AM–11:15 AM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

A Focus on Assessment, Student Success and Retention – 2032

Table 7

Technologies



Does your strategy for improving student retention revolve around a series of alert and warning systems? If so, you may be missing out on an important component of a holistic, research-based student retention strategy. Research shows that a successful initiative incorporates early these “red flag” transactions with student surveys, faculty and staff input, and overall program assessment. EBI MAP-Works provides a comprehensive set of student retention and benchmarking assessment solutions, enabling colleges and universities to achieve measurable results. Our student retention platform combines predictive analytics and proprietary algorithms with student data—both historical and current—to provide a continuous cycle of communication across departments, visually informing faculty and staff of critical issues.

Presenter(s)

Sherry Woosley, EBI MAP-Works
Kurt Moderson, EBI MAP-Works
Annette Miller, EBI MAP-Works

Categorizing Identities: Race, Gender, Disability, and Sexual Orientation – 1414

Table 1

Analysis

The goals of good survey practice can be in contrast to the variable and complex nature of identity. This session focuses on how to balance the competing needs of creating clear, concise, and easily answerable questions on aspects of student identity that are sensitive, complex, and not easily

defined. Discussants lead conversation focused on the difficulties of designing survey questions to record student race/ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, and disability. Topics of discussion center around the following questions: What demographics are of interest to study at your institution? What challenges have you faced in trying to collect demographic information from students? How does your institution ask about complex identities such as race, gender, disability, and sexual orientation? How are students categorized in results and reporting at your institution?

Presenter(s)

Allison BrokaLorenz, National Survey of Student Engagement
Heather Haeger, National Survey of Student Engagement
John Zilvinskis, Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research

Data Warehousing and Institutional Research: Friends or Foes? – 1347

Table 5

Assessment

This discussion addresses the overlapping scopes of data warehousing and institutional research. Do your DW and IR offices cooperate, compete, or coexist? Join us to share how your institution is managing these two functions that overlap in scope, talent, and tools. If IR and DW are not integrated, are we missing opportunities for increased efficiency and, more troubling, are we introducing inconsistent data? Does the investment in DW come at cost to IR offices? Is “nesting” DW into existing IR offices a best practice that needs more consideration?

Presenter(s)

Amber Machamer, California State University-East Bay

Developing and Enhancing a Data-Driven Academic Portfolio Review Process – 1837

Table 6

Assessment

How does an institution evaluate a variety of undergraduate, graduate, and undergraduate program offerings? How does a comparison of significant data points get created and used for an institution's decision making? How can data be effectively warehoused to provide accurate data points without a sophisticated and costly data warehousing system? For an institution just starting its own academic portfolio process, what are the optimal time intervals to ask academic units to participate in the portfolio activity? These questions are the center of discussion as the presenters talk about their experiences in implementing and revising an academic program portfolio process at The University of Findlay. The presenters provide their perspectives on what they consider to be strengths and challenges in implementing this process with further group discussion on lessons learned at other institutions that have implemented similar processes.

Presenter(s)

Mary Jo Geise, The University of Findlay
Sara Hingson, The University of Findlay



Evaluating a College Access Program—Being Flexible and Maintaining Fidelity – 1803

Table 4

Reporting

This discussion addresses challenges the presenters faced when evaluating a federally funded college access program by working with different levels of actors. Collaboration often presents challenges in collecting high-quality and complete data, especially when each actor thought other parties were collecting, storing, and managing data. Three questions guide the discussion: What were the primary obstacles the research team faced? What strategies were used to maintain rigorous evaluation designs in spite of unanticipated barriers? How might IR help to evaluate university-sponsored college access programs and inform outreach efforts involving different levels of actors?

Presenter(s)

Ya-Chi Hung, Pennsylvania State University
 Karla Loya, Pennsylvania State University
 Frank Fernandez, Pennsylvania State University

High School and Dual Credit Dashboards: Delivery and Comparisons using Tableau – 1913

Table 3

Analysis

With the desire to have more students attain timely and cost efficient post-secondary degrees, there is a push for students to earn college credit during high school. These programs include Advanced Placement (AP) exams, attending courses on college campuses, and even dual enrollment in which students earn college credit for courses taught or delivered at high schools. Unfortunately, there is not much information about the success and impact of these programs. UVU developed a series of dashboards to analyze these efforts. In this session, we discuss the following questions: (1) What data is needed for these dashboards? (2) How were the Tableau visualizations developed? (3) What is the difference in college participation for the different programs? (4) What are retention rates for different enrollment options? (5) What is the time to graduation and percentage by program? Please come prepared to learn what we have done, and share results and methods from your own institution.

Presenter(s)

Robert Loveridge, Utah Valley University
 Mark Leany, Utah Valley University

Recommendations for Data Warehousing Large Scale Assessments – 1679

Table 2

Operations

This discussion will cover methods, policies, and procedures for users to consider when designing their data systems. The facilitators will guide discussions focused on identifying the essential questions your data system will be used to answer as well as the appropriate uses for different types of data.

This discussion will also include a review of sample case studies of institutions that have recently redesigned their data systems and the steps they followed to incorporate multiple sources of data into their system. Discussion Questions: - Has your organization created an overall validity framework for the evaluation of your admissions process? - Has your organization conducted a systematic evaluation of the type of data collected in your organization and whether it is being used for its intended purpose? - How do you incorporate outside data into your systems? - What are some challenges to incorporating outside data into your systems? - What best practices can be learned on incorporating outside data into your systems?

Presenter(s)

Sherby Jean-Leger, The College Board
 Andrew Wiley, Alpine Testing Solutions
 Ellen Sawtell, The College Board

Switching to Online Student Evaluations: Response Rates and Other Issues – 1263

Table 9

Operations

This discussion addresses switching to online student evaluation processes within institutions of higher learning. Moving to an online evaluation process can have a large impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of an IR office. We share some of the challenges in this process and discuss ways in which to overcome them. What are the main concerns with an online student evaluation process? How can an IR office make a compelling case to move the evaluation process online? How can we overcome faculty resistance? What can we do to improve response rates for online student evaluations?

Presenter(s)

Joseph Baumann, Blinn College
 Kara Larkan-Skinner, Our Lady of the Lake University

Using Analytics to Support IR - 2083

Table 8

IR Technologies



LiveText Analytics is the application of business intelligence in education, reflecting the role of data analysis at the college, departmental, institutional, regional, national and international levels. Live Text Analytics provides for the ability to collect, maintain, and organize large amounts of information to help institutions identify opportunities for improvement.

Presenter(s)

Matthew Kaylie, LiveText
 John McGrath, LiveText



Speaker Sessions

“Power” Tools for IR Reporting – 1599

Sebastian L3

Technologies

Building on existing skill sets in Microsoft SQL Server and Microsoft Excel, the university is exploring the new Microsoft “Power” tools - Power Pivot, Power View, Power Maps, and Power Query. The IR office took this opportunity to consider moving its fact book and many campus reports to the new platform, simplifying the creation process and shortening the time from data finalization to final report. This session focuses on how this office began moving to these new tools and provides a demonstration of the “power” of these new tools, including the tremendous benefits to an IR office.

Presenter(s)

David Onder, Western Carolina University
Alison Joseph, Western Carolina University

Building a Culture of Evidence at Two Universities in the Middle East – 1438

Panzacola F2

Operations

This session presents the experiences of the American University in Cairo (Egypt) and the Lebanese American University (Lebanon), each of which has embarked on a process to develop an organizational culture that supports evidence-based decision-making. The session explores the process of effecting cultural change among staff and faculty who are sometimes highly resistant to change of traditional business processes and approaches. Using IPEDS to jumpstart the process, the universities are leveraging the IPEDS framework to adopt standard data definitions, review business processes, implement data standards, and adopt best practices as well as build a set of peers for intra-regional comparisons.

Presenter(s)

Ann Boudinot-Amin, The American University in Cairo
Rasha Radwan, The American University in Cairo
Diane Nauffal, Lebanese American University

Campus Indicators of Student Success: It's in the CISS – 1618

Panzacola F1

Decision-Support

Sound research relies on evidence to help decision-makers understand student success at their institutions. One of the key components of a culture of evidence is the use of disaggregated data, not only in student populations, but also by campus. In this session, participants are introduced to Broward College's Campus Indicators of Student Success (CISS) process. Included in this dynamic, engaging session is a sample of a CISS report with 12 student success indicators, executive briefing sheets, summary tables, posters, and data

narratives to foster understanding, conversations, and use of student success data. This session is appropriate for all audiences.

Presenter(s)

Rigoberto Rincones Gomez, Broward College
Noel Betts, Broward College
Nicole Graham, Broward College

Computing the ROI of College Degrees to State and Local Governments – 1338

Panzacola H2

Decision-Support

In recent years, post-secondary institutions have experienced a decrease in funding support from their state and local governments. In competition for tax dollars with transportation, public aid, public education, etc., post-secondary institutions are often considered an expense category that has alternate methods of funding (tuition), and thus do not receive the same consideration for state and local appropriations. This presentation provides a framework using national data from the American Communities Survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics, state and local data from the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS), Taxpayer Association, and Department of Workforce Services to demonstrate that post-secondary education is an investment and not an expense with measurable dollar returns through increased tax revenues and savings in public assistance programs.

Presenter(s)

Joseph Curtin, Utah System of Higher Education

Institution-Level Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Administrative Units – 1619

Panzacola F3

Assessment

While assessment at the unit level is essential to programmatic improvement, it is also important to review and respond to data at an institutional level. This presentation highlights the process employed by Georgia Gwinnett College to aggregate assessment of individual units into an institutional perspective that can be used for institutional and strategic decisions.

Presenter(s)

Austen Krill, Georgia Gwinnett College

Leveraging Student Satisfaction Assessment at a Liberal Arts College – 1391

Panzacola H4

Decision-Support

This session addresses multiple issues that may be valuable to participants including: actively using student satisfaction data, collaboration techniques to analyze and present multi-year trends to various campus constituents, and how to provide benchmark comparisons for maximum impact on campus efforts to improve the student experience. This session explores ways that institutional research and student affairs offices can best work together to enact meaningful change. A case study is presented, along with additional examples from institutions nationally.

Presenter(s)

Tim Merrill, Randolph-Macon College
Julie Bryant, Noel-Levitz

Little Things Mean A Lot: Building a Culture of Assessment for Students – 1712

Wekiwa 3

Assessment

Can expanding the definition of “culture of assessment” to include the student population help to reduce the threat of survey fatigue among students? This session describes a simple application of existing survey technology that is expected to raise student interest in assessment on campus, making them active rather than passive participants. VERY short surveys on timely topics are administered, analyzed, and published in the campus paper within one week, allowing students to see how results are used while the data collection experience is still fresh in their minds. The tools and methods used to implement this initiative and test its results will be presented, with ample time for discussion.

Presenter(s)

John Wise, Houghton College

Looking to the Future: Enhancing the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes – 1951

Wekiwa 4

Assessment

SPONSOR ETS recognizes the challenges that institutions are facing, including the mounting pressure for accountability, the ever increasing need for valid student learning outcomes, and the necessity to assess growing numbers of students in varied locations and types of learning environments. Attend this informative session to learn about enhanced products and services from ETS, designed to help you satisfy accreditation and accountability requirements and demonstrate institutional effectiveness.

Presenter(s)

Cheryl Casper, ETS

Making the Most of College and University Rankings – 1557

Panzacola H1

Analysis

College and university rankings are widely publicized and increase in number every year, but how can higher education institutions use the information constructively? Using the data to make program changes and adjustments, to communicate future directions, and articulate how the rankings are affected are the keys to optimizing the results. Strategies are discussed for successful reflection and utilization of ranking information in order to help leaders represent their institutions to external constituents, and to stimulate improvement in internal programs and services, and in the overall rankings.

Presenter(s)

Shawn Peters, Indiana University-Bloomington
Victor Borden, Indiana University-Bloomington

Measuring Students' Perceptions of Campus Climate by Academic Major – 1719

Sebastian 14

Analysis

How students experience their campus environments influences learning, development, and educational attainment. Being able to measure how students in various academic majors experience campus will help professionals design more targeted and effective educational interventions. A new psychometrically tested tool for measuring climate, the Perceptions of Climate Instrument (PCI), is applied to a multi-institution dataset to produce profiles illustrating STEM and non-STEM majors' perceptions of climate. Attendees will learn how students in different majors perceive climate differently, the hierarchical factor analytic techniques used to create the PCI, and how the PCI can be used to assess the climate at their own institutions.

Presenter(s)

Dan Merson, Pennsylvania State University
Kadian McIntosh, University of Arizona

On-Line Course Evaluation Implementation and Improvement of Response Rates – 1451

Wekiwa 9

Decision-Support



This study explores how a team approach was used to implement a complex on-line course evaluation system in which departments could opt in or out of the evaluation and use their own sets of questions. The role that faculty play in improving response rates is also addressed through predicting response rates based on the tactics faculty reported using, along with the instructor and course characteristics.

Presenter(s)

Marcia Belcheir, Boise State University
Robert Anson, Boise State University
James Goodman, Boise State University

Overmatching, Affirmative Action, and Success for Low-Income Students – 1337

Sebastian I3

Analysis

Central to the affirmative action debate currently in the forefront of education policy is the issue of academic matching in college selectivity. A statewide dataset of the Illinois high school graduating class of 2003 was analyzed using Cox regression survival analysis. Odds ratios were determined for the likelihood of baccalaureate completion based on matching conditions and on selectivity of institution attended while controlling for other demographic and academic characteristics. Separate models were developed for family income quartiles and major race/ethnicity groups to determine if matching had a differential impact across groups on timely bachelor's degree completion. Policy implications related to both affirmative action and the completion policies are provided.

Presenter(s)

Bob Blankenberger, University of Illinois at Springfield
Eric Lichtenberger, Illinois Education Research Council
Mary Allison Witt, University of Illinois
Doug Franklin, Illinois Board of Higher Education

Presenting the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Data Presentation Basics and More – 1415

Sebastian L2

Analysis

This presentation delves into taking data from raw output and turning them into materials that can be easily understood – and acted upon – by lay audiences. In a world of technological advancements in presenting data, basic principles for data analysis and presentation can be forgotten. This presentation highlights data presentation best practices as well as the basic principles in presenting data in accurate but compelling ways. Examples of both good and less than optimal designs are presented to highlight what works and what does not. Tips are given on how to design data presentations that are applicable for a range of software including SPSS and Excel. Handouts of the examples and other resources are shared so participants can tailor these principles and best practices for their own needs.

Presenter(s)

Amanda Saw, Ashford University
Kristina Cragg, Bridgepoint Education

QS Academic Reputation Dataset- A Data Rich Tool for Institutional Analysis – 1947

Wekiwa 5

Analysis



The Academic Reputation Dataset provides granular access to the QS Global Academic Reputation Survey results, arguably the largest and strongest survey of its type with over 62,000 responses in 2013. The tool reveals a deep insight into institutional brand recognition and delivers a data-rich solution for measuring

and comparing academic perception at global, regional and national levels. The session will showcase this information source whilst providing access to the Academic Reputation results for the North American and Latin American regions.

Presenter(s)

Baerbel Eckelmann, QS Quacquarelli Symonds Limited
Martin Juno, QS Intelligence Unit

Scaling Up is Hard to Do, but the Payoff Extends the Success Course's Reach – 1368

Panzacola F4

Decision-Support

Using data to inform decision making for increasing student success and completion, Texarkana College developed and brought to scale a student success course for FTIC students placing into developmental education. The results have been dramatic. Texarkana College, an Achieving the Dream Leader College, implemented changes across the institution—from advising, to faculty training, to data analysis—using data developed over time from a pilot program to a scaled intervention. Learn how Texarkana College transformed student success for its at-risk student population through a commitment to scaling up in the face of financial challenges and personnel limitations by using data to inform decision making.

Presenter(s)

Jan Lyddon, Organizational Effectiveness Consultants
Jamie Ashby, Texarkana College

Strategies for Examining the Validity of Interpretations and Uses of Performance Assessment Data – 1593

Sebastian I1

Assessment

This presentation provides an overview of a Validity Inquiry Process (VIP) Model that is aligned to eight validity criteria outlined in the literature (Linn, Baker, & Dunbar, 1991; Messick, 1994). The VIP Model includes guidelines and instruments for implementing a validity inquiry and utilizes a qualitative, reflective practice approach. Higher education assessment and accreditation processes are utilizing performance assessments as one method of evaluating student learning outcomes. Given the increased, high stakes use of these instruments that are typically developed locally, it is important to examine the validity of the interpretations and uses of performance assessment data, a step that often goes unaddressed. Participants in this session will examine validity criteria documented in the literature, review strategies and instruments developed to examine the validity of the interpretations and uses of locally developed performance assessment data, and practice implementing two reflective practice instruments.

Presenter(s)

Cynthia Conn, Northern Arizona University
Sue Pieper, Northern Arizona University



Student Loans – Do You Know Where Your Data Go? – 1374

Wekiwa 6

Reporting

Widespread concern about rising student debt levels has led to increased scrutiny of college-level student loan data. Institutional researchers have a critical role to play in ensuring that these data are complete, accurate, and presented in meaningful ways for students, families, and others who use these data. This session provides updated information about what data are collected from colleges about student loans and where these data show up online, such as the federal College Scorecard and College Navigator sites and the Project on Student Debt's annual reports on student debt at graduation. The session also provides the institutional research perspective on reporting and presenting student loan data. The presenters encourage discussion about promising practices for data reporting and presentation, such as collaboration between institutional researchers and financial aid administrators, and opportunities to advocate for better data collection and presentation processes.

Presenter(s)

Matt Reed, The Institute for College Access & Success
Mary Sapp, University of Miami

The Impact of Guaranteed Tuition Policies on Postsecondary Tuition Levels – 1924

Sebastian 12

Analysis



This study considers the impact of state-level guaranteed tuition laws on postsecondary tuition levels. The analytic framework argues that state-level laws requiring flat tuition rates for four years contain inflationary risk, which encourages institutions to set tuition higher than they otherwise would with annual adjustments. This study uses a national panel dataset and a quasi-experimental difference-in-difference methodological approach, with Illinois' Truth-in-Tuition law serving as the treatment condition. On average, institutions subject to this law increased tuition by approximately \$1,500 in excess of the amount predicted by the trend for institutions not subject to the law. This finding is robust to alternative specifications and indicates that state-level guaranteed tuition laws encourage institutional tuition increases. Additional results will be presented about the impact of these laws on state general appropriations and student-level outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Jennifer Delaney, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Tracking Faculty Activities and Benchmarking Research Performance – 1963

Wekiwa 7

Technologies



You need reliable data to make informed decisions about your university's research programs. But what are your strengths, how do you compare to peers, and where should you be collaborating? Universities around the globe use InCites to support strategic decisions with data on faculty research productivity and impact. Based on the trusted Web of Science data, InCites offers a range of analytics and visualizations to demonstrate your place in the research community. The Converis full solution within InCites alleviates the administrative burden for faculty activity reporting through data pre-population and customized workflows. Join us to learn how universities use InCites to support both faculty and administration needs.

Presenter(s)

Ann Beynon, Thomson Reuters

Unit Cost Expenditure Measures in Campus-Level Decision Making – 1680

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

Funded by a grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, our research examines how unit instructional cost expenditure measures are defined, calculated, and used in campus-level decision-making. We also examine the role of external stakeholders and their influence on the collection and reporting of unit cost measures as an accountability mechanism. This study is part of a multinational research project that includes institutions in the U.S. and European Union. The results will be shared with policymakers and researchers in the U.S. and Japan to inform institutional finance policy.

Presenter(s)

Nathaniel Johnson, Postsecondary Analytics, LLC

Who Fills Out Multiple Surveys? Tracking Responses Using Online Panels – 1503

Sebastian L4

Decision-Support

In the past few decades, web surveys have exploded in popularity as a method of surveying students. During this same time period, response rates to student surveys have seen significant declines. It is now not unusual for web surveys to yield 20%-30% response rates—or lower. What is largely unknown, however, is whether it is the same 20%-30% of students who respond to every survey, or whether there are discernible patterns of response among students depending on factors such as demographics, academics, and/or survey timing. This session describes one institution's exploration of this issue using online panels to track patterns



in undergraduate student survey responses over an academic semester.

Presenter(s)

Jessica Sharkness, Tufts University
Katia Miller, Tufts University

11:30 AM–12:15 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Cutting Costs and Leading the Way through Campus Energy Productivity – 1628

Table 8

Operations

Higher education institutions are being challenged by stagnant or declining budgets whilst operational costs, predominantly energy prices, are rising. This discussion addresses how and whether institutional research can assist or even take a lead in reducing financial strangulation through campus energy productivity to enhance institutional effectiveness, awareness, processes and strategy. Do financial limitations affect your work significantly? How can IR help to ease these burdens and free up budget for teaching and research? What is the situation at your campus regarding energy and resources? What can institutional research do to link together and lead the way towards true institutional effectiveness and be a thought leader and role model?

Presenter(s)

Stefan Buettner, University of Tuebingen

Effects of Delaying Math and Policy Formation – 1126

Table 9

Decision-Support

(1) What are the potential benefits and pitfalls of requiring math in the first semester? (2) Are there certain student groups to which this should be applied? (3) If such a policy were implemented across the board, what role should faculty play in shaping it? (4) How, as IR professionals, should we include faculty input into recommendations for administrators?

Presenter(s)

Janice Childress, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Improving Online Course Evaluation Processes and Increasing Response Rates – 1394

Table 1

Operations

This discussion addresses the challenges and opportunities associated with online student course evaluations. Institutions are increasingly transitioning from paper-based surveys to online programs, and IR is often significantly involved in the

process. What is IR's role in providing service to students and faculty? How do we best address faculty concerns? What are some strategies for increasing student response rates? We share our experiences and ideas in order to facilitate valuable insights for improving the effectiveness of online course evaluations.

Presenter(s)

Elizabeth Snyder, Western Carolina University

Infographics: Information Communication for Change – 1334

Table 7

Technologies

This discussion addresses the use of infographics to incite changes at colleges and universities. It focuses on the use of infographics as a mass communication tool to support change efforts in a college or university context. The discussion leads to idea generation during which participants brainstorm other ways in which infographics can be employed to support change efforts. Sometimes, changes need to start at the ground level and move up. For example, an increase in academic rigor needs to begin with faculty making changes to their classes. How do you best design an infographic that catches viewers' attention, and helps to solve the problem, but does is not discouraging with negative results? How do you represent a large amount of data in a small space to provoke thought, but not present misleading information? Are there other ways in which infographics or similar depictions of data may be used to incite changes from the bottom-up and fuel a data-driven culture? Participants are encouraged to bring 1-2 examples of infographics they have created.

Presenter(s)

Pamela Jackson, Franklin Pierce University

Jumpstarting Campus-Wide Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes : Using Student Assessment of Increased Learning – 2071

Table 5

Assessment



Many colleges track program level outcomes, no outcomes that are assessed across the entire campus. This discussion group will address how to track the Student's Assessment of Learning Outcomes across your entire campus and allow you to quickly get curriculum mapping data as well as increased faculty interest in tracking campus-wide student learning outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Larry Piegza, SmartEvals
Garrett Swearingen, SmartEvals

Performance-Based Funding Redux: The Role of IR – 1351

Table 6

Assessment

This discussion addresses performance-based funding (PBF), which has a checkered history, but which states are using to allocate limited resources and increase accountability. IR can contribute to PBF in designing metrics, developing submission data, and assessing the impact on their institutions. Questions to be addressed include: (1) How has IR influenced the implementation of PBF and its metrics in your state? (2) How can IR contribute to the assessment of the impact of PBF on institutions and systems? (3) How can researchers share their analyses to develop a body of knowledge about current PBF models?

Presenter(s)

Mona Levine, University of Maryland

Promoting Academic Success in First-Year Students During College Transition – 1833

Table 3

Analysis

This study extends beyond traditional measures of student engagement; the results offer strong potential for educational research and practice by modeling academic achievement using new measures of students' college experiences to identify strategies for enhancing student success. This discussion session provides insight into the key roles of measures that make significant contributions in understanding academic success by asking: How would your institution support development of this type of model? What action items would you suggest to further explore this model in terms of supportive conditions for academic achievement, retention, and ultimately degree attainment? What other models shall be developed to better understand how students develop, for instance, self-efficacy or resilience to deepen an examination of the academic achievement and retention puzzles?

Presenter(s)

Aurelia Kollasch, Iowa State University
Jie Sun, Iowa State University

Texas Consumer Resource on Education and Workforce Statistics – 1771

Table 4

Analysis

This discussion addresses the need for consumer information to help students and parents make informed decisions on postsecondary education and get the best returns on their educational investments. A new consumer tool called Texas CREWS is reviewed for content and utility. The following questions guide discussion: (1) Is education a consumer good? (2) Is there a need for consumer information on education, and what information should a consumer report include? (3) Does TX CREWS

have useful information for the consumer? (4) How can TX CREWS be improved to be a better consumer report application?

Presenter(s)

Ruben Garcia, Texas Workforce Commission
Gabriela Borcoman, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Panel Sessions

Assessing Higher Education Learning Outcomes Globally – 1461

Panzacola F3

Assessment

This panel presentation reports key IR-relevant insights gained from international and national leadership of a major higher education study. Between 2010 and 2012, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) ran the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) Feasibility Study. AHELO involved 23,000 students and 5,000 faculty at 250 institutions in 17 countries. Governed by officials from participating countries, AHELO was executed by an international consortium of research agencies. Responding directly to several quality and strategy concerns, AHELO sought to determine whether higher education learning outcomes could be assessed in ways that are efficient and internationally comparable. The implementation and outcomes of AHELO highlighted much about the nature and assessment of tertiary learning. Drawing on research processes and outcomes, the presentation documents implications for IR scholarship, methodology, practice, and policy.

Presenter(s)

Alexander McCormick, Indiana University Bloomington
Mary Catharine Lennon, University of Toronto
Hamish Coates, University of Melbourne
Charles S. Lenth, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

Performance Funding: What's Now and Next—State Community College Perspectives – 1179

Panzacola F4

Reporting

Calls for accountability and transparency coupled with austere state budgets are contributing to the resurgence of Performance Funding (PF 2.0 is underway in 22 states). State legislatures and governors are seeking student progress and performance returns for their higher education investments. Chief research officers from three major community college states in different stages of PF 2.0 development – established, operational, and re-entering PF – conduct this session. Session leaders will engage in a discussion of key decision points (e.g., selecting and operationalizing metrics, weighting, establishing a level playing field, comparative



reference points, etc.), describe future directions, and provide a national context.

Presenter(s)

Scott Parke, Florida College System
Cory Clasemann, Ivy Tech Community College
Nathan Wilson, Illinois Community College Board

Post-Collegiate Outcome Measures: Who, What, Where, When, Why? – 1238

Panzacola F2

Assessment

This panel represents broad perspectives on post-collegiate outcomes and explores the rationale for different types of measures for different audiences. Panelists are asked to address: Who?—Who will be included in the measure and for whom is this an appropriate measure? What?—What data get collected, analyzed, and displayed? Where?—Where are the data coming from and where are the former students going? When?—When is the appropriate time to measure this outcome? Why?—Why are these data important?

Presenter(s)

Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Tod Massa, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Brian Prescott, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Christine Keller, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

Speaker Sessions

AAIR Best Presentation: Modelling Continuing Load at Disaggregated Levels in Flinders University – 1922

Panzacola H2

Analysis



This paper compares the current methodology of estimating continuing load in the following year with an alternative methodology developed by the Planning Services Unit. The current methodology creates one estimate per course and utilises the previous year's continuation rate unless exogenous information suggests otherwise. The proposed alternative methodology disaggregates courses according to student academic characteristics that are associated with continuation rates. The methodology uses a generalised linear statistical model, derived from varying amounts of historic data, to estimate continuing load separately within each course cross-classification.

Presenter(s)

Ewa Seidel, Flinders University

A Comparison of Student and Alumni Experiences by Program Delivery Modality – 1576

Panzacola H3

Decision-Support

As the number of online programs burgeons, it is valuable to understand online students' experiences relative to their face-to-face counterparts. Nova Southeastern University's annual alumni and student surveys were designed to assess the student experience and allow us to investigate possible differences among modalities (campus-based residential, campus-based commuter, online, and blended). Our results broadly indicate that online students are just as – if not more – satisfied with the overall quality of their educations at NSU compared to campus-based students. Beyond this generality, we explored whether this finding is moderated by level (i.e., undergraduate, master's, doctorate), college (e.g., Arts and Sciences, Business, etc.), and a variety of other factors.

Presenter(s)

Arie Spiegel, Nova Southeastern University
Barbara Packer-Muti, Nova Southeastern University
Donald Rudawsky, Nova Southeastern University

A Survival Analysis on Gender and Racial Differences in Faculty Resignation – 1646

Panzacola H4

Decision-Support

Utilizing survival analysis, this study seeks to understand faculty voluntary turnover at a large research university over a period of 10 years, focusing in particular on gender and racial differences. The results revealed issues related to timing of resignation, racial disparity, age, compensation, and other hurdles in one's academic career path. The findings have significant implications for timing, strategies, and targets of interventions that aim to increase faculty retention and thus to enhance institutional commitment to general equity and campus diversity. Through this study, the researchers demonstrate in detail how advanced statistical techniques could be applied to administrative data to support various policy objects, including faculty retention.

Presenter(s)

Jin Chen, Indiana University-Bloomington
Patricia Goodall, Indiana University-Bloomington

A Tale of Three Models: What Contributes to Student Persistence – 1704

Panzacola H1

Decision-Support

Predictive modeling of student data can be an effective tool for addressing issues of enrollment management, institutional fit, and persistence to graduation. A predictive model was developed using the 2006 and 2007 Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) cohorts and used to score the 2008, 2009, and 2010 cohorts. As a follow-up to two previous analyses focusing on student retention in the first year and second year, data from the National Student Clearinghouse were used to investigate issues of institutional fit and affordability for students persisting to the third year. A comparison of variables that impact retention in the first, second, and third years was developed. The changing profile of students as they progress towards graduation provides insight into new approaches to student programming designed to increase persistence to graduation.

Presenter(s)

Rebecca Patterson, University of Louisville
Robert Goldstein, University of Louisville
Arnold Hook, University of Louisville
IL Young Barrow, University of Louisville

Aligning Workforce Needs and Higher Education in Florida – 1511

Wekiwa 3

Assessment

The alignment of workforce needs with educational attainment persists as a key accountability issue facing higher education institutions across the U.S. A central challenge underlying this issue is the disconnect between some high demand, high growth occupations and the corresponding supply of graduates who hold degrees in appropriate disciplines. Recognizing these challenges, the State University System of Florida led a state-wide, cross-sector gap analysis to identify shortfalls between workforce demand and corresponding degree attainment in baccalaureate-level occupations. The presenters provide in-depth discussion on the gap analysis methodology, noting key decision points made at each step of the process to respond strategically to current and future workforce needs. Further, participants in this session will be able to understand the approach and key considerations for possible replication of this study in other institutional, system, and state-level contexts.

Presenter(s)

Jason Jones, State University System of Florida
Andrew Morse, State University System of Florida

Alumni Outcomes and ROI: Predicting Likelihood to Recommend Alma Mater – 1650

Sebastian L3

Analysis

Policy-makers, accreditation bodies, state regulatory agencies, and taxpayers are interested in the return on investment (ROI) of a university degree. Additionally, institutions are interested in the ROI of alumni from the perspectives of institutional research, marketing, communications, faculty and course development, and student satisfaction. In Fall 2012, Capella University commissioned a custom study with Noel-Levitz to explore outcomes and satisfaction among business alumni from Capella compared to a national sample. After using the data to benchmark our outcomes against other sectors' outcomes, we turned to three goals: demonstrating ROI, increasing recommendations, and assessing our reputation. To do this, we used logistic regression to model Capella alumni's likelihood of recommending Capella. The presentation focuses on the methods used as well as applicability to other analyses of understanding student and alumni outcomes, ROI, and satisfaction.

Presenter(s)

Laura Fingerson, Capella University

Data Envelopment Analysis as a Tool For HBCUs – 1559

Sebastian L2

Decision-Support

Constrained resources often impose tough administrative decisions on HBCUs. As such, efficiency for HBCUs is paramount. The efficiency of HBCUs, however, cannot be understood singularly. This paper presents Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), a non-parametric tool for comparing the technical efficiency of HBCUs. DEA has several advantages, particularly for groups of institutions like HBCUs that are diverse in organization, but share several external challenges. First, HBCUs use a diverse number of resources (inputs) to address a diverse number of goals (outputs). Secondly, DEA envelops the efficiency scores of institutions with comparisons to "peers", institutions with similar resource combinations. The results depict several aspects of DEA's usefulness, pointing out the HBCUs that are most efficient.

Presenter(s)

Jason Coupet, University of Illinois at Chicago



Discover a Comprehensive Approach to Institutional & Student Success with Campus – 1872

Wekiwa 4

Analysis



Every campus runs on data. Efficiently collecting data and sharing that data in meaningful ways can be challenging tasks. The Campus Labs® platform, in use at over 750 colleges and universities, supports institutional and student success by connecting data in a centralized location. Our solution allows campuses to increase transparency, produce reports and self-studies, improve retention and raise student engagement, and interpret data for decision making and resource allocation. Attend this session to see how the Campus Labs platform can be used to connect assessment data from across the institution and report on institutional and student success to stakeholders.

Presenter(s)

Annemieke Rice, Campus Labs

IPEDS Upload File Formats – Leveraging Technology to Reduce Reporting Burden – 1663

Sebastian 11

Reporting

As the workload burden continues to increase with additional IPEDS reporting requirements, and the new surveys come online in academic year 2014-2015, many IR offices are pressed for time to complete the surveys. Institutions must develop systematic practices to work more efficiently while staying within the limits of budget restraints. The presenters offer solutions to reduce the IPEDS reporting burden by using a framework of best practices for developing and uploading IPEDS data files and show institutions how to leverage technology to get this done more efficiently.

Presenter(s)

*Donna Silber, Maricopa Community College System
Sonia Schaible-Brandon, Colorado Mesa University*

IR Office Becomes a Student Success Office at a Large Community College: New Model at NOVA – 1187

Sebastian 14

Operations

By exploring NOVA's journey from focusing on access to focusing on success, participants will learn how an IR office transitioned to lead and support student success initiatives. Specifically, this presentation covers how the IR office transitioned to a student success initiatives office, the impact of the transition on student success initiatives, improvements in major student success outcomes as a result of this transition, and institutional advantages in reorganizing the IR office. Restructuring an IR office to focus on success is important because institutional funding is increasingly tied to success instead of access. Therefore, IR offices must shift

from analyzing and reporting enrollment data to investigating factors influencing success. Without IR offices directly connected to success, institutions could struggle in the new higher education era devoted to success.

Presenter(s)

George Gabriel, Northern Virginia Community College

Leading Data Governance Activities: Perspectives from Two Institutions – 1246

Wekiwa 9

Operations

Data governance is a management activity carried out to ensure effective data access, usage, integrity, and integration that is critically important in an environment of ERP systems and business intelligence. It involves understanding and guiding a diverse and often-conflicting set of personalities and perspectives. Those who lead it must be at least as adept in politics, communication, and diplomacy as they are in their knowledge of information technology. Two seasoned institutional researchers share structures, policies, and lessons learned when they have been charged with leading data governance on their campuses.

Presenter(s)

*William Knight, Ball State University
Gregory Rogers, University of Miami*

Learning Outcomes as Statements of Value: A Proposal – 1530

Wekiwa 6

Assessment

This paper proposes that learning outcomes ought foremost to be statements of the values held by a program of study. To make the case, it borrows from what the social sciences refer to as the new institutionalism. Any alteration in the conception of learning outcomes must allow them to maintain their roles in demonstrating institutional effectiveness. But, when written as statements of value, outcomes give an indication of the particular concepts, modes of thinking, and ways of acting that a program wishes to emphasize among the many other possible emphases within a discipline. Embedded within all programs are a set of values that have served as the criteria for such choices. Outcomes should thus not attempt to provide a global description of a discipline, but should instead serve to make these programmatic values explicit. As a result, outcome statements may become more finely tuned expressions of what faculty teach and why.

Presenter(s)

William Buhrman, St. Mary's University



Majoring in STEM? An Inquiry into the Major Choice of Native and Immigrant College Students – 1916

Wekiwa 5

Analysis

Presenter: Ning Jia, University of Notre Dame The government has identified STEM education as a top national priority. The goal is to produce one million more U.S. college graduates with STEM degrees than what are expected at the current rates over the next decade (Office of Science and Technology Policy, 2012). While researchers have examined high skilled immigration in the college educated STEM workforce, little is known about immigrants in the STEM pipeline in college. Using data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study 2004/09 (BPS: 2004/09), I fill in this gap and address the following questions. Are immigrant students more likely to major in STEM fields than their native counterparts? If so, what is driving their higher likelihood of majoring in STEM? The ultimate goal of this project is to inform policy makers about the important factors contributing to students' college STEM attainment.

Presenter(s)

Ning Jia, University of Notre Dame

Making Future Scientists: Campuses' Efficiency in STEM Degree Production – 1469

Panzacola F1

Analysis

Recent reports make it clear that the U.S. needs to dramatically increase its production of undergraduate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Efforts to hold institutions accountable for generating more bachelor's degrees in STEM tend to focus on poor STEM completion rates, which ignore vast differences in measures of institutional capital, labor, and technological capacity. This presentation highlights an alternative metric for understanding how efficient U.S. colleges and universities are at producing undergraduate degrees in STEM, which takes into account measures of financial capital, human capital, and faculty labor. Through this approach, we identify exemplar campuses engaging in best practices in STEM degree production that can be further studied to understand what unique approaches they have undertaken with regard to undergraduate STEM education.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Sylvia Hurtado, University of California-Los Angeles
Tanya Figueroa, University of California-Los Angeles
Bryce Hughes, University of California-Los Angeles

Surveying Alumni: More than Just Employment and Salary – 1080

Wekiwa 7

Decision-Support

Alumni have long been a difficult group from which to collect data. In light of the need for reliable alumni data highlighted by President Obama's call to ensure college affordability – in part by connecting an institution's access to financial aid with institutional performance measures, such as alumni employment – it behooves universities to capture these data themselves, as questions will arise when and if such a plan moves forward. In this presentation, we share our experience evaluating our university's current, disparate methods for capturing alumni data and developing a plan for a more systematic campus process. We outline our search for peer comparison data and the necessary balance between comparative and longitudinal data needs. We also outline the potential data sources we identified, both within and beyond our university, and explain the resulting data collection plan, including the types of data we decided were important to collect.

Presenter(s)

Gina Johnson, University of Denver
Katie Schroeder, University of Denver

Toward Greater Simplification and Transparency of Higher Education Data – 1595

Sebastian L4

Analysis



This session presents findings from two new reports. One identifies key questions of importance to postsecondary consumers and policymakers, maps these questions against existing data sources, and makes recommendations for improvements to federal data systems. The other reviews the history and potential of proposals to establish a student unit record data system. Presenters offer a broad view of the postsecondary data landscape, identify data limitations, and offer recommendations for improvements. Both are part of the Gates Foundation's Reimagining Aid Design and Delivery project, through which a consortium of organizations develop policy recommendations to improve America's higher education system.

Presenter(s)

Alegneta Long, Institute for Higher Education Policy
Mamie Voight, Institute for Higher Education Policy
Clare McCann, New America Foundation
Amy Laitinen, New America Foundation



Transparency in an Age of Data Analytics – 1518

Sebastian L1

Assessment

Internal and external constituencies expect colleges and universities to be more transparent with their data, information, and decision processes. However, within the institution, knowing what data to share and who to share the data with can be a perplexing process. Because institutional research professionals are frequently at the center of these discussions, this session focuses on the challenges faced by one institution that wrestled with sharing scholarly productivity data in an effort to improve academic programs and departments. Considerations, lessons learned, and pitfalls are highlighted and shared in this session.

Presenter(s)

Mardy Eimers, University of Missouri Columbia

We're Listening: Improving Survey Processes Based on Student Feedback – 1290

Sebastian I2

Decision-Support

Low survey response rates can impair data quality and lead to nonresponse bias. In an era of increasing reliance on survey data, maximizing response rates is imperative. Although extant studies provide suggestions for survey practices that can improve response rates, institutions are unique and must critically consider which recommendations are most relevant to their populations. In an effort to improve survey practices and thus response rates, we interviewed students to learn about their experiences with our surveys, what forces deter nonresponders from participating in surveys, and how we can best motivate students to participate. We dovetail our interview findings with observations of past survey practices and analyses of past response rates in order to distill best practices for our campus. These practices are shared with clients to improve survey processes and, in turn, response rates, reducing the chance that our data is compromised by nonresponse bias.

Presenter(s)

Lauren Conoscenti, Tufts University

Withdrawals are Addictive: Findings from the PAR Cross-Institutional Data – 1597

Sebastian I3

Analysis

The PAR Proof of Concept found that student withdrawals were not isolated events, and had lasting impacts on students' academic careers. Students with withdrawals in the previous term were more likely to withdraw in later terms and less likely to achieve passing grades in their courses. This session expands on these initial findings using the latest PAR data, which includes 16 institutions and 3+ years worth of longitudinal student and course-level records. The

presentation discusses the new data set, the methodology applied, and the results of the analysis.

Presenter(s)

Rebecca Barber, Arizona State University

12:15 PM–01:45 PM

Special Event

Lunch Break and Poster Presentations (Thursday)

Exhibit Hall (Sebastian J/K)

A dedicated lunch break is co-located with the Poster Presentations. Special menu pricing will be offered for lunch in all Rosen Shingle Creek hotel outlets at \$13; cash carts in common areas will offer a sandwich, chips, and a drink for \$13.

01:15 PM–01:45 PM

Special Event

Dessert Break - Thank You to Our Sponsors

Exhibit Hall (Sebastian J/K)

Please join us for a complimentary dessert break to close the Exhibit Hall and thank our 2014 Sponsors.

12:45 PM–01:45 PM

Poster Gallery Q&A

The Poster Gallery Q&A for odd numbered posters is Wednesday 12:45-1:45 p.m.

A Graphical Representation of Survey Quantity and Quality on Informed Decision-Making

Poster 26

Analysis

This session graphically presents the findings of a study of community colleges and universities to assess the impact of quantity and quality response rates on informed decision-making. The presentation provides IR professionals a critical analysis of why individuals respond to surveys and to what extent their responses are of value (quality) to an organization in terms of collecting, analyzing, and utilizing survey data in a holistic approach to decision-making and outcomes. A mixed-mode survey methodology was used to collect the sample population dataset. Attendees will better understand how the respondents perceived and responded to surveys to improve institutional survey methods/outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Kenneth Scott, Trenholm State Technical College

Mimi Johnson, Trenholm State Technical College

Novadean Watson-Stone, American Public University System

Aggregation and Presentation of University-Level Learning Outcomes

Poster 36

Assessment

With increased expectations to present meaningful data around learning outcomes, institutional researchers are uniquely poised to share their expertise with curricular and co-curricular programs and departments. This poster provides examples of ways to present program-level and aligned university-level outcomes data to engage a variety of stakeholders. Viewers will recognize graphic displays commonly used in institutional research that have been appropriately adapted and applied to learning outcomes assessment.

Presenter(s)

Tracy Williams, Hamline University

Assessing Gen Ed Assessment Methods: Course-Based, Capstones, E-portfolios

Poster 20

Assessment

Hostos Community College is currently assessing general education using a course-based strategy. The college is piloting e-portfolios and capstone assignments to determine

which of the three methods will be most useful for assessing general education. This session focuses on the results from each method, as well as issues of implementation, faculty buy-in, and cost effectiveness. Results from this study will be used by the college to identify the method(s) to be used moving forward.

Presenter(s)

Richard Gampert, Hostos Community College - City University of New York

Baccalaureate in STEM: Impact of Program Quality, Interaction, and Learning

Poster 44

Decision-Support

This study examines the impact of program quality, academic interaction, and learning experiences, and seeks to understand the relations and effects of these selected factors on student degree completion in STEM. I hypothesize that the factors of academic interaction and program quality have effects on STEM major baccalaureate completion in higher education institutions, as mediated by the factor of student learning experiences. Using survey data from the Longitudinal Study of American Youth (LSAY), this study addresses: (1) Is a student's baccalaureate attainment in STEM related to college instructional factors of program quality and academic interactions? (2) After accounting for pre-college characteristics and postsecondary enrollment intensity, is the relationship between instructional factors and a student's baccalaureate attainment mediated by the degree to which the student has a positive learning experience? Structural equation modeling is applied to address the research questions.

Presenter(s)

Hui Wu, University of Wisconsin - Madison

Classroom FTE Projection Using Enrollment Growth Assumptions in Majors

Poster 40

Decision-Support

This FTE projection model uses assumptions collected from academic department chairs on headcount increase to drive classroom FTE projection and support facilities management. Since major FTE and classroom FTE are interrelated complexly, a sequence of conversions is necessary to correlate major headcount and classroom FTE. In the development of this report, statements of enrollment increase assumptions are collected from department chairs. The products of this report are three tables: enrollment projection by major, FTE projection by major, and FTE projection by discipline. Assumption of the overall enrollment growth from enrollment management is used to gauge the total enrollment increase.

Presenter(s)

Eva Chan, CUNY Medgar Evers College



Completion by Design: Improving Student Success through Curricular Mapping

Poster 32

Decision-Support

Nationally, community colleges have come under increasing scrutiny for student success outcomes. Rising student loan default rates, demands for accountability, and student success-based funding have led colleges to re-examine institutional processes and student outcomes. This presentation details how curricular mapping and student pathway analysis was used to address time-to-degree and degree completion rates for students who are enrolled in high-demand health majors at the College and who have been negatively impacted by wait lists and program requirements. Academic pathway redesign has resulted in more than double the number of Associate of Science degrees awarded over the previous academic year.

Presenter(s)

Peter Trumpower, Stark State College

Designing a Dashboard for Students in Japanese Universities

Poster 54

Technologies

This presentation discusses our efforts in Japanese cultural context to design a web-based feedback/forward system that directly informs Japanese students of their progress toward success. We showcase the demo-version of the dashboard, discuss its rationale, and share our experience with the development of the system. The dashboard in the making will provide students with three categories of information: (1) a student's academic progress relative to other students, (2) a dynamic course catalog that shows the relevancy of each course to the declared major and other courses, and (3) a student's learning analyzed by self-directed learning theories.

Presenter(s)

Takeshi Matsuda, Shimane University

Yuki Watanabe, Tokyo Metropolitan University

Katsusuke Shigeta, Hokkaido University

Hiroshi Kato, The Open University of Japan

Exploratory Analysis of Distance Education Data in IPEDS Completions Survey

Poster 58

Analysis

The newly-established completions data about graduates of distance education programs are presented. Various institutional and programmatic factors are presented in several tables and charts about the number of graduates from distance education programs offered at the institutional, sector, and national levels. These data are extremely relevant to institutional, state, and national policy leaders as they continue to understand more succinctly the magnitude or scale of distance education programs offered by institutions in the public and private sectors.

Presenter(s)

Kurt Gunnell, Western Governors University



Are You in the Loop?

eAIR is your free
monthly connection
to all things IR.

Tools

Trends

Innovations

Opportunities

Stay informed.
Stay connected.
Subscribe today.

www.airweb.org/eair

Extremely Silent but Incredibly Suggestive: The Profile of Non-Respondents

Poster 52

Analysis

The pressure to improve the response rate of a self-rating student survey is one cause of worry for IR regardless of country. This is because even non-respondents cannot be ignored in considering the overall effectiveness of the institution. However, do non-respondents tell nothing? Do the collected data show only the respondents' information? This study aims to reveal the characteristics of non-respondents to a student survey, listening deeply to the voices of non-respondents. Sharing of an idea about this new approach with participants who confront similar problems is hoped.

Presenter(s)

Takashi Kawanabe, Ritsumeikan University
Tomoko Torii, Ritsumeikan University

Math Requirement Fulfillment at a Two-Year College: A Matter of When

Poster 24

Analysis

This study focuses on the relationship between the time when two-year college students fulfill their math requirements (developmental or college-level) and their longer-term success. The findings add new empirical insight into the extent to which the timing of math requirement fulfillment matters to community college student success. The study also highlights viable data sources that can help better understand the complex processes underlying the pathways to student success in community colleges.

Presenter(s)

Xueli Wang, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Yan Wang, Milwaukee Area Technical College

Online Certificate in IR at Florida State University—Professional Development

Poster 34

Operations

This session is developed to share an online certificate program designed to provide academic and professional development opportunities for institutional researchers, administrators, doctoral students, and faculty from all higher education institutions. The program is designed to accommodate the working professional's schedule. The program goals are (1) to enhance knowledge and understanding of the core principles of IR; (2) to facilitate use of national databases; and (3) to promote the use of IR to improve administrative and policy development processes. The 18-credit hour curriculum focuses on IR theory, institutional administration, quantitative research methods, utilization of national databases, and IR practice.

Presenter(s)

Paul Stonecipher, Florida State University

Penn State IR Certificate: Providing Credit for AIR Experiences

Poster 42

Operations

With support from AIR, Penn State offers an on-line graduate program for institutional researchers. The program is designed to provide students with the skills that support institutional planning, analysis, and policy formation, benefitting in-career professionals, institutional researchers, graduate students, and persons in related fields. This poster session describes how students can participate in the AIR Data and Decisions Academy or the Data Institute and receive graduate credit towards the Penn State Institutional Research Certificate.

Presenter(s)

Justin Ortagus, Penn State University

Propensity Score Matching: Evaluating Student Participation in Organizations

Poster 12

Analysis

Although used frequently in other fields, propensity score matching (PSM) has been infrequently used in higher education. This poster provides higher education researchers with a pedagogical application of propensity score matching to examine the long-term effects of participation in ethnic/racial student organizations during college on post-college civic engagement. This study utilized a multi-institutional, ten-year longitudinal dataset from UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). The sample included 8,634 college alumni from 229 institutions who were surveyed as freshman, four years later as seniors, and then six years after graduation. This approach can aid college administrators in evaluating the effectiveness of various programs and activities on their campuses utilizing propensity score matching techniques.

Presenter(s)

Nicholas Bowman, Bowling Green State University

Resident Success Characteristics for Programs in Appalachia and Rural America Compared with Other Regions

Poster 50

Decision-Support



This poster session presents the findings from an AACOM-funded IR study which analyzed institutional support factors influencing student success in post graduate training by the region in which the residency program was located. The study answered the following research question: Which institutional support factors influence student success in post graduate training, specifically between factors for post graduate training in Appalachia and rural America and post graduate training



in other geographic settings? While there was some agreement by program directors and graduates as to which the characteristics successful residents possess, program directors statistically differed by region which characteristics they identified being in their top important characteristics.

Presenter(s)

Meg Sidle, University of Pikeville

SAS Tips and Tricks Used in IR Raw Data Manipulation and Project Reporting

Poster 56

Technologies



Institutional research offices collect all kinds of data in different formats from different sources. Sometimes, the raw data can not be used directly for reporting; they must be manipulated first. The SAS software has the power to manipulate the raw data efficiently and effectively. Some SAS tips and tricks introduced herewith are very useful in dealing with the dirty data in IR routine projects and/or ad hoc studies. The SAS sample codes of the tips and tricks are shared herewith so that SAS users can take them home and use them in their IR projects.

Presenter(s)

Robert Zhang, Chatham University

Spatial Analysis of Student Data: Geography in Institutional Research

Poster 10

Decision-Support

Geographic examination and visual display of the spatial components of institutional data holds within it great power to express patterns connected to both place and time – data and information that might otherwise be permanently buried in digital files. This poster session presents the results of a study of applicant and enrollment data at a Kansas community college. Through the use of clustering analysis, Thiessen polygons, and the urban geographic concept of the gravity model, five years of data were examined to determine best possible scenarios for focusing marketing efforts to recruit new students.

Presenter(s)

Mitch Stimers, Cloud County Community College

Students' Perceptions of Campus Community: An Empirical Analysis

Poster 6

Analysis



This study applied Boyer's campus community model to assess students' perceptions of campus communities at universities in the country Ghana. Survey data from Boyer's instruments were used to construct a composite campus community perception index (CCPI). The CCPI was regressed on institutional characteristic

factors constructed from McDonald's college and university community inventory (CUCI) survey data. The regression results indicated that students' perceptions of campus community might be significantly influenced by institutional characteristics and student demographic factors. The results also indicated that 60-80 percent of respondents perceived their campus communities as being purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, celebrative, learning, social, and/or all-inclusive. The policy implications of the results are also discussed.

Presenter(s)

Edward Acquah, Athabasca University

The Alpha, Bravo, Charlie of Military Student Success—A Proposed Framework

Poster 22

Analysis

President Obama's initial State of the Union address discussed his plan to bring home 34,000 troops in the next year while planning to responsibly end the war by the end of 2014. An unanswered question remains: "What is being done to ensure the success for these tens of thousands of students returning to campuses nationwide?" This poster presentation discusses the combination and modification of Bean and Metzner (1985) and Swail's (2003) persistence theories and posits a new framework for military student (e.g., veteran, active duty, National Guard, and reservists) persistence. The framework considers relevant measures of military student outcomes set forth by a working group organized by the Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC). The statistical method behind this study includes advanced regression analyses. The session also briefly discusses the transition from theory to practice in the development of an early warning system catered to the success of military students.

Presenter(s)

Rosa Belerique, California State University, Long Beach

The Impact of Deep Learning and Academic Discipline on Degree Aspirations

Poster 16

Assessment



This study investigates the extent to which individual learning behaviors and disciplinary-based academic environments affect college seniors' plans to earn graduate degrees. Applying Holland's (1997) theory to describe academic environments within colleges and universities, this study sets out to reveal qualities of academic environments associated with higher degree aspirations, and whether or not the effect of deep approaches to learning on graduate school plans is moderated by the disciplinary culture. Results indicate that engaging in deep approaches to learning has a stronger influence on degree aspirations for students in artistic (e.g., music) and enterprising (e.g., business) academic environments than students in investigative (e.g., biology) fields. The study's findings may inform the work of institutional researchers, faculty, academic advisors, and faculty developers as well as academic units looking for ways to bolster graduate school enrollments.

Presenter(s)

Louis Rocconi, Indiana University Bloomington

Amy Ribera, National Survey of Student Engagement

Thomas Nelson Laird, Indiana University

The Importance of Well-Being: Research, Measurement, and Interventions

Poster 4

Assessment

This session focuses on the effect of employee well-being on major cost drivers and provides researchers with the tools to measure well-being and empirically sound practices for improving employee well-being. Specifically, physical health, mental health, employee turnover, absenteeism, and employee inefficiency are among a few cost drivers that are affected by well-being. This poster provides the "why" and "how" for working with the abstract concept of well-being.

Presenter(s)

Jon McNaughtan, University of Michigan- Ann Arbor

The Relationship between Service Learning and Deep Learning

Poster 14

Analysis



This poster presentation details research using NSSE data to further understand the relationship between participation in a service learning course and a student's deep learning skills. With more attention directed to the public purposes of higher education and undergraduate learning, this topic's relevance to institutional research is significant. The objectives of the session are to (1) describe the origin and subsequent growth of service learning courses, (2) describe deep learning and its constructs of higher order learning, integrative learning, and reflective learning, and (3)

describe the research on the relationship between service learning and deep learning and its implications

Presenter(s)

Tom Hahn, Indiana University - Purdue University, Indianapolis

Three Models of Assessing Student Learning in Innovative Science Curricula

Poster 2

Assessment

Effective use of assessment that illuminates students' attitudes toward the curriculum and experiences with various pedagogical practices can be highly instructive and beneficial in supporting the development of innovative undergraduate teaching approaches in the life sciences. This poster presents three dynamic, multi-pronged assessment plans that contribute to our understanding of student learning and engagement. This poster provides a visual map of the assessment process for three life science courses from choosing appropriate measures that match course goals, to collecting and analyzing data, to using results to inform and enhance practice.

Presenter(s)

Brit Toven-Lindsey, University of California-Los Angeles

Time to the Doctorate: Impact of Major Choice from Bachelor's to Doctorate

Poster 38

Decision-Support

In recent years, there have been increased concerns at institutional and national levels that too many doctoral students leave programs without completing degrees; many who complete the doctorate take too long to complete their degrees. This study combines nine years of data from the Survey of Earned Doctorates and institutional records to examine factors that impact time to the doctoral degree at a large metropolitan public research university. The study focuses on graduates who earned doctorates at the institution between 2004 and 2012 and who also earned bachelor's and master's degrees (at the study institution or elsewhere) prior to earning the doctorate. This study particularly examines how students' major trajectories (choice of study fields) from bachelor's to doctoral level impact time to the doctorate, after controlling for other factors (e.g., student background, sources of support, prior degrees completed at the institution, etc.)

Presenter(s)

Felly Chiteng Kot, Georgia State University

Valuing Undergraduate Education: Determining a Maximum Degree Price

Poster 48

Analysis



Is college education worth the expense? Despite generating massive political attention in the past year, little quantitative academic research has been done on this topic. This research proposes a methodology



for determining the maximum price to pay for undergraduate degrees by career choice. Further, maximum prices for average baccalaureate degrees are calculated. Now that the Obama Administration has proposed tying funding to outcomes, it is crucial for AIR members to have ideas of the financial values of degrees. The first step is having and understanding a valuation method.

Presenter(s)

Patricia Bartholomew, Auburn University

Why do Students Switch Majors?

Poster 8

Decision-Support

Choosing a suitable major is essential to on-time graduation, but many students change majors, which slows their progress. Using data from the Enrolled Student Survey, this study examined the factors related to major “switching” and investigated reasons why students change majors by disciplines. The results of logistic regression show that students with poor academic preparation, a planned major in sciences, and preference for easy coursework are more likely to switch majors. The most frequent switching paths within disciplines were between majors in Social Sciences and Sciences. For cross-divisional changes, the most frequent switches were from Sciences to Social Sciences and Social Sciences to Humanities. The reasons with the greatest divisional differences included potential job placement opportunities, stress of intended majors, poor grades, and being turned off by introductory courses.

Presenter(s)

Jessie Liu, Dartmouth College

Lynn Foster-Johnson, Dartmouth College

Why Do They Leave? A Withdrawn Student Study

Poster 18

Decision-Support

New College of Florida, a small public liberal Arts college, needs timely, reliable information on why some students choose to leave the College. Past attempts to systematically survey exiting students using paper- and Web-based questionnaires resulted in low response rates and yielded little insight. To collect information quickly, a telephone interview was developed for the study, and the methodology yielded a much higher response rate. The analysis has found that the most frequently-selected reason is that students’ experience were not as they expected. Also, former students were far more likely to discuss their decisions to leave New College with parents, friends, and faculty advisors versus campus supporting staff. As a result of the study, the College plans to strengthen relations and communications with parents and conduct further studies to close gaps between students’ expectations and experiences.

Presenter(s)

Preston Bennett, New College of Florida

02:00 PM–02:45 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Analysis of Performance in Key Chemistry Courses of Transfer Students – 1840

Table 3

Analysis

This discussion addresses the academic performance of transfer students in STEM majors within the context of grades earned in chemistry courses at their previous institutions. How can we identify key indicators that affect the academic performance of transfer students? Does the interruption of a course sequence affect transfer students’ success at the next level? What can institutions do to identify students who may lack adequate preparation for STEM majors? What factors should be considered when developing a methodology for robust and adequate data collection of this population? What kind of statistical approaches would be appropriate for this analysis?

Presenter(s)

Danilo Le Sante, Florida International University

Assessing College Educational Quality: An Inside Look at Academic Rigor, Teaching Quality, and Learning Objectives – 1823

Table 7

Assessment

This session describes the College Educational Quality (CEQ) project and the results from the first pilot study at two research institutions in Spring 2013. This project aims to create comprehensive measures of educational quality (academic rigor, teaching quality, learning objectives) at the institution level. By using teaching observation, syllabus analyses, and student surveys, measures of educational quality could yield new insights for benchmarking institutions. This session discusses the feasibility and benefits of comprehensive summative measures of college educational quality at the institutional level. Discussion questions: (1) How would the CEQ project be useful for your institution? (2) What would be the challenges in implementing CEQ at your institution? (3) What data does your institution currently collect on educational quality? What data do you wish you had? (4) Do you have the ability to benchmark educational quality across institutions? How?

Presenter(s)

Jessica Ostrow, Teachers College, Columbia University

Christopher Chamberlin, Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art

Delta Cost Project Users Group – 1465*Table 1**Analysis*

This discussion addresses Delta Cost Project data access, including both the Trends in College Spending web-based interface and the data download site; issues users have found in using the data, including timeliness, accuracy, completeness, and so forth; and the issue of grouped institutions and how the data can be disaggregated using IPEDS data as needed. Also, the issue of grouping IPEDS data to match the DCP institution groupings is reviewed. This discussion addresses how the data can be combined with other IPEDS data to create useful metrics. Questions to Lead Discussion: 1. Grouped institutions – to work with or work around them? 2. Timeliness of updates – how to get more recent data? 3. What are the best practices in using the information? 4. Suggestions for improvement?

Presenter(s)

David Mongold, University of Hawaii System

Enrollment Projection Using Return Ratio and Logistic Regression Models – 1795*Table 8**Decision-Support*

Accurate enrollment forecasts are crucial for postsecondary institutions in order to recruit new students as well as appropriate resource allocations. Therefore, it is critical to take the right steps in order to select, build, and refine an appropriate enrollment forecasting model. The discussion addresses the following questions: (1) Which of the two models (AVR vs. LRM) is a better forecasting model? (2) What are the significant variables influencing students to continue from prior semester to the next semester? (3) What are the limitations of these two models and how can the error rates be reduced?

Presenter(s)

Tania Das, Binghamton University

Nasrin Fatima, Binghamton University - State University of New York

Exploring Reporting Capabilities with FSSE 2014 – 1239*Table 9**Assessment*

The primary purpose of this session is to highlight new reporting features of the FSSE 2014 administration as well as demonstrate how the updates and changes will assist institutions in their improvement efforts. Session attendees have opportunities to ask questions of the presenters (e.g., How can I customize my reports? How can I use these new features? How do these features correspond with NSSE 2014 updates?) and explore ways to enhance their future survey findings.

Presenter(s)

Leah Peck, Indiana University-Bloomington

Yi-Chen Chiang, Indiana University-Bloomington

Integrating Assessment, IR, APR, and Accreditation: Work Smarter Not Harder – 1133*Table 4**Assessment*

(1) In your institution, who is responsible for completing data collection, analysis, and reporting in IR, assessment, academic program review, and accreditation efforts? Are these done by the same office or multiple entities? (2) How do you communicate with different parties that are responsible for these types of projects to make sure that they are on the same page and using the same data? (3) What issues have you had surrounding coordinating these types of projects? (4) What strategies are you using that integrate these types of projects? If you are not, what questions do you have about how to do this?

Presenter(s)

Shari Jorissen, Walden University

Nicole Holland, Walden University

Crissie Grove Jameson, Walden University

Survey Palooza – 1721*Table 5**Operations*

Survey Policy Palooza—how to say yes, and no, to survey requests, and how to have a policy to back you up and assist you in managing the survey scheduling process at your institution. It can be an overwhelming task to manage not only data reporting, but also data collection via the armada of survey requestors at your institution. An increasingly sought-after discussion topic at previous Forums, this discussion provides policy and practice examples and support from fellow survey warriors.

Presenter(s)

Julliana Brey, Carroll University

The Effect of Tablet and Mobile Technologies on University Survey Data – 1774*Table 6**Technologies*

Recent enhancements in tablet and mobile technologies are changing how respondents interact with surveys. This small group discussion session briefly provides information about technology use trends among college students and describes the effect of these trends on surveys at a large U.S. university. The following questions are discussed: (1) What demographics are most likely to use mobile technologies to respond to surveys? (2) What are the effects on survey responses due to mobile technologies observed at other universities? (3) What are the best methods to optimize surveys for use on both computers and mobile technologies?

Presenter(s)

Eric Jenson, Brigham Young University

Danny Olsen, Brigham Young University



Using Social Media to Collect Alumni Data: Successes and Lessons Learned – 1669

Table 2

Analysis

With the growing public attention to the value of a college degree, colleges are gathering various baccalaureate outcomes data (e. g., job placement) to strengthen value messaging and demonstrate institutional effectiveness. Many IR offices are significantly involved in gathering alumni outcomes data. The traditional method has been the alumni survey (paper, on-line). However, response rates tend to be low, posing issues of biased results. In recent years, many colleges have started to use social networking sites (e. g., LinkedIn) to collect data. With the emergence of these innovative practices arose skepticism and concern. This discussion session is guided by the following questions: How prevalent is the use of social media in collecting alumni outcomes data? What are the challenges, successes, and lesson learned? What quality control techniques can be used to maximize data accuracy? As an IR professional, how do you select the methods that best fit your institutional context?

Presenter(s)

Suhua Dong, Gettysburg College

Speaker Sessions

A Business Intelligence Implementation: Automating for Strategic Decisions – 1236

Panzacola H1

Technologies

This session focuses on the transformation of one institution's enrollment reporting from its old, static, Excel-based spreadsheet report to a dynamic, real-time reporting website that was made possible by the implementation of Business Intelligence software. The session's case study format re-traces the steps the institution took to make this transition possible. Various examples of both the old and new reporting environments demonstrate the profound and far-reaching impact this transition has made on the entire organization.

Presenter(s)

Paul Rusinko, Columbus State Community College
Kris Coble, Franklin University

A Study of Characteristics and Outcomes of Transfer Students – 1188

Sebastian I4

Decision-Support

The transfer student population is examined to further understand the characteristics and outcomes of students who transfer from 2- or 4-year institutions to Purdue University West Lafayette. Characteristics such as demographics, previous college information, previous college GPA, number of transfer credits, entry college, and residency status are

examined for the transfer student population. In addition, academic outcomes for transfer students are reported based on factors such as courses taken, semester and cumulative GPAs, and retention and graduation rates. The withdrawal rate for transfer students is highlighted and furthermore leaves an open question regarding the national disposition of withdrawn students on degree completion and possible accumulation of student debt.

Presenter(s)

Monal Patel, Purdue University
Brent Drake, Purdue University
Jacqueline Hills, Purdue University

Accelerating Developmental Education: Findings from Fifteen Colleges – 1251

Sebastian I2

Analysis

Developmental education is often seen as a stumbling block in the path to graduation for those who are less academically prepared when they start at community colleges. Numerous initiatives have been taken to expedite remedial education so that students can start taking college-level, credit-bearing courses and work towards degrees. Based on cohort-based longitudinal student data from 15 colleges, this study examines the impact of different types of developmental education intervention programs on community college students' academic performance, persistence, and completion.

Presenter(s)

Wei Song, Achieving the Dream, Inc.

Assessing Diversity/Global Engagement in the Research University – 1546

Sebastian L1

Assessment

Global learning is now recognized as an essential outcome of higher education for the twenty-first century. Engagement in global learning activities has been identified by the LEAP initiative as a high impact practice. This session uses exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to extract global learning factors from the SERU, and uses structural equation modeling to specify the relationships between global learning experiences and learning outcomes. Participants will learn how engagement in high impact practices related to global learning predict performance on both specific global learning outcomes and general academic outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Mark Troy, Texas A&M University
Yunhee Bae, Texas A&M University

Developing a Report Toolkit for Admissions at a Regional Public University – 1408

Sebastian L2

Technologies

In a competitive admissions environment, having actionable information is a necessary component to successful recruitment and enrollment of new students. To meet this need, the Office of IR at Slippery Rock University has worked closely with leadership in admissions to build a fresh toolkit of interconnected reports and dashboards. This session tracks the obstacles and opportunities of this process and demonstrates many of the tools. While the toolkit is developed in IBM Cognos, the concepts and process can be adapted to many other reporting systems.

Presenter(s)

Kevin McCarthy, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania

Learning Analytics, IR, and Assessment: Living Together in the Same House – 1600

Panzacola F2

Operations

Many higher education institutions are venturing into learning analytics as a constructively disruptive innovation that can help improve student success. This paper explores the relationship among learning analytics, institutional research, and other organized evidence-based practices at higher education institutions. It seeks to identify the promises and pitfalls of adding “yet another” evidence-based approach within organizational environments that are prone to decentralized and segmented modes of operation. The paper concludes with recommendations for avoiding the pitfalls and realizing the promises of such innovative technologies.

Presenter(s)

Victor Borden, Indiana University-Bloomington

Ken Guan, Indiana University-Bloomington

John Zilvinskis, Indiana University-Bloomington

Nontraditional Students at Community Colleges: Paths to Success – 1670

Sebastian L3

Analysis

Utilizing competing risks event history analysis, this study seeks to understand postsecondary pathways of nontraditional students who started at community colleges over a period of six years. The results of this study reveal the unique pathways nontraditional students took and identify factors that may have impeded or encouraged their persistence to graduation. The study provides insights into issues associated with students' socioeconomic backgrounds, enrollment intensity, academic progress, and financial constraint. Significant implications are drawn for accountability measures, financial aid policies, and

retention practices that pertain to nontraditional students at community colleges.

Presenter(s)

Jin Chen, Indiana University-Bloomington

Obtaining Online Students' Opinions: National and In-House Surveys – 1491

Panzacola F3

Analysis

“What do online students say about their experiences and how does that compare to other students?” With increases in online course and program offerings, this is a common question asked of institutional research offices. Presenters in this session will share the process for making changes to a national survey (Your First College Year Survey) and in-house surveys to reflect experiences specific to online learners. Results show significant differences in perceptions of academics, advising, and engagement. Pros and cons of using national and in-house surveys will also be discussed. Audience discussion welcome.

Presenter(s)

Kristina Cragg, Bridgepoint Education

Erin Hansman, Ashford University

Angela Henderson, Keiser University

Ooh, Shiny! Creating an Online Fact Book in R – 1454

Panzacola F4

Technologies

This session demonstrates the development of an interactive online fact book using R's Shiny package. The primary goals of this project were to increase the fact book's value to stakeholders by providing greater customization and interactivity, and to decrease the amount of time needed to prepare the fact book annually. For IR departments that already use R for data analysis, Shiny provides a freely available option for accomplishing those goals within a familiar environment that can leverage your previous code. As part of the demonstration, a basic interactive web page is built from scratch.

Presenter(s)

Michael Wallinga, Northwestern College (IA)

Remaining in a State of “Reporting Readiness” for Accreditation – 2051

Wekiwa 6

Reporting



Periodic reporting to an accrediting agency can be a huge undertaking, but with the right technology, you can remain in a state of “reporting readiness.” Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) provides a proven effective platform to manage the self-study process, organize evidence, craft narrative responses, and publish out the self-study documents for print or electronic delivery. “Best



practice” institutions use SPOL to perform annual audits and organically collect evidence between reporting periods through the integrated planning, budget, and assessment cycles. This presentation will provide case study examples of SPOL institutions that have used this comprehensive solution to great effect for accreditation reporting.

Presenter(s)

Erin Bell, Strategic Planning Online

RMAIR Best Presentation: What’s Behind SAT Scores in Predicting University Graduation Rate? – 1293

Sebastian I1

Analysis



This study statistically demonstrates that in-state tuition mediates SAT scores in predicting university graduation rate. It also explains the reason, suggesting to education policy makers that multiple factors should be taken into account when making education policies instead of focusing on the single measure of graduation rate.

Presenter(s)

Song Gao, Dixie State University

Andrea Brown, Dixie State University

SAS and Excel Go Hand in Hand for Automation: Data Management to IR Reports – 1514

Wekiwa 4

Technologies

Preparing policy briefs and research reports from administrative data can be very cumbersome and time consuming. SAS and Excel together have proved to be powerful tools and can be used to alleviate major issues with automation of institutional research reports. Managing and cleaning administrative data can be challenging, but using simple RETAIN with IF-THEN-ELSE-DO loops in SAS helps manage and analyze data with multiple records. Exporting the analyzed results from SAS into pre-formatted Excel reports and using various methods available in SAS, (e.g., SAS Add-In and DDE) can help automate reports in desirable templates for administrative and IR reports.

Presenter(s)

Shabnam Mehra, University of South Florida

Selecting Institutional Peers—On Your Own or with Help – 1086

Panzacola H4

Analysis



Accountability continues to become increasingly prevalent. A common response has been for institutions to conduct their own comparisons. Unknown, usually, is the relevance of the institutions chosen for comparison. In part, this may be due to the fact that few studies provide guidance on such selection methodologies.

To mitigate that deficiency, several institutional peer selection methodologies are described via a case study conducted by the presenters. Brief demonstration of existing web tools is given. An overview of methodologies to select peers found by the presenters is also provided. Participants are given the opportunity to share their experiences.

Presenter(s)

Mary-Lou D'Allegro, Siena College

Survey Incentives and Institutional Response Rates: An Exploratory Analysis – 1709

Sebastian L4

Decision-Support

Colleges and universities often use various types of survey participation incentives without any information about their relationships to response rates. Using results from hundreds of institutions that participated in the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the current study investigated whether different types of incentives (cash, gift cards) correlate with higher response rates after controlling for various important institutional factors, such as the general level of campus promotional efforts and extent of campus surveying. How campuses choose to promote NSSE (social media, posters) as well as the various offices that assist with this effort are described as well.

Presenter(s)

Shimon Sarraf, Indiana University-Bloomington

James Cole, National Survey of Student Engagement

The Tipping Point: When Transfer SCH is No Longer a Good Thing – 1692

Sebastian I3

Analysis

Student credit hour (SCH) accumulation and time to degree are policy issues facing colleges and universities across the nation. This study tested the theory that transfer student success is predicated on SCH accumulation, but only to a certain point. It was hypothesized that beyond this theorized “tipping point”, SCH becomes detrimental to graduation probabilities. We used Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detection (CHAID) modeling to determine whether a tipping point existed in SCH accrual at the time of transfer, and whether this interacted with transfer GPA to influence graduation outcomes for transfer students.

Presenter(s)

Carmen Allen, University of Houston

Maureen Croft, University of Houston

The X Factor: The Undefinable “Something” that Makes Your Report a Star! – 1064

Panzacola H2

Operations

Our profession is evolving from producing and compiling pages of data to providing concise reports that tell a story. Although demands for our time never cease, we need to become more adept at creating these features without a lot of fuss. This session demonstrates how easy it is to create a report in Excel without using publishing software and illustrates the report creation process, from data collection to distribution. Additionally, we highlight best practices of effective reports and provide key elements to help give your report star quality.

Presenter(s)

Bethany Butson, Purdue University-Main Campus
Margaret Dalrymple, Purdue University-Main Campus

Tracking and Improving Retention of Undergraduates Across all Class Levels: The Imperative in Tennessee – 1751

Panzacola H3

Decision-Support



This session will help you understand the impact of the new funding formula in Tennessee that rewards institutions for students who earn 24, 48, and 72 credit hours, and then graduate. The politics surrounding retention data are particularly heated given its impact on funding. Similarities and significant differences between freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, regarding their reasons for withdrawal are presented, along with differences in predictive models for each group. This presentation also brings in open-ended survey responses from 727 undergraduates who dropped or stopped out. Interventions and the benefits of tracking students in all class levels year-to-year in a retention dashboard are also discussed.

Presenter(s)

Jeff Hoyt, Middle Tennessee State University
Christopher Brewer, Middle Tennessee State University
Benjamin Simpkins, Middle Tennessee State University
Brian Hinote, Middle Tennessee State University

Turning Top-Down Evaluations into 360 Degree Feedback using Class Climate – 1949

Wekiwa 5

Assessment



Would you like to see your evaluation systems transformed into a performance based assessment to increase productivity and relationships in the workplace? We will share our journey to using Class Climate to make it happen! This workshop will share how we developed the questionnaire, setup distribution for

supervisors, subordinates, peers, customers and self to give feedback.

Presenter(s)

Margaret Dixon, Coahoma Community College

Visions and Pathways: Predictive Retention Model for Transfer Students – 1581

Panzacola F1

Decision-Support

This study focused on a unique approach to predicting transfer student retention over the first 12 quarters of undergraduate enrollment. The presentation focuses on the research methodology applied by Organizational Effectiveness and interventions applied by student services to address the “at-risk” transfer student retention rate. Eight years of student admissions, enrollment, and graduation data, along with census, financial aid, and remedial course work provided the foundation for the study. The clustering of stratified groups produced statistically significant predictive variables that varied over time. The results clearly indicate that risk factors are bimodal.

Presenter(s)

Jim DePaepe, Central Washington University
Daniel Matthews, Central Washington University
Sigrid Davison, Central Washington University
Elizabeth Lee, Central Washington University

03:00 PM–03:45 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Experiences of International Doctoral Students in Science and Engineering – 1809

Table 3

Analysis

Considering the significant increase in the number of international doctoral students in American universities, how important is it to understand their experiences and the impact of those experiences on their decisions to stay and work in the U.S. after graduation? Do you think that the academic, social, and cultural experiences of international doctoral students in science and engineering are different from those of students in other fields, or those of American students, and why? As institutional researchers, do you think universities should conduct systematic data collection on international students to encourage and support research in this area? To what extent does such research affect policies at your institutions, and the programs and services offered by international education offices?

Presenter(s)

Throy Campbell, University of Texas at Arlington

Operationalizing Institutional Effectiveness to Increase Student Retention – 1787

Table 2

Assessment

The session provides a case study perspective of how institutional effectiveness was operationalized and implemented to increase student retention at an online graduate program. The session highlights how data were used to modify operations, implement new practices, and assess performance. Furthermore, the session emphasizes how the collegial and representative nature of the committee fostered shared vision and dedication to the goal of increasing student retention that resulted in changes across the institution, and ultimately, goal achievement. How is institutional effectiveness operationalized and implemented at an institutional level? What are best practices for monitoring and assessing institutional effectiveness projects? How can institutional effectiveness enhance the student experience?

Presenter(s)

Jason Brunner, College for Financial Planning

Postsecondary Data and the Postsecondary Institution Ratings System (PIRS) – 2050

Table 1

Reporting

In August 2013, President Obama proposed a Postsecondary Institution Ratings System (PIRS). As proposed, the system initially would be used for consumer information purposes and later be adapted for use in distributing federal financial aid. The ratings system has sparked debate about the appropriate measures, metrics, and benchmarks to use to measure success across all institutions of higher education, and its implementation will have implications for institutional researchers. This discussion group will examine questions including: What are the most important measures and metrics within higher education? What data limitations need to be addressed to populate these measures and metrics at a national level? In what specific ways can these data improvement efforts minimize reporting burden? Are different measures appropriate for different purposes (e.g. consumer information vs. accountability)?

Presenter(s)

Mamie Voight, Institute for Higher Education Policy
Alegneta Long, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Skills Certificates– Missing Piece of the Completions Puzzle – 1767

Table 5

Assessment

The discussion addresses credentials of less than 30 credits (i.e., skills certificates) as viable outcomes for students who do not earn formal awards, yet receive valuable job-related training leading to industry certification. Come learn how these credentials of value can help advance a completions agenda at your institution. The discussion addresses the

following questions: What criteria can be utilized in the academic review process to identify skills certificates? How to define a skills certificate completer? How to track credentials of less than 30 credits? How can skills certificates advance the completions agenda of your college? The presenters represent a large urban college in Reno, Nevada.

Presenter(s)

Elena Bubnova, Truckee Meadows Community College
Cheryl Scott, Truckee Meadows Community College

Speaker Sessions

A Conversation with Richard D. Howard, 2014 Sidney Suslow Scholar Award Winner – 1937

Sebastian I4

Decision-Support

Forum attendees are invited to join Rich Howard and participate in conversation about being a scholar, practicing institutional research, and the importance of both roles in the future of the profession. All are welcome to attend. This session may be of particular interest to graduate students and those new to the profession as an opportunity to learn about Rich's work strategies and his contributions to AIR. Session participants are invited to engage in dialogue about contributing both as a scholar and a professional to higher education.

Presenter(s)

Richard Howard, University of Minnesota (Retired)

AIRUM Best Presentation: Comparison Shopping: A Data-based Web-App for Generating Comparison Groups – 1933

Panzacola H3

Technologies



The Comparison Group Generator is an intuitive browser based interface that allows users to generate institutional specific comparison groups. During this presentation, we will outline the methodology behind our data-informed process for identifying institutional comparison groups. Following the methodology/technical overview, we will perform a live demo of the web application. The presentation will demonstrate how the application can be used to create a comparison group and illustrate the value provided by technological collaboration in expanding the audience of IR data sets. Participants will leave with access to a tool that will enable them to assess the quality of their current institutional peer group.

Presenter(s)

Daniel Jones-White, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
David Peterson, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Ilya Begelman, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

Appeal Grants: A Strategy for Realizing ROI through Student Retention – 1555

Sebastian L2

Decision-Support

How often do institutions hear students say that they cannot afford to continue their educations? For first-year students in particular, an unexpected break can derail their ideal course progression and even delay degree completion. Research shows that students in financial distress can be helped with proactive institutional support such as small financial aid supplements to keep them in class, motivated, and on track towards graduation. This session provides participants with a strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of appeal grants in boosting retention and graduation rates of first-year students. Discussion is based on one institution's examination of multiple cohorts of first-year appeal grant recipients to determine whether the additional investment in their educations ultimately resulted in student success.

Presenter(s)

Michael Anuszkiewicz, Marymount University

Leah Roa, Marymount University

Assessing College Student Leadership Development – 1353

Panzacola F4

Analysis

This presentation introduces a campus-wide assessment effort of a Midwestern public research university that aims to understand the relationship between college student leadership development and co-curricular activities participation. The first half of the presentation introduces a survey instrument that was used to assess student leadership development, which is built upon a three-dimension model suggested by Shankman and Allen: consciousness of self, consciousness of others, and consciousness of the context. The second half of the presentation discusses the statistical findings from the survey data. This presentation contributes to the theoretical and methodological discussion on assessing college student leadership development, as well as the significance of different types of co-curricular activities.

Presenter(s)

Wen Qi, Ball State University

William Knight, Ball State University

Click Here! Web-Based Course Evaluations with Early Grade View Incentive – 1248

Sebastian L1

Decision-Support

Web-based course evaluations provide effective reports for time-sensitive decisions regarding faculty contract renewals, promotions, and teaching and learning improvements. Many institutions are moving toward use of web-based student evaluations to assess courses and instructors, but critics of the practice fear that the online format will only result in lower levels of student participation. As a case study, we highlight a collaborative university-wide initiative of a web-based course evaluation system with an early grade view incentive that yielded an 85.2% student response rate. Learn key steps for successful implementation of a university-wide system, pitfalls to avoid in working with external and internal partners, and effective communication and advertising strategies.

Presenter(s)

Marco Sausa, Hawai'i Pacific University

Data-Driven GE Reform: Uniting Mission, Transferability, and Assessment – 1121

Sebastian I1

Assessment

This presentation delineates the results of a systematic reform plan at The University of Findlay designed to forge a unique GE imprint that unites mission, transferability, and assessment. The plan began with surveys of internal and external stakeholders and provided quantitative data regarding the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions students should possess upon graduation. Town Hall meetings provided qualitative data; the guidance of outside facilitators allowed for additional perspectives; and data analysis by the University's institutional research team informed the process. The intentional design of the plan (and its subsequent study) demonstrates that GE reform has a greater likelihood of success when the process includes input from a variety of stakeholders.

Presenter(s)

Mary Jo Geise, The University of Findlay

Susan Brooks, The University of Findlay

Christine Denecker, The University of Findlay

Evisions Argos Enterprise Reporting Solution – 1874

Wekiwa 5

Reporting



Do you need a reporting solution that helps you collect, analyze, and distribute data and information related to the general operation of your institution?

Argos, an enterprise reporting solution designed specifically for Colleges and Universities is easy to use and gives you quick access to the quantitative and qualitative data you need with output options you require. Use OLAP and data cubes to analyze your students, faculty, staff, curriculum,



course offerings, and learning outcomes. Use Dashboards to report your results to executives, government and the public. Schedule reports to run automatically or let users run them when they want. Argos has the rich features you need in a user-friendly tool. Come see how other institutions are using Argos to help enhance and support institutional research.

Presenter(s)

Alice Levy, Evisions

Faculty Who Teach IR – 1960

Sebastian L3

Operations

As the demand for institutional researchers continues to increase, so does the need to identify successful practices for delivering IR-related instruction. Three moderators will lead a discussion that addresses approaches for developing and delivering graduate-level institutional research courses, and the knowledge, skills, and abilities that graduate students need to be prepared for institutional research careers. The session is open to all Forum participants, but is designed for individuals who teach IR courses or are planning to start new IR courses in the future.

Presenter(s)

Robert Schwartz, Florida State University

John Cheslock, Pennsylvania State University

Karen Webber, University of Georgia

FERPA and its Role In Institutional Research – How to Play it Safe – 1527

Panzacola F2

Operations

Often offices of institutional research focus energy on research innovations, but neglect important issues of compliance. The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) governs access to data by students, but also plays a role in how those data are protected. Institutional Research departments receive many requests for data, and when those requests call for records of identifiable students, care needs to be taken that departments operate within the confines of the law. This presentation provides an explanation of these rules, coupled with applicable examples and one department's strategies for avoiding problems.

Presenter(s)

Geoff Matthews, Utah Valley University

Tim Stanley, Utah Valley University

Linking University Expenses to Performance Outcomes – 1153

Panzacola F3

Analysis



Higher education has been criticized for rising costs, lack of affordability, and the inefficient use of resources. Little research has been conducted into these areas regarding budgeting and student outcomes at the institutional level. This study contributes to the field in three

primary ways. First, it develops a conceptual framework for how inputs are transformed into outcomes at the institutional level. This introduces a modified higher education production function given the recent reforms in performance funding and management. Second, it analyzes data looking at the relationship between resources and outputs at the department, college, and institutional levels. This uses fixed effects regression and stochastic frontier analysis to estimate efficiency and the public return on investment. Finally, it offers policy implications for policymakers and administrators by presenting the findings and outlining the use of the methods and results for practical decision making.

Presenter(s)

Justin Shepherd, Vanderbilt University

Maximum Spreadsheet: A Hands-On Introduction to Rapid Report Development – 1176

Panzacola H1

Technologies

Develop a dynamic, drillable report in your spreadsheet software of choice in 30 minutes! Attendees are invited to participate in developing a sample report while learning several spreadsheet “tricks” or “recipes”. The report provides a simple dashboard-like interface for browsing aggregate data according to a dynamic collection of filters, as well as the capacity to drill into the underlying dataset. Following the session, the finished report will be available as a reference for future work. The session concludes with a discussion of the effective use of such reports in presentations and discussions.

Presenter(s)

William Greenland, University of Chicago

Mid-AIR Best Presentation: Assessment More than Numbers – 1942

Wekiwa 6

Assessment



Knowing how well our students learn and improving teaching are the fundamental driving forces behind assessment activities. Engaging faculty in the process of assessment is critical. At Johnson County Community College the focus of assessment has been within the framework of the “Cycle of Assessment.” This presentation has two complementary learning outcomes: 1) to provide useful and practical information on how to assess what and how our students are learning; and 2) to illustrate ways to engage faculty in the process by using the “Cycle of Assessment” as a framework.

Presenter(s)

Sheri Barrett, Johnson County Community College



Organizational Change: Using Theory to Drive a Culture of Assessment – 1584

Panzacola H2

Assessment

Organizational Change is usually thought of being led from the top. This session examines a model of organizational change that theorizes change from multiple directions, resulting in a shift in organizational culture, along with implications for action and examples from programs implemented on the presenters' campus. Intended participants include administrators and assessment personnel who are developing opportunities for assessment support and outreach. Through participation in the discussion, participants will be able to articulate key principles of organizational change, judge the transferability of these principles to their own institutional contexts, and extend them to the practice and management of assessment at the administrative level.

Presenter(s)

Jessica Thornton, University of San Francisco
Jennifer Hill, Duke University

Second Year Retention Behavior at Virginia Commonwealth University – 1344

Panzacola F1

Decision-Support

Many factors play important roles in determining whether students are continuing their studies in the third year. This project tries to examine student second-year retention behavior. The population includes freshmen cohorts from Fall 2007 to Fall 2011. A logistic regression model is used to detect whether different patterns existed between students who returned and those who didn't return in the fifth semester associated with academic performance, financial aid, and student characteristics. Independent variables include student demographic information (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, residency), financial aid (e.g., % of need met), and academic performance (e.g., GPA, credit hours earned, and warning grades earned).

Presenter(s)

Chunmei Yao, Virginia Commonwealth University
Khoi To, Virginia Commonwealth University
Elizabeth Johnson, Virginia Commonwealth University
William Evans, Virginia Commonwealth University

Vehicles for Mobility or Engines of Inequality? SES and High-Ability Students' College Pathways – 1923

Sebastian L4

Analysis

While higher education is often described as a primary gateway for social mobility, significant socioeconomic gaps have been identified in various stages of students' college-to-career pathways. However, limited research exists exploring the relative importance of SES at each stage in students' pathways. The purpose of this study is to estimate the relative degree to which socioeconomic background affects each postsecondary transition point and explore the theoretical

perspectives that are most congruent with these findings. The study utilizes a nationally representative cohort of high-ability students, drawn from NCES' Education Longitudinal Study of 2002, providing nationally generalizable results for this college-ready subgroup.

Presenter(s)

Matthew Giani, The University of Texas at Austin

What We've Learned about Effective Use of NSSE Data: Lessons from the Field – 1379

Sebastian I2

Assessment

A central objective of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is to encourage the use of student engagement results to assess and improve quality in undergraduate education. This session highlights lessons learned about data use from hundreds of institutional accounts of using NSSE data. A systematic examination of institutional data use examples provides a source of collective lessons about effective use of student engagement results and potential considerations for shifts in institutional research practice.

Presenter(s)

Jillian Kinzie, Indiana University-Bloomington
Cynthia Ahonen, Indiana University-Bloomington
Katherine Wheatle, Indiana University-Bloomington

Why Universities Can't Count: Challenges of Using Operations Oriented Data – 1247

Panzacola H4

Analysis

To support operations, universities collect vast amounts of information regarding students, faculty, courses, and finances, storing that information within large data warehouses. These data can be employed within research seeking to support the decision-making of university leaders, but such work is challenging because these data are often structured, measured, and segmented in ways that advance operations but complicate research. However, an operations orientation can promote reporting accuracy in a manner that research-oriented data collection never can. After describing the forces shaping operations-oriented data, we present recommendations for how analysts can best extract the valuable information contained within institutional databases. We illustrate our points using examples pertaining to data elements describing courses and instructors.

Presenter(s)

Mark Umbricht, Pennsylvania State University
John Cheslock, Pennsylvania State University



04:00 PM–04:45 PM

Discussion Groups

Panzacola G

Math Preparation and Institution Type—Influencing Retention of STEM Students – 1131

Table 4

Assessment

This discussion addresses the variables important to STEM student retention within the concepts of mathematics preparation and institutional characteristics. How does math preparation affect the retention and graduation rates of the different majors within STEM? How do institutional characteristics, such as faculty rank, minority/gender profile of faculty, and undergraduate teaching emphasis, affect student retention and graduation within STEM fields? How can we use these factors to help colleagues form policies and services for students?

Presenter(s)

Timothy O'Malley, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Stephen Hundley, Indiana University- Purdue University Indianapolis

The Academic Adjustment of Men of Color: Understanding Gender Differences – 1800

Table 1

Assessment

This discussion addresses the factors that contribute to URM men's academic adjustments in four-year colleges and universities within the first year of college. The discussion addresses the following questions: (1) What factors contribute to underrepresented minority male students' academic adjustments to four-year institutions? (2) How do these factors differ in comparison to underrepresented minority women? (3) How can institutions support the academic adjustment of underrepresented minority men?

Presenter(s)

Marco Murillo, UCLA

The Strategic and Social Transformation of Institutional Research – 1829

Table 2

Operations

What is your unit responsible for and what is your unit's title? What are the distinguishing differences between OE, IR, and IE? On your campus, are OE and IE considered competitors, customers, collaborators, or replacements? Should the amount of time and staff resources devoted to reporting, analytics, accreditation, assessment, and strategic planning be the defining parameters? Should AIR take a leadership role in producing a guide for universities in labeling OE, IR, and IE units?

Presenter(s)

Jim DePaepe, Central Washington University

Panel Sessions

Common Data Set (CDS) Update and Feedback Session – 1505

Panzacola F3

Reporting

Based on feedback from AIR and other educational associations, the publishers who created and fine-tuned the Common Data Set (CDS) template discuss their perspectives on updates to the CDS-H financial aid section proposed by NASFAA and TICAS for the 2014 version of the CDS. Audience participation is encouraged. Also included is an overview of the CDS Initiative for new CDS respondents, including best practices in submitting CDS data, annual calendar of CDS activities, online and print publications populated by CDS data and their demographics/impact on student recruitment.

Presenter(s)

Stanley Bernstein, College Board
Robert Morse, U.S. News and World Report
Stephen Sauermelech, Peterson's, a Nelnet Company

iCount: Improving Data Quality for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders – 1070

Panzacola F2

Analysis

Institutional data collection systems that aggregate Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) students mask educational realities and serve as a barrier for AAPI educational attainment and success. This session brings attention to the ways in which student-level data on AAPIs reported in the aggregate conceals significant disparities in educational experiences and outcomes among AAPI subgroups. It provides various models for how postsecondary institutions and systems have recognized and responded to this problem by collecting and reporting disaggregated data and how these changes have influenced practice and policy that directly impact their AAPI student populations. Additionally, this session provides insight into how educators, administrators, and policymakers can work jointly to mobilize this effort and to change policy that directly impacts the allocation of resources that can create more equitable educational outcomes.

Presenter(s)

Pearl Iboshi, University of Hawaii System
Robert Teranishi, University of California, Los Angeles
Akil Vohra, White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders
Patricia Nguyen, University of California, Los Angeles
Bach-Mai Dolly Nguyen, University of California, Los Angeles



Scholarly Writing: Advice from Editors – 2046*Panzacola F4**Analysis*

This session is for individuals interested to learn more about writing for scholarly publications. A panel of journal editors will share insight, advice, and suggestions about writing for higher education journals in general, and institutional research-related journals specifically. Information about a variety of journals, their requirements, and related review and selection processes will be shared, including AIR Professional File, Innovative Higher Education, New Directions for Institutional Research, and Research in Higher Education.

Presenter(s)

Gloria Crisp, The University of Texas at San Antonio
Christopher Mullin, State University System of Florida
Gary Pike, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
John Ryan, University of Vermont
Sharron Ronco, Marquette University
Leah Ewing Ross, Association for Institutional Research

Speaker Sessions**‘Calculating’ Return: Using Student Inputs to Estimate First-Year Retention – 1543***Sebastian I4**Analysis*

First-year student retention rates continue to be a concern for college campuses across the country. Although retention is one of the most-studied issues in research on college students, research often fails to provide practitioners and institutional researchers with tools to understand whether individual campuses are retaining students at higher rates than would be expected given student characteristics and institutional resources. This session reviews findings from a national first-year persistence study and provides participants with first-year retention calculators they can use on their campuses to estimate first-year persistence rates.

Presenter(s)

Kevin Eagan, University of California-Los Angeles
Adriana Ruiz Alvarado, University of California-Los Angeles

2008/12 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B:08/12) – 1249*Sebastian I3**Analysis*

We provide an overview of the newly-released 2008/12 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B:08/12), and a demonstration of NCES's PowerStats, a powerful online data analysis tool. The study is a nationally representative longitudinal sample survey of students who completed bachelor's degrees during the 2007–08 academic year and were followed-up approximately 4 years after graduation. We cover study content and present some initial findings. For

institutional researchers interested in a national-level look at employment, enrollment, and student loan debt after the bachelor's degree, this session provides key information on a dataset with considerable research potential and an overview of PowerStats, a publicly available tool for data analysis of a number of data sets.

Presenter(s)

Emily Cataldi, RTI International
Stephanie Nevill, RTI International

A Toolkit for Mapping and Strengthening Student Pathways to Success – 1952*Panzacola H1**Technologies*

To increase students' success with completion, transfer and job advancement, colleges need to have a clear understanding of how their students progress, where they struggle, and how their forward progress can be improved. In this session, we will demonstrate, and provide a hands-on introduction to, an on-line toolkit designed to help colleges chart students' pathways from initial connection to completion and beyond. This knowledge is essential for colleges as they redesign programs and student supports to help strengthen student pathways and increase outcomes and completions.

Presenter(s)

Sue Clery, JBL Associates, Inc.

Agile IR: Lessons Learned from the Software Development World – 1532*Panzacola H3**Operations*

Sometimes the techies get it right. This session provides reflections from more than 5 years split between IR and an open source software development project. Collaboration tools, project management, and requirements gathering are among the areas in which borrowing from the software development world can help IR professionals work more efficiently and effectively.

Presenter(s)

Michelle Appel, University of Maryland-College Park

Case Study on In-memory Computing for Student Retention – 2049*Wekiwa 5**Technologies*

College of DuPage hired Dunn Solutions Group to implement the latest SAP in-memory data platform called SAP HANA and streamlined their ability to perform analytics on critical student retention data. The ability to recognize early warning signs and take corrective action can dramatically impact an institution's retention and graduation rates. Recruiting replacement students is



prohibitively expensive and the solution can easily cost justify itself.

Presenter(s)

Bruce Levick, SAP
Bill Dunn, SAP

Challenging “Cultures of Assessment” Through Faculty Perspectives – 1509

Wekiwa 6

Assessment

Many institutions claim to have a “culture of assessment.” Successful institutional assessment practices are correlated with substantial faculty involvement. Using data from surveys of 21 faculty, this session examines faculty beliefs about their involvement with assessment at an institution that claims to have a culture of assessment. We expect that attendees will gain an appreciation of how faculty perceive their engagement in institutional assessment. In addition, the session provides a survey tool that will aid AIR professionals in ascertaining current faculty involvement in the assessment process at their respective campuses.

Presenter(s)

Nichole Radulovich, University of Pittsburgh

Determinants of Six-Year Graduation Rate: Findings from a Multi-Year Study – 1569

Sebastian I1

Analysis



Using a binary logistic regression model, this study examined how student demographic variables, pre-college academic variables, institutional variables, and financial aid variables affected the six-year graduation rate. It was a multi-year study that incorporated data from five cohorts of students, each of which were followed for six years. This study had the advantage of revealing institutional changes over time. Findings of this study have great policy implications on how to tackle retention and graduation issues for higher education institutions.

Presenter(s)

Fen Yu, University of North Florida

Exploring Retention in Higher Education Using Tree-Based Models – 1547

Panzacola F1

Decision-Support

This study explores the relationship between retention and institutional expenditures in higher education. The literature related to retention has resulted in mixed findings on the impact of institutional characteristics on student outcomes, often noting that it depends on individual characteristics. The large number of potentially correlated variables make examining retention difficult. Moreover, it is well-known that retention is a complex issue; traditional models that involve main effects may be limited in the number of variables than

can be analyzed and may miss moderators of retention. Tree-based models, however, provide a simple visualization of higher order interactions and a decision tool for identifying the variables related to student retention. Classification and regression trees (CART) are used to identify groups with low levels of retention, and will help quantify how individual and institutional-level variables may differentially impact retention for these students.

Presenter(s)

Josh Bush, University of Kentucky
Cody Davidson, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education

Going Mobile! The Effects of Mobile Devices on Online Course Evaluations – 1098

Sebastian L4

Analysis

California Lutheran University introduced a new mobile feature and studied how it affects student comments and ratings on online course evaluations. This presentation discusses challenges and solutions associated with completing online course evaluations via mobile devices. They include: using mobile devices will lead to fewer comments and text speak, only traditional undergraduate or tech-savvy students will complete evaluations, and mean scores for evaluations completed on mobile devices will be lower. Presenters also discuss how they are beginning to track the number of saves and abandons on evaluations. Findings and concerns are discussed and best practices are recommended.

Presenter(s)

Melinda Wright, California Lutheran University
Karissa Oien, California Lutheran University

How to Avoid Surveying Students to Death – 1667

Panzacola H2

Assessment

Many institutions rely on survey instruments to assess improvement in support services. Unfortunately, some students are surveyed to the point of exhaustion. One institution used the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Self-Assessment Process to develop a more meaningful assessment strategy. A framework for building a comprehensive two-year survey plan is provided. The question, “What measurable evidence exists which demonstrates that the institution makes a difference in students’ lives?” will be examined.

Presenter(s)

Christine Robinson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte



KAIR Best Presentation: Engaging Your Campus Community on the Use of Data: Re-framing Your Tools – 1926

Sebastian I2

Assessment



The assessment movement has firmly taken hold in colleges and universities. The most common approach used for institutional assessment is the administration of nationally normed surveys. The University of Louisville (UofL) took a fresh approach on addressing the use of data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This presentation will discuss how to effectively utilize, communicate, and appropriately package assessment results for diverse audiences. The data shared in these reports helped drive vibrant conversations as well as identified practical areas needing improvement. The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) was administered as a direct response to university-wide interest in the NSSE reports.

Presenter(s)

IL Young Barrow, University of Louisville
Robert Goldstein, University of Louisville

Lessons Learned in Our Journey towards Building a Culture of Assessment – 1223

Sebastian L1

Assessment

The word “assessment” often implies compliance or “extra-work”. Many institutions struggle with shifting this perception and building a culture of assessment that facilitates continuous improvement and supports teaching and learning. The University of Mount Union began its journey towards building a sustainable culture of assessment in 1991 and has achieved several key milestones since, such as establishing a Committee on Assessment, adopting an e-portfolio system, and implementing a new undergraduate curriculum. This presentation shared lessons that the University learned in its journey towards building a culture of assessment and how this learning has contributed to our success.

Presenter(s)

Fang Du, University of Mount Union

Student Career Success: What Do We Know? How Do We Act? A Systematic Review – 1359

Panzacola H4

Decision-Support

To achieve a better understanding of how our students fare after graduation and how to improve their career outcomes, this systematic literature review surveys, appraises, and synthesizes what is known about postsecondary students' career outcomes and how postsecondary education and labor market outcomes are linked. The study is part of UTEP's student career success project that supports evidence-guided institutional actions aimed to improve both short- and long-term student outcomes. The substantive insights will help

participants deepen their understandings of why government agencies are imposing labor market measures on institutions and how education and work are interconnected so that they can better anticipate and respond to related data and analytical requests. The methodology, protocol, and tools of systematic literature review will help participants expand their toolboxes and perspectives beyond primary research in order to conceptually and coherently anchor various IR projects.

Presenter(s)

Yan Xie, IR Consultant (UTEP)

Using Institutional Data to Identify Community College Leavers – 1668

Sebastian L3

Analysis



This study utilizes institutional data and a discrete-time event history model to predict non-transfer attrition in community colleges. The data utilized include five years of institutional data from 21,724 first-time freshmen from the six community colleges of the City University of New York. Multinomial logistic regression was employed in an event history model of student absence and transfer; models were developed for both the first and second spells. Continuation or type of leaving following each semester constituted the dependent variable. The most successful model for the first spell correctly identified 34.6 percent of the leavers in the semester in which they left.

Presenter(s)

Paul Bachler, Baruch College

Using the Diverse Learning Environments Survey to Assess Campus Climate – 1059

Sebastian L2

Assessment

This study is intended to provide participants a better understanding of the complexity of campus climate and the usefulness of empirically derived constructs in assessing campus climate. By examining and comparing the differential perceptions and experiences of different student groupings, we are better able to identify significant differences and focus resources on inequities. This session focuses on the use of climate construct scores obtained from the Diverse Learning Environments Survey to compare the perceptions and experiences of URM and non-URM students. A primary objective of this session is to demonstrate the value of climate construct scores in comparing the experiences and perceptions of student groupings within the university.

Presenter(s)

William Armstrong, University of California-San Diego



05:00 PM–06:00 PM

Affiliated Organization Meetings

Canadian Institutional Research and Planning Association (CIRPA) – 2011

Wekiwa 8

Canadian attendees: Come join us for a meet and greet! Network with your Canadian peers. Hopefully we will find a venue nearby to continue our conversations over dinner. Convener: Sharon Shultz

Catholic Higher Education Research Cooperative (CHERC) – 2066

Wekiwa 7

CHERC, the Catholic Higher Education Research Cooperative, is an organization for IR professionals and others involved in research issues common to Catholic higher education. All current members and those interested in learning more about the organization are invited to attend. Convener: Laura Uerling

Georgia Association for Institutional Research, Planning, Assessment, and Quality (GAIRPAQ) – 2014

Wekiwa 10

Meet with officers and members of the GA state AIR affiliate to hear about plans for the coming year and give your input into planning the 2015 GAIRPAQ Conference. We would especially like to get feedback from private and public sector members about how we can coordinate our conference dates and locations to meet the needs of our public and private college members. New members welcome! Convener: Patricia Gregg, President-Elect

Illinois Association of Institutional Research (IAIR) – 2013

Wekiwa 2

IAIR members and any interested in learning more about the Illinois Association for Institutional Research are invited to attend this informal session. Convener: Kristi Mindrup

Indiana Association for Institutional Research (INAIR) – 2059

Wekiwa 4

An informal meeting for INAIR members and those interested in connecting with Institutional Researchers in Indiana. We will be discussing recent happenings, our 2015 Annual conference, and other important and noteworthy topics. Come connect and re-connect with colleagues in a casual atmosphere. Convener: Linda Ferguson

Kentucky Association for Institutional Research (KAIR) – 2060

Wekiwa 6

Connect with KAIR! Join your KAIR Executive Committee for a meet and greet with your colleagues. There will be a brief KAIR update which will include information about our upcoming fall conference. We really just want to take this opportunity to connect or reconnect with other colleagues in the state. We are all busy and travel budgets are tight so let's make the most of our time together! We are considering a KAIR dinner group immediately following the meet and greet, so that we can keep the conversation going, so please keep that in mind while planning your time at AIR. Convener: Dr. Katie Bontrager, Vice President

Maryland Association for Institutional Research (MdAIR) – 2069

Suwannee 19

Join your Maryland institutional research and assessment colleagues to discuss state and regional issues. Come prepared to suggest topics of interest for upcoming Summer and Fall association events. Optional dinner group to follow at 6:00 pm. Convener: Gregory C. Spengler, President, MdAIR

Michigan Association for Institutional Research (MI/AIR) – 2012

Wekiwa 1

Come meet and greet all of your Michigan friends and colleagues. Get caught up and find out the latest for the Fall 2014 MI-AIR conference in Port Huron. Convener: Katie Schoonveld

Middle East and North Africa- Association for Institutional Research (MENA-AIR) – 2063

Wekiwa 9

“MENA-AIR” is a professional organization operating in the Middle East and North Africa that aims to assist individuals serving postsecondary education in the field of Institutional Research to develop professionally through sharing and learning best practices in the profession. MENA-AIR encourages and supports quality assurance in higher education through: • Improved institutional assessment and research • Professional development • Networking within the Middle East and North Africa region Convener: Maryam Riaz • Increased collaboration among institutions of higher education

Overseas Chinese Association for Institutional Research (OCAIR) – 2019

Wekiwa 5

The Overseas Chinese AIR (OCAIR) session is open to all current OCAIR members and those who are interested in joining OCAIR. The annual meeting will include a brief business meeting, presentation of awards, and a panel discussion focusing on “successes and services.” There will also be a group picture and dinner after the meeting. Conveners: Xiaobing Cao and Allan Joseph Medwick

Texas Association for Institutional Research (TAIR) – 2015

Wekiwa 3

Members and those interested in learning about the Texas Association for Institutional Research are invited to attend this informal session for the exchange of ideas, discussion of current events, and planning for future activities Convener: Susan Thompson, Texas State University

Research in Higher Education Special Forum Issue

AIR and Springer are pleased to provide free access for all AIR members.

airweb.org/publications



Program Highlights: Friday, May 30

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 7:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. | Registration Open, Sebastian Registration |
| 8:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. | Concurrent Sessions |
| 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. | Farewell Brunch and Closing Keynote, Gatlin A/B |
| 12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Post-Conference Workshops (additional fee required) |

FRIDAY

8:00AM

9:00AM

Concurrent Sessions

10:00AM

11:00AM

Farewell Brunch
& Closing Keynote

12:00PM

1:00PM

2:00PM

Post-Conference Workshops

3:00PM

4:00PM

Friday

08:00 AM–08:45 AM

Speaker Sessions

A New LinkedIn App for Alumni Research and Surveying – 1748

Sebastian I1

Technologies

This paper describes a LinkedIn application recently developed by the authors that facilitates alumni research and surveying. The tool allows connections with LinkedIn members who place specific institutions on their educational profiles. The new app also supports alumni surveying. This app permits gathering of alumni educational experiences, job and salary data, and professional growth perspectives from social media. Together these functions can support professional accreditation requirements. This paper also describes the developed tool and the evaluation conducted with one university's recent alumni data. In conclusion, the results are summarized and future developments are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Alex Rudniy, New Jersey Institute of Technology

Campus-Wide Collaboration: A Broad-Based Approach to Online Course Evaluations – 1533

Panzacola H4

Operations

Despite numerous benefits of online course evaluations, practitioners have questioned whether a return to paper is necessary given plummeting response rates. This presentation offers a broad-based approach to significantly increasing participation rates at a small HBCU with limited resources and student participation challenges. Through implementation of several practical on-the-ground strategies, the response rate rose from 24% to 59% within the first semester and has remained constant. Strategies discussed in-depth include establishing a relevant incentive program, organizing student course evaluation events, and creating an exciting campaign to develop a culture of engagement for faculty and students. With continuous review and adaptation, such strategies have shown resilience to a shifting student community. This presentation also discusses emerging challenges (such as an increasing non-traditional student population) and planned approaches to adapt.

Presenter(s)

Jaya Soni, Huston-Tillotson University

Content Analysis as an IR Tool: Methods, Findings, and Implications – 1686

Panzacola H2

Analysis

This session reviews a project that looks across an urban institution by reviewing academic program review documents. The researchers worked collaboratively via distance using qualitative data analysis software (Atlas.ti) to conduct a content analysis. In this presentation participants will learn the procedures of conducting a successful content analysis and also learn about program review at an Urban-Metropolitan University. Additionally, qualitative findings are presented related to the emerged themes of faculty, curriculum, interdepartmental collaborations, campus space, and financial resources. A discussion of content analysis as an institutional research tool and research method is included.

Presenter(s)

Daniel Trujillo, Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis

Cynthia Ahonen, Indiana University

CUNY Best Presentation: Developing an Effective and Sustainable Continuous Improvement Cycle - 2082

Sebastian I4

Assessment



This presentation provides a detailed overview of the assessment system developed by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research at The City University of New York - New York City College of Technology. The assessment system - with a key element added in the continuous improvement model - was received by faculty as an efficient tool to support the development and use of direct assessment methods to improve student learning outcomes by making data-driven decisions and to support accreditation standards.

Presenter(s)

Tammie Cumming, City University of New York - NYCCT

Ramon Moncada, Global Education Innovations Inc.

Identifying Roadblocks for Psychology Majors and Predicting Course Need – 1406

Wekiwa 3

Analysis

Psychology is one of the largest majors at our university. A series of analyses were used to identify primary roadblocks to graduation in this major, and to create a model that allows us to predict needed seats for the roadblock courses. We identified two roadblocks: successful completion of an early statistics course, and insufficient access to statistics courses in general. This session presents the methodology utilized and findings noted in identifying primary roadblocks to graduation and in creating a model to predict needed seats for the roadblock courses.

Presenter(s)

Arlene Garcia, Florida International University



Implementing a Comprehensive Retention Database – 1494

Panzacola H1

Decision-Support

In 2011, Northern Kentucky University was chosen as 1 of 18 institutions nationally to participate in a national study sponsored by the University of Alaska Anchorage for the Student Learning Progress Model (SLPM) that supports metrics other than the traditional graduation rate. After completing the study, internal stakeholders requested a more robust retention database to support internal decisions. In this session, participants will learn how to develop a retention database that tracks students' mobility, KPIs, and degree productivity. We discuss the types of ad hoc reports and statistical research that can be developed utilizing a retention database.

Presenter(s)

Erin Mulligan-Nguyen, Northern Kentucky University
Katie Bontrager, Northern Kentucky University

Predicting Successful Remediation among Latina/o Students – 1930

Sebastian I3

Analysis



This presentation will examine Latina/o students' remedial math needs and outcomes. Using data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS: 04/09), hierarchical generalized linear modeling (HGLM) techniques will be used identify socio-demographic characteristics, pre-college experiences, academic goals, environmental pull-factors, college experiences, and institutional characteristics that predict successful remediation among a national sample of Latina/o students. Results are expected to have direct implications for policy and practice by providing a means for targeting developmental students who are at risk of not successfully remediating.

Presenter(s)

Gloria Crisp, University of Texas at San Antonio
Nicole Reyes, University of Texas at San Antonio
Erin Doran, University of Texas at San Antonio

Testing a Conceptual Model that Measures For-Profit College Student Success – 1992

Sebastian I2

Analysis

This study aims to better understand student success at for-profit colleges and universities (FPCUs). Through analyzing the BPS04 and IPEDS, the study examines the influences of student backgrounds, student experiences, institutional structure, and student support services on student certificate/degree goal completion, which is defined as the alignment of student intention and accomplishment with 6 years of enrollment. Results from multilevel logistic regression indicate that factors influencing certificate completion are different from associate of bachelor's degree complete at FPCUs.

The results also include degree completion involves different factors across programs of study. Implications for theory and policy are discussed.

Presenter(s)

Jihee Hwang, Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus

Unit-Level Strategic Planning: Selecting, Measuring, and Communicating KPI – 1345

Panzacola H3

Decision-Support

This presentation offers a case study of how a college within a larger RU/VH university selects, measures, and communicates key performance indicators on a regular basis. Issues to be discussed include which measures to select, how often should they be measured, how they should be reported. Selecting and measuring KPIs at a college level is challenging; these measures must be consistent with broader university measures (if they exist!) and also specific to the unique characteristics of the college.

Presenter(s)

John Leonard, Georgia Institute of Technology

09:00 AM–09:45 AM

Speaker Sessions

But What do YOU Need? Sharing Data with Multiple Stakeholders – 1629

Wekiwa 4

Assessment

Gathering data can be the easy part of assessment. Providing useful and actionable information to a variety of stakeholders can be much harder. We share our processes and experiences identifying various stakeholder groups, communicating with them to gauge their needs, and designing creative and innovative ways to provide meaningful data. Some solutions use existing software, and others can be implemented using technology that is likely already on hand. Participants are invited to share unique stakeholder groups and concerns.

Presenter(s)

Julie Atwood, American Public University System
Jennifer Helm, American Public University System



Data Driven Student Portal for Improved Student Success – 1501

Wekiwa 3

Decision-Support



Retention and graduation rates have long been student success indicators that occur at the end of a term or academic year. By changing the culture on one campus to focus on providing faculty with indicators early in the semester, or even before students step foot in class, dramatically helped to increase the students' success. Utilizing technology and predictive analytics to communicate and facilitate strategies not only increase retention and graduation, they also provided opportunities for students' success. Join us as we review techniques and technologies implemented at Valdosta State University to provide students a higher chance of academic and life success.

Presenter(s)

Barrie Fitzgerald, Valdosta State University
Andy Clark, Valdosta State University
Brian Haugabrook, Valdosta State University

Determinants of Transferring Behavior of College Students – 1579

Panzacola H4

Decision-Support

The purpose of this study is to address the fundamental question central to higher education across the nation: What are the determinants of transferring behaviors of college students? Given the fact that an increasing number of students are attending more than one institution, this is an important research topic that is understudied. Drawing on panel data collected from a large public college system, this study provides critical information for policy makers in promoting the success of growing portion of higher education system: transferring students. Applying a multinomial logistic regression, this study analyzes 6 freshman entering cohorts between 1999 and 2004.

Presenter(s)

Giljae Lee, City University of New York
Andrew Wallace, City University of New York

Flexible Degree Attainment: Impact of Breaks on Online Students' Success – 1651

Wekiwa 7

Decision-Support

Online institutions often offer the flexibility of scheduling courses and breaks as desired. This feature attracts many students who would not be able to complete their programs within a traditional academic schedule. Thus, this flexibility is generally considered an important factor leading to success for non-traditional students. A study of 27,086 undergraduate students enrolled at a large online university suggests a negative impact of breaks on student success. Compared to students who took no breaks, those who spent more than 10% of time on break were more likely to withdraw in the first

year. Further, student success was more negatively impacted as break time increased. Performance in the first course affected the magnitude of this association. While scheduling flexibility may be crucial for e-learners, online institutions should consider the time spent on break in relation to critical student outcomes. Implications for enrollment and student satisfaction is discussed.

Presenter(s)

Loraine Devos, Ashford University
Amy Garczynski, Ashford University
Stephen Nettles, Ashford University

INAIR Best Presentation: Writing an IR Strategic Plan – 1900

Panzacola H3

Operations



While one of the key roles of Institutional Research offices is to facilitate and support University strategic planning, it is also imperative that the office develop its own strategic plan to clarify mission, set direction, establish goals and evaluate progress. This requires determining what the office does and needs to do in the future. ISU will share its experience in developing and implementing its first 5-year strategic plan. Critical issues discussed include: getting started, the components of the plan, organizational issues, developing work plans and benchmarks, annual reporting, and the role of an IR Advisory Board.

Presenter(s)

Patricia McClintock, Indiana State University
Linda Ferguson, Indiana State University

Integrating Institutional Research and Information Technology – 1381

Panzacola H1

Technologies

This presentation features three examples of how Institutional Research/Assessment (IR/IA) and Information Technology (IT) offices can collaborate synergistically to accomplish what neither could by themselves. The first example is the implementation of the WordPress Content Management System to distribute the maintenance of web content among multiple staff members, thus improving operational efficiency in an IR/IA office. The second is a demonstration of how Google Analytics can reveal the ways in which current and prospective students enter, traverse, and exit key university webpages, thus providing insights for recruitment, engagement, retention, and advancement activities. The third is the application of analytical skills to the benchmarking of overall IT expenditures at institutions with highly distributed budgetary activities.

Presenter(s)

David Stack, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Zhicheng Zhang, George Mason University



Measuring Diversity: A New Approach for Health Professions Education – 1580

Sebastian I3

Decision-Support

As institutions broaden their conceptualization of diversity, consideration must be given to how diversity is measured within the context of today's changing education and health care systems. Currently, the most common approach to measuring diversity is to count the magnitude or percentage of various demographic categories for a given population. However, use of multidimensional models that support simultaneous consideration of other individual characteristics – such as geographic origin, veteran status, and profession – can enable institutions to identify progress toward complex diversity initiatives while meeting legal requirements for targeted strategies. The purpose of this presentation is to demonstrate the application of multidimensional diversity models to all health professions institutions with data housed in IPEDS. Using IPEDS data, we develop a Composite Diversity Index and examine trends and changes in the diversity of these institutions over the past decade.

Presenter(s)

Jacqueline McLaughlin, University of North Carolina
Gerald McLaughlin, DePaul University
Josetta McLaughlin, Roosevelt University
Carla White, UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy

Mining Big Data to Solve the Retention and Graduation Puzzle – 1596

Sebastian I2

Decision-Support

Tinto's seminal model spawned decades of empirical research and influenced higher education practitioners who embraced their roles as intentional actors in the student departure process. This session focuses on how a large research institution designed and built a comprehensive longitudinal database to mine for actionable findings to proactively support strategies to increase graduation rates. Logistic model results for two research questions are described that show the explanatory power of general education program course performance in the first year. Participants will understand the steps to build data mining capacity and be able to replicate the method at their institutions.

Presenter(s)

Patrice Lancey, University of Central Florida
Rachel Straney, University of Central Florida
Uday Nair, University of Central Florida

SAIR 2013 Best Presentation: Tracking Pathways to Student Success – 1928

Sebastian I1

Assessment



Using the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), a public-domain assessment tool, Polk State College applies

the analysis of longitudinal data to track student success in courses and across program hurdles. The results provide surprising insights into the interaction between student motivation and learning strategies across various disciplines and delivery methods. The analyses also describe particular shortages in higher order learning skills and how findings can be used to improve student orientation and curriculum content. Mr. Peter Usinger, President of the Association of Florida Colleges, will summarize the findings, provide application examples, and discuss opportunities to leverage the instrument's capabilities.

Presenter(s)

Peter Usinger, Polk State College

Testing the New Scales on the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement – 1405

Panzacola H2

Analysis

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) annually collects information from thousands of faculty at baccalaureate degree-granting colleges and universities about student engagement both in and out of the classroom. With the update to the FSSE instrument in 2013, new scales were rigorously tested to aid in reporting and discussions about student engagement. FSSE staff have documented the array of analyses and tests used to evaluate the quality of these scales, including descriptive analyses and studies of validity, reliability, and survey construction. This session provides details about the methods and results of these analyses using data from the 2013 administration of FSSE.

Presenter(s)

Allison BrckaLorenz, National Survey of Student Engagement
Thomas Nelson Laird, Indiana University-Bloomington
Yi-Chen Chiang, Indiana University-Bloomington



Value-Added Metric: Establishing an Earnings-to-Student Loan Debt Ratio – 1633

Sebastian I4

Decision-Support

It is critical for institutions to provide information on how they add value to students' lives and assist in maintaining the future success of the U.S. One way to do this is through use of wage data. Moreover, given the focus on the costs of higher education, the primary focus of this presentation is to introduce a potential direct value-added measurement: students' earnings-to-debt ratios. Linking wage records from the Texas Workforce Commission and students' loan debts, UT System calculated short- and long-term earnings-to-debt ratios by degree majors. To help students minimize costs and reduce time to degree, UT institutions are working hard to find a tool to provide a similar portrait of an individual student's earnings-to-debt ratio that dynamically reflects decisions such as academic major changes or increased loan amounts.

Presenter(s)

David Troutman, The University of Texas System

Stephanie Bond Huie, The University of Texas System

10:00 AM–12:00 PM

Farewell Brunch and Closing Keynote

Board Farewell

Gatlin A/B

The official Forum closing session includes retirement of the 2013-2014 Board, inauguration of the 2014-2015 Board, and information about the 2015 AIR Forum in Denver.

Convener

Gayle Fink, AIR Vice President, Bowie State University

Navigating the Changing Landscape of Higher Education: The Critical Role of Institutional Researchers in Advancing Our Nation's Postsecondary Goals - 2041

Gatlin A/B



Earning a post-secondary degree or credential is no longer just a pathway to opportunity for a talented few; rather, it is a prerequisite for the growing jobs of the new economy and strengthens our democracy. In the evolving landscape of higher education policy, institutional researchers have an increasingly important role to play to ensure their campuses are well-positioned to help more students receive the education and training they need to be successful. Many innovative IR leaders are already using the data and resources of their offices to help streamline campus operations, support faculty teaching and learning, and improve the quality of student services on campus. These actions are helping to bridge policy and practice in ways that can transform student success and help realize the President's vision to once again lead the world in college completion.

Speaker

Ajita Talwalker Menon, Senior Policy Advisor for Higher Education, White House Domestic Policy Council



12:30 PM–04:00 PM

Post-Conference Workshops (additional fee)

A Step-by-Step Introduction to Building a Student-at-Risk Prediction Model – 1988

Wekiwa 2

To improve student retention, and thus net tuition revenues, IR offices are increasingly asked to help identify which students are likely to drop out. The purpose of this workshop is to teach IR professionals how to effectively build and implement a predictive model for student dropout and retention using standard regression methods with SPSS. Instruction is delivered in a hands-on format. Participants can follow along on their laptops while instructors demonstrate step-by-step instructions on how to build a model with start-of-semester data that yields the relative dropout risk for each student. The workshop shows how dropout risk data are used by academic support services to tangibly improve student retention.

Presenter(s)

Serge Herzog, University of Nevada-Reno
John Stanley, Honolulu Community College

Dashboards in Excel: Advanced – 1989

Wekiwa 1

In this workshop, participants learn how to dynamically update visual displays of data for dashboards, including updating the functionality of graphs using the OFFSET

function in Excel. For displaying data on multiple reporting units, participants learn how to use combo boxes. Participants also learn how to create traffic light indicators and how to automatically change the number of graphed data points.

Presenter(s)

Craig Abbey, University at Buffalo

How to Use Wage Records to Inform Multiple Audiences – 1990

Wekiwa 5

What happens to students after graduation? Do they find jobs? Do they attend graduate school? When they do find jobs, how much money do they make during their first five years of employment? To help institutions address these issues, this workshop begins by sharing the initial steps the UT System took to respond to this critical need for data—partnering with the state's workforce commission. Next, attendees are provided detailed information on the types of data used to track UT System students' employment and additional educational outcomes. Moreover, workshop participants gain a deeper understanding of the methods used to produce post-graduates' annual wages. Lastly, the presenters provide four wage projects that demonstrate how university administrators can inform students/parents, provosts/deans, and legislators about wage data.

Presenter(s)

Stephanie Bond Huie, The University of Texas System
Cathy Delgado, The University of Texas System
David Troutman, The University of Texas System



IPEDS Training



AIR offers IPEDS training and information at no charge to participants through face-to-face workshops and online resources. Two new online courses for **IPEDS Keyholders** will be available in Fall 2014. Funding for this work comes from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

www.airweb.org/IPEDS



Affiliated Organization Meetings

Association for Institutional Research in the Upper Midwest (AIRUM)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 4

Members of AIRUM and other interested AIR members are welcome to attend an informal gathering to visit with colleagues, discuss topics of interest, and learn about the upcoming fall 2014 AIRUM annual meeting. AIRUM consists of members from Iowa, Minnesota, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Plan on joining your colleagues for dinner/social hour after the meeting. Convener: Ron Huesman

California Association for Institutional Research (CAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 3

CAIR business meeting and open forum for issues concerning California higher education. The CAIR 2014 conference will be a topic of discussion. Convener: Bryce Mason, President

Canadian Institutional Research and Planning Association (CIRPA)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 8

Canadian attendees: Come join us for a meet and greet! Network with your Canadian peers. Hopefully we will find a venue nearby to continue our conversations over dinner. Convener: Sharon Shultz

Catholic Higher Education Research Cooperative (CHERC)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 7

CHERC, the Catholic Higher Education Research Cooperative, is an organization for IR professionals and others involved in research issues common to Catholic higher education. All current members and those interested in learning more about the organization are invited to attend. Convener: Laura Uerling

Georgia Association for Institutional Research, Planning, Assessment, and Quality (GAIRPAQ)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 10

Meet with officers and members of the GA state AIR affiliate to hear about plans for the coming year and give your input into planning the 2015 GAIRPAQ Conference. We would especially like to get feedback from private and public sector members about how we can coordinate our conference dates and locations to meet the needs of our public and private college members. New members welcome! Convener: Patricia Gregg, President-Elect

Illinois Association of Institutional Research (IAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 2

IAIR members and any interested in learning more about the Illinois Association for Institutional Research are invited to attend this informal session. Convener: Kristi Mindrup

Indiana Association for Institutional Research (INAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 4

An informal meeting for INAIR members and those interested in connecting with Institutional Researchers in Indiana. We will be discussing recent happenings, our 2015 Annual conference, and other important and noteworthy topics. Come connect and re-connect with colleagues in a casual atmosphere. Convener: Linda Ferguson

Kentucky Association for Institutional Research (KAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 6

Connect with KAIR! Join your KAIR Executive Committee for a meet and greet with your colleagues. There will be a brief KAIR update which will include information about our upcoming fall conference. We really just want to take this opportunity to connect or reconnect with other colleagues in the state. We are all busy and travel budgets are tight so let's make the most of our time together! We are considering a KAIR dinner group immediately following the meet and greet, so that we can keep the conversation going, so please keep that in mind while planning your time at AIR. Convener: Dr. Katie Bontrager, Vice President

Maryland Association for Institutional Research (MdAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Suwannee 19

Join your Maryland institutional research and assessment colleagues to discuss state and regional issues. Come prepared to suggest topics of interest for upcoming Summer and Fall association events. Optional dinner group to follow at 6:00 pm. Convener: Gregory C. Spengler, President, MdAIR

Michigan Association for Institutional Research (MI/AIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 1

Come meet and greet all of your Michigan friends and colleagues. Get caught up and find out the latest for the Fall 2014 MI-AIR conference in Port Huron. Convener: Katie Schoonveld

Mid-America Association for Institutional Research (MidAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 7

This informal gathering and networking opportunity is for MidAIR members, prospective members, and other interested colleagues. MidAIR consists of members from Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Oklahoma. We will also have information on the MidAIR annual conference, which will be held Nov. 5-7, 2014 at Holiday Inn, Country Club Plaza in Kansas City, MO. Meet here for dinner group plans with other MidAIR members. Convener: John A. Clayton, President-MidAIR

Middle East and North Africa Association for Institutional Research (MENA-AIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 9

MENA-AIR is a professional organization operating in the Middle East and North Africa that aims to assist individuals serving postsecondary education in the field of Institutional Research to develop professionally through sharing and learning best practices in the profession. MENA-AIR encourages and supports quality assurance in higher education through improved institutional assessment and research, professional development, networking within the Middle East and North Africa region, and increased collaboration among institutions of higher education. Convener: Maryan Riaz

Northeast Association for Institutional Research (NEAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 9

NEAIR, the Northeast Association for Institutional Research, is an organization for IR professionals in the northeastern US. All current members and those interested in learning more about the organization are invited to attend. Conveners: Laura Uerling and Heather Kelly

Overseas Chinese Association for Institutional Research (OCAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 5

The Overseas Chinese AIR (OCAIR) session is open to all current OCAIR members and those who are interested in joining OCAIR. The annual meeting will include a brief business meeting, presentation of awards, and a panel discussion focusing on “successes and services.” There will also be a group picture and dinner after the meeting. Conveners: Xiaobing Cao and Allan Joseph Medwick

Pacific Association for Institutional Research (PacAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Suwannee 19

Aloha! Join fellow PacAIR members for a brief meeting and “talk-story” time. Anyone interested may attend. We will be gathering a dinner group right after our meeting and you are welcome to join us. Convener: Kathy Pulotu

Pacific North West Association for Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 6

This casual gathering is open to interested colleagues, prospective members and members alike who would like to network with regional peers and hear the latest from the Pacific Northwest Association of Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP) executive team - including an update on PNAIRP’s 35th annual conference being held at the Seattle Sheraton, November 5-7, 2014. This AIR affiliate primarily serves colleagues from Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Idaho, British Columbia and Yukon, however we welcome IR professionals from all regions. An informal group dinner is likely to follow. Convener: Erin Aselas, PNAIRP Vice President

Rocky Mountain Association for Institutional Research (RMAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 10

Please join fellow RMAIRians at our semi-annual business meeting. We'll update members on progress related to our strategic plan implementation, our 501(c)(3) status, and upcoming RMAIR conferences, as well as elect emeritus members. Following the meeting, we'll head to a local restaurant for dinner. Convener: Ann Murray, President

Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR)

Wednesday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 5

SAIR members, as well as anyone who works at institutions in the SAIR region (AL, AR, DE, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV) -- are encouraged to attend this meeting to network with colleagues, discuss current activities of the SAIR organization, and learn more about our fall conference in San Destin, FL. Convener: Mary Harrington, SAIR President

Texas Association for Institutional Research (TAIR)

Thursday, 05:00 PM–06:00 PM, Wekiwa 3

Members and those interested in learning about the Texas Association for Institutional Research are invited to attend this informal session for the exchange of ideas, discussion of current events, and planning for future activities. Convener: Susan Thompson, Texas State University

New Directions for Institutional Research Call for Contributors

New Directions for Institutional Research (NDIR) is under the new editorship of John Ryan and Gloria Crisp. *NDIR* is a quarterly sourcebook published by Jossey-Bass/ a Wiley Brand. New Directions monographs are non-peer reviewed thematic, and practitioner-oriented edited sourcebooks; each issue of *NDIR* focuses on specific topics related to IR, planning, or higher education administration. The editors are interested in receiving proposals from potential issue editors who identify and work with chapter contributors. Example topics (with focus on the IR audience and implications for IR) include:

- Post-9/11 GI Bill
- ACA – Institutional Impacts and Responses
- Budget Systems and Models
- Data Warehousing/Data Marts
- Measuring Faculty Scholarly Productivity
- TT vs. Non-TT Faculty: Trends and Impacts
- MOOCs
- Accountability (such as the White House Scorecard)

NDIR issues are normally seven to eight chapters in length (30,000-40,000 words). Potential contributors are encouraged to read recent issues of *NDIR* for style/format/focus. The time frame from accepted proposals to print is approximately nine months. Those interested in exploring opportunities to publish in *NDIR* and/or serve as volume editors are encouraged to contact John Ryan at jfryan@uvm.edu.



Aims and Scope

Quarterly issues of **New Directions for Institutional Research** focus on specific topics related to institutional research, planning, or higher education management.

Abstracting and Indexing Information

- Academic Search (EBSCO Publishing)
- Academic Search Elite (EBSCO Publishing)
- Academic Search Premier (EBSCO Publishing)
- ERA: Educational Research Abstracts Online (T&F)
- ERIC: Educational Resources Information Center (CSC)
- Higher Education Abstracts (Claremont Graduate University)
- Professional Development Collection (EBSCO Publishing)

 Available wherever books and e-books are sold.

Jossey-Bass is a registered trademark of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

JOSSEY-BASS™
A Wiley Brand



**We look forward to seeing you in
Washington D.C.!**

39th Annual Conference

Washington Hilton

Pre-Conference: November 19-20

General Conference: November 20-22

~Weaving Scholarship and Policy Making~

<http://www.ashe.ws/2014conference.html>

Scholarly Paper Citations

Acquah, E. *Students' Sense of Campus Community: An Empirical Analysis*. Session: Students' Perceptions of Campus Community: An Empirical Analysis (Thursday 12:45).

Bachler, P. *Using Institutional Data to Identify Students at Risk for Leaving Community College: An Event History Approach*. Session: Using Institutional Data to Identify Community College Leavers (Thursday 4:00).

Bahr, P. *The Labor Market Return in Earnings to Community College Credits and Credentials in California*. Session: The Ones that Got Away: Employment Outcomes of Non-Completers (Wednesday 9:30).

Bartholomew, P., & Llanes, J. *Is U.S. Higher Education Overvalued? A Methodology for Pricing Undergraduate Education*. Session: Valuing Undergraduate Education: Determining a Maximum Degree Price (Thursday 12:45).

Belcheir, M., Anson, R., & Goodman, J. *On-line Course Evaluation Implementation and Improvement of Response Rates*. Session: On-line Course Evaluation Implementation and Improvement of Response Rates (Thursday 10:30).

Bowman, N., & Denson, N. *Sticking with it: Grit and College Student Success*. Session: Sticking with It: Grit and College Student Success (Wednesday 11:30).

Clark, A., Haugabrook, B., & Fitzgerald, B. *Data Driven Student Portal for Improved Student Success*. Session: Data Driven Student Portal for Improved Student Success (Friday 9:00).

Crisp, G., Reyes, N., & Doran, E. *Predicting Successful Remediation among Latina/o Students*. Session: Predicting Successful Remediation among Latina/o Students (Friday 8:00).

D'Allegro, M. *Peer Grouping and Aspirant Selection Methodology*. Session: Selecting Institutional Peers—On Your Own or with Help (Thursday 2:00).

Daly, R. *Six Stages of Growth for the IR Professional*. Session: CAIR Best Presentation: Six Stages of Growth for the IR Professional (Wednesday 11:30).

Dean, M. *Navigating University Silos to Assess Advising: A Review of the Literature*. Session: Navigating University Silos: Assessing Advising Across Disciplines (Wednesday 11:30).

Delaney, J., & Kearney, T. *The Impact of Guaranteed Tuition Policies on Postsecondary Tuition Levels: A Difference-in-Difference Approach*. Session: The Impact of Guaranteed Tuition Policies on Postsecondary Tuition Levels (Thursday 10:30).

Dickmeyer, N., & Zhu, C. *Targeting Retention Initiatives: Communicating with Your Clients on the Critical Target*. Session: High-Risk Targeting: The Interaction of R-squared, Effectiveness, and Budget (Wednesday 10:30).

Eubanks, D. *Causal Interfaces*. Session: Correlation, Prediction, and Causation (Thursday 8:30).

Fiorini, S., Liu T., Shepard, L., & Ouimet, J. *Using NSSE to Understand Student Success: A Multiyear Analysis*. Session: Using NSSE to Understand Student Success: A Multiyear Analysis (Wednesday 12:45).

Fosnacht, K., & Gonyea R. *The Dependability of NSSE 2013: A Generalizability Study*. Session: The Dependability of NSSE 2013: A Generalizability Study (Wednesday 9:30).

Gao, S., & Brown, A. *The Statistical and Literal Analysis of How In-State Tuition Mediates SAT Scores in Predicting Graduation Rate*. Session: RMAIR Best Presentation: What's Behind SAT Scores in Predicting University Graduation Rate? (Thursday 2:00).

Germaine, R., Barton, G., & Bustillos, T. *Program Review: Opportunity for Innovation and Change*. Session: Program Review: Opportunity for Innovation and Change (Wednesday 9:30).

Hahn T., & Hatcher, J. *The Relationship between Service Learning and Deep Learning*. Session: The Relationship between Service Learning and Deep Learning (Thursday 12:45).

Hoyt, J., Simpkins, B., Hinote, B., Brewer, C., & Eggett, D. *Predictive Modeling: Tracking and Improving Retention of Undergraduates in All Class Levels*. Session: Tracking and Improving Retention of Undergraduates Across all Class Levels: The Imperative in Tennessee (Thursday 2:00).

Laguilles, J. *Low-Income Students and Future Alumni Involvement: Is there a Relationship?* Session: Low-Income Students and Future Alumni Involvement: Is there a Relationship? (Wednesday 2:00).

Lambert, A., & Miller, A. *Living with Smartphones: Does Completion Device Affect Survey Responses?* Session: Living with Smartphones: Does Completion Device Affect Survey Responses? (Wednesday 11:30).

Lenchner, E. *Evaluating Graduation Rates at Two-year Community Colleges versus Four-Year Open Admission or Minimally Selective Institutions*. Session: Evaluating Graduation Rates at Two-Year vs. Four-Year Open/Minimally Selective Colleges (Thursday 8:30).

Nosaka, T., & Novak, H. *Against all Odds: The Impact of the Key Communities on Retention and Graduation for Historically At-Risk students at Colorado State University*. Session: Against All Odds: A Successful Learning Community for At-Risk Students (Thursday 8:30).

Ornelas, F., Ordonez, C., & Huston, D. *Predicting Student Success: An Application to Community College Data*. Session: Predicting Student Success: An Application to Community College Data (Wednesday 11:30).

Petoskey, S. *Balancing Financial Aid and Revenue Utilizing a Predictive Enrollment Model*. Session: Balancing Financial Aid and Revenue Utilizing a Predictive Enrollment Model (Wednesday 2:00).

Rocconi, L., Ribera, A., & Nelson Laird, T. *The Impact of Deep Learning and Academic Discipline on Degree Aspirations*. Session: The Impact of Deep Learning and Academic Discipline on Degree Aspirations (Thursday 12:45).

Sanchez, E. *Differential Effects of Using ACT® College Readiness Assessment Scores and High School GPA to Predict First-Year College GPA among Racial/Ethnic, Gender, and Income Groups*. Session: Student Subgroups and Admissions Decisions using Test Score and/or HSGPA (Thursday 8:30).

Seidel, E. *Modelling Continuing Load at Disaggregated Levels*. Session: SAAIR Best Presentation: Modelling Continuing Load at Disaggregated Levels in Flinders University (Thursday 11:30).

Shepherd, J. *Linking University Expenses to Performance Outcomes: A Look at Departments, Colleges, and Institutions*. Session: Linking University Expenses to Performance Outcomes (Thursday 3:00).

Sidle, M., & Shaffer, D. *Resident Success Characteristics for Graduate Medical Education Programs in Appalachia and Rural America Compared with Other Regions of the United States*. Session: Resident Success Characteristics for Programs in Appalachia and Rural America Compared with Other Regions (Thursday 12:45).

Usinger, P., & Boyer, N. *Tracking Pathways to Success: A Continuation Study*. Session: SAIR 2013 Best Presentation: Tracking Pathways to Student Success (Friday 9:00).

Voight, M., Long, A., Huelsman, M., & Engle, J. *Mapping the Postsecondary Data Domain: Problems and Possibilities*. Session: Toward Greater Simplification and Transparency of Higher Education Data (Thursday 11:30).

Warshaw, J., Webber, K., & Turk, J. *From Doctoral Studies to Employment: Does Institutional Investment Matter?* Session: Doctoral Studies to Employment: Does Institutional Investment Matter? (Thursday 9:30).

Weiss, J. *Closing the Academic Assessment Loop using the Practice of Programmatic Data Dialogue: A Study of Institutional Impact*. Session: Closing the Programmatic Assessment Loop: A Study of Institutional Impact (Wednesday 10:30).

Westrick, P., & Allen, J. *Validity Evidence for ACT Compass Placement Tests*. Session: Using Multiple Measures in Course Placement (Wednesday 11:30).

Yu, F., & Powell, R. *Determinants of the Six-Year Graduation Rate: Findings from a Multi-Year Study*. Session: Determinants of Six-Year Graduation Rate: Findings from a Multi-Year Study (Thursday 4:00).

Zhang, R. *SAS Tips and Tricks Used in IR Raw Data Manipulation and Project Reporting*. Session: SAS Tips and Tricks Used in IR Raw Data Manipulation and Project Reporting (Thursday 12:45).

AIR Award Recipients

Thank you for your contributions to the Association and to the field of institutional research.

2014 AIR Outstanding Service Award

The Outstanding Service Award recognizes a member for professional leadership and exemplary service to AIR. Dr. Trainer's remarkable commitment to AIR is demonstrated by the myriad roles he has assumed in service to the Association, including his term as President (2010-2011). Several of his colleagues highlighted his experience as Chair of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee as the ultimate example of his dedication to AIR and his thoughtful leadership, powerful listening skills, and inclusive nature. One AIR member explained that Dr. Trainer has been "a leading figure (often quietly behind the scenes) during significant periods in the development of AIR and of institutional research more generally."



James F. Trainer
Associate Vice President and Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Research
Villanova University

2014 John E. Stecklein Distinguished Member Award

The John E. Stecklein Distinguished Member Award recognizes an individual whose professional career has significantly advanced the field of institutional research through extraordinary scholarship, leadership, and service. Dr. Seybert's colleagues laud his vision for higher education—a vision that has served as the foundation for his career in institutional research and is evident in his significant contributions to the field and to community colleges in particular. He is described as "forward-looking, responsive to current challenges, and decidedly pragmatic." Furthermore, each person who wrote in support of his nomination for this award noted their appreciation for his roles as mentor, colleague, and friend.



Jeffrey A. Seybert
Consultant, National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute
Johnson County Community College

2014 Sidney Suslow Scholar Award

The Sidney Suslow Scholar Award recognizes an individual who, through scholarly work, has made significant contributions to the field of institutional research and advanced understanding of the profession in a meaningful way. The expressions of support from the individuals who nominated Dr. Howard for this award clearly reflect appreciation for his prolific scholarly contributions, leadership as author and editor in many different capacities, and dedication as a mentor in support of colleagues' research interests and endeavors. In the words of one colleague, Dr. Howard's work is "instrumental in bridging the gap between research and practice."



Richard D. Howard
Director of University-Wide Office of Institutional Research and Professor
University of Minnesota (Retired)

2013 Charles F. Elton Best Paper Award

The Charles F. Elton Best Paper Award celebrates the papers presented at the AIR Forum that most clearly exemplify the standards of excellence established by the award's namesake and make significant contributions to the field of institutional research and decision-making in higher education.

Four articles were selected as 2013 Charles F. Elton Best Papers.

A Missing Piece of the Departure Puzzle: Student-Institution Fit and Intent to Persist

Nicholas Bowman, Bowling Green State University

Nida Denson, University of Western Sydney

Postsecondary Co-Enrollment and Baccalaureate Completion: A Look at Both Beginning 4-Year College Students and Baccalaureate Aspirants Beginning at Community Colleges

Xueli Wang, University of Wisconsin–Madison

Kelly Wickersham, University of Wisconsin–Madison

Preparing Students for College and Careers: The Causal Role of Algebra II

Matthew Gaertner, Pearson

Jeongeun Kim, University of Michigan

Stephen DesJardins, University of Michigan

Katie McClarty, Pearson

The Impact of Alumni Status on Institutional Giving by Faculty and Staff

Victor Borden, Indiana University

Genevieve G. Shaker, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis

Brittany L. Kienker, Indiana University

Our Sponsors

Academic Analytics, LLC [Booth 114]

Academic Analytics is a full-service provider of academic business intelligence data. Our mission is to help universities by providing high quality, discipline-level data on faculty research output that administrators can use to support strategic decision-making and to facilitate the pursuit of excellence. The Academic Analytics Database (AAD) includes comprehensive information on over 230,000 faculty members, more than 9,000 Ph.D. programs, 11,000 departments, and 385 universities in the United States and abroad. The database presents faculty scholarly research output measuring research funding, journal and book publications, citations, conference proceedings, and honors and awards. Please stop by our booth for a demo!



Campus Labs [Booths 220, 222]

Higher One partners with colleges and universities to lower their administrative costs and to improve graduation rates. Our Campus Labs® suite of data management services provides a specialized, comprehensive assessment program that combines data collection, reporting, organization, and campus-wide integration. <http://www.campuslabs.com/>



CLA+ [Booth 118]

The CLA+ measures individual student-level attainment of several general education skills (critical thinking, problem solving, scientific and quantitative reason, writing, and the ability to make and critique arguments). The CLA+ combines institutional analyses with a new utility to make more formative pedagogical improvements at the student and classroom-level. www.cae.org



College Board [Booth 409]

The College Board is a mission-driven not-for-profit membership organization that connects students to college success and opportunity. Each year, the College Board helps more than seven million students globally prepare for a successful transition to college through programs and services anchored in college readiness and college success — including the PSAT/NMSQT®, ReadStep™, SAT®, Pre-AP®, AP®, SpringBoard®, and ACCUPLACER®. <http://www.collegeboard.org/>



College Survey Services [Booth 417]

Evaluations of instruction - let CSS do the grunt work: customized design from survey to reporting, programming matches your every need, web hosting and delivery, or face-to-face online or paper packaging personalized to every class. Expert data collection at CSS incorporates attention to detail insuring accurate, clean data. Receive measureable feedback that administration can readily use to make confident decisions. Which sections scored the lowest and which courses/instructors will the students avoid? Examine constructs of effective teaching and review instructor trend lines over several semesters. Enjoy less work, better reports and reduced costs at College Survey Services - 800.755.9065.



Concord USA, Inc. [Booths 109, 111]

Xitracs Accreditation Management and Assessment Reporting System. Xitracs is the simple to use yet feature rich solution for program and course outcomes assessment, curriculum mapping, strategic planning, credentials management and compliance reporting. Discover how Xitracs gives you more reports while taking less time for you and the faculty by contacting Ed Hanley (ehanley@concord-usa.com) or our website (www.xitracs.com).



Data180 [Booth 116]

Data180 (www.data180.com) provides customized online software solutions for academic institutions. Our products are focused on the following:



- Faculty activity reporting
- Faculty evaluations related to annual reviews and tenure/promotion decisions
- Assessment management and e-portfolios
- Co-curricular transcripts

Digital Measures [Booths 201, 203, 300, 302]

Your campus currently asks your faculty 8-12 times per year for information about their teaching, research, and service activities. Rather than that, have them maintain this information in a database. Enter the information one time so it can be used many times: for annual faculty activity reports, promotion and tenure documents, accreditation reports, CVs, faculty profiles on your campus website, and more. 300+ of the largest 500 campuses of higher education leverage Digital Measures' software for this purpose. www.digitalmeasures.com

**EBI MAP-Works [Booth 100]**

EBI MAP-Works provides a comprehensive set of student retention and benchmarking assessment solutions, enabling colleges and universities to achieve measurable results in student success. Our solutions provide a continuous cycle of communication across departments, visually informing faculty, staff, and students of critical areas for improvement and enabling intervention measures for at-risk students – before it's too late. Learn about how the EBI MAP-Works team of researchers, implementation consultants, and change management consultants can help your institution achieve its student success and retention goals. To schedule a demo or for more information, visit our website at www.webebi.com or e-mail us at info@webebi.com.

**Ellucian/Nuventive [Booth 510]**

Ellucian. Ellucian provides innovative software and services to help education institutions thrive in an open and dynamic world. We deliver a broad portfolio of technology solutions, developed in collaboration with a global education community, and provide strategic guidance to help education institutions of all kinds navigate change, achieve greater transparency, and drive efficiencies. More than 2,400 institutions in 40 countries around the world look to Ellucian for the ideas and insights that will move education forward, helping people everywhere discover their futures through learning. Visit us at ellucian.com.



Nuventive. For more than 13 years, Nuventive has helped hundreds of higher education institutions improve personal and institutional performance through institutional performance management, strategic planning, academic and administrative outcomes assessment, program review, accreditation, and student success. Our performance management solutions offer a new way to establish a culture of performance with a flexible software system that enables faculty, staff, and administrators to link measurement to strategic objectives, reflect on those measurements, and take action to improve performance. As a result, you can engage your stakeholders more deeply in developing and executing your institutional plans and improve institutional achievement and competitiveness.

**Engineerica Systems, Inc. [Booth 110]**

Engineerica Systems, Inc. offers a diverse family of software and database solutions!



Accudemia: Cloud Based Student Tracking, Appointments & Referral System; AccuTrack & AccuSQL: Student Tracking & Appointments; AccuLite: Basic Tracking; iAccu: Portable iPhone attendance tracking; AccuTesting: Test Tracking; Conference Tracker for Conference Attendee Tracking. Visit us at: www.engineerica.com or Toll Free: 888.249.7227.

Entigence Corporation [Booth 408]

Entigence (short for “enterprise intelligence”) is an IT services company that specializes in business intelligence and reporting services for higher education. We enhance your ability to access enterprise data how you want, when you need, with the accuracy which your constituents demand. We also offer Lyterati, a comprehensive faculty information system that provides senior university leaders an integrated and paperless view of faculty contributions, annual reporting, and promotion and tenure processes with integrated workflow. Our CV loading services create a faculty productivity database and provide reporting on day one by using Lyterati coupled with a BI engine. www.entigence.com and www.lyterati.com.

**ETS [Booth 401]**

ETS advances quality and equity in education by providing fair and valid assessments, research and related services. Institutions of higher education rely on ETS to help them demonstrate student learning outcomes and promote student success and institutional effectiveness. To learn more, visit <http://www.ets.org/highered>.

**EvaluationKIT [Booth 112]**

EvaluationKIT is an affordable, fully-hosted course evaluation and survey system with features to streamline your course evaluation setup and drive participation in your surveys. EvaluationKIT provides all the necessary functionality to manage these important institutional processes, including turnkey LMS integrations (Canvas, Blackboard, Desire2Learn, Moodle...), survey authoring, customized communications, and automated reports for instructors and administrators. With hundreds of implementations throughout higher education, EvaluationKIT scales well for institutions of all types and sizes. There's no hardware to buy, setup, or maintain, so implementation is a snap. Visit www.evaluationkit.com for a free pilot and see for yourself why so many institutions have chosen EvaluationKIT.

**Evisions, Inc. [Booth 506]**

Evisions has been building great products and delivering fantastic service since 1998. Our products include Argos, an Enterprise Reporting Solution, Cayuse SP, a Sponsored Project Life Cycle Management Solution, Cayuse 424, a Proposal Development Solution, and FormFusion, a Document Enhancement & Distribution Solution. We are passionate about working with our clients to find the best solution. Our clients drive everything we do – our research, products, service, and support. We truly believe that it is great relationships that make all the difference – when you work with us, you are part of the Evisions team. For more information about Evisions, visit: www.evisions.com

**ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc. [Booth 413]**

ExamSoft is committed to partnering with faculty members and administrators to improve student learning, engagement, and retention, as well as assessment mapping and course design, all using existing assessments given to students in class. More than 525 clients across the country partner with us to conduct secure, offline computer-based embedded assessments that help “close the loop” on programmatic and institutional assessment. Your students' work is speaking volumes--are you listening?

**eXplorance [Booths 208, 210]**

eXplorance is a global Learning Experience Management (LEM) solutions provider with several colleges and universities such as the École Centrale Paris, University of Toronto, University of Louisville, RMIT University, University of Groningen, and Hong Kong City University among our many satisfied clients.



The Blue suite of products focuses on Return on Expectations (ROE) allowing educators to understand the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to improve the classroom environment. Through the use of web-enabled learning management processes, institutions and organizations can gain deeper insight into their data through fully automated surveys, course evaluations, performance appraisals, and 360 degree feedback reviews.

Gallup

Gallup delivers forward-thinking research, analytics, and advice to help leaders solve their most pressing problems. Combining more than 75 years of experience with its global reach, Gallup knows more about the attitudes and behaviors of the world's constituents, employees, and customers than any other organization. Gallup consultants help private and public sector organizations boost organic growth through measurement tools, strategic advice, and education. Gallup's 2,000 professionals deliver services at client organizations, through the Web, and in nearly 40 offices around the world.



GradesFirst [Booth 407]

GradesFirst is a student retention solution serving over 230 institutions nationwide. Our comprehensive system combines Early Alert, Advising Management, Tutoring Management, advanced Communication tools, and GradesFirst Analytics, a powerful reporting and assessment module. Each component of GradesFirst works seamlessly to improve student success and measure institutional outcomes.



Gravic, Inc. – Remark Software [Booth 122]

Gravic's Remark Software Products collect and analyze data from paper and web forms (surveys, evaluations, assessments). Use any word processor to create and print your own plain-paper surveys and scan them with Remark Office OMR using an image scanner. Or, create, host, and administer online surveys using Remark Web Survey. Host your own online forms; there are no form or respondent limitations. Use both products to combine data from paper and web surveys. Easily generate analysis reports and graphs with Remark Quick Stats, a built-in analysis component. Or, export data to 35+ different formats (SPSS, Excel, ASCII, etc.) www.gravic.com/remark



Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) [Booth 415]

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) is the nation's largest and most comprehensive study of higher education, involving longitudinal data on 1,900 institutions and 15 million students. Administered by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute, CIRP covers all the essential elements to support your assessment of student learning and consists of the Freshman Survey, Your First College Year Survey, the College Senior Survey and the new Diverse Learning Environments Survey. Additionally, HERI offers a triennial survey of faculty.



IASystem – University of Washington [Booth 500]

IASystem provides nationally recognized course evaluation services that support best practices and inform decision making by faculty, administrators, and students. Developed and maintained at the University of Washington, IASystem builds on more than 40 years of experience in providing course evaluation services to institutions across the United States. IASystem combines a powerful, streamlined web-based application with a suite of rigorously tested evaluation tools. Technical and analytic controls protect the integrity of your evaluation data and support effective instructional improvement and faculty development programs.



IBM Business Analytics [Booth 420]

For almost 50 years, IBM SPSS Predictive Analytics has been helping institutions of higher education to prepare students with the analytical skills needed to succeed today and to transform their own institutional practices. Turning data into predictive and actionable insight, innovative organizations are utilizing analytics to personally engage students, alumni and constituents throughout their lifecycle, resulting in key metrics such as increased enrollment yield, student retention rates and donor contributions, but more than anything, an enhanced student experience and optimized institutional outcomes.



iDashboards [Booth 120]

Beautiful Dashboards.
Powerful Insights.

iDashboards is a pioneer in the data visualization space. Through award winning engineering, and patented technology, we're making it easier to understand your data. At iDashboards we don't just provide richer, more visually engaging ways to display your data. We offer easy-to-build, dynamic dashboards that create context for any user – in any organization – so they can draw real meaning from raw data. No matter who you are, or what industry you work in, we can rapidly reduce the time it takes to build beautiful dashboards and discover powerful insights. Download a free trial today at iDashboards.com. www.iDashboards.com/edu



IData Incorporated [Booth 505]

IData is The Data
Management
Company for Higher

Education. Our products and services help institutions access, understand, connect and effectively use data across their systems. IData offers data management services with the Data Cookbook, system integration services with the IDataHub, and expert custom development and technology staffing.



IDEA Education [Booth 507]

IDEA, a non-profit organization established in 1975, set the standard for helping institutions improve learning. The Student Ratings of Instruction system, powered by Campus Labs technology, is a normed, research-based instrument focusing on student learning outcomes and provides feedback for development. Department Chair and Administrator systems are also available. www.IDEAedu.org



Incisive Analytics LLC [Booth 419]

Incisive Analytics
LLC (IA) is
an Analytics
and Business
Intelligence

Your power behind Business Intelligence



consulting firm. Our core services focus on solving a client's most challenging information problems. Our approach is to partner with clients, creating a unique experience to deliver results that equip clients to make strategic decisions using Take Action Analytics! IA provides full-lifecycle Business Intelligence solutions involving needs discovery, tool selection, technical design, and implementation and user acceptance into a 'culture of analytics'. We leverage an industry proven methodology, advocate star designs, and take an unbiased agnostic approach to the application of technology to evolve world class solutions for our clients. <http://www.incisiveanalytics.com/>

Information Builders [Booth 422]

Information Builders helps you achieve goals such as accountability, compliance, and efficiency. We do so with our 3

I's: business INTELLIGENCE, data INTEGRITY, and data INTEGRATION. And for 39 years as a leading, global, independent software provider, our goal has been our customers' success. Let us hear your needs for cohort tracking, retention analytics, academic dashboards, longitudinal analysis, data visualization, and data quality. At AIR 2014, attend Franklin University's presentation, "A Business Intelligence Implementation: Automating for Strategic Decisions". Learn about the RETA application template, either at our booth, our sponsor speaker session, or at www.informationbuilders.com/highered. Follow us on Twitter: @infobldrs.



Insightrix Research [Booth 123]

Insightrix Research works with clients in the higher education sector to collect data and turn it into intelligence and insight. Insightrix uses custom research approaches that are specific to the challenges an institution is facing or a strategy it is considering. We regularly conduct reputation, satisfaction and retention studies using the following research tools:



- survey research (online, telephone, SMS)
- advanced data analytics (complex trade-off, segmentation, key driver analysis)
- qualitative research (in-person and online focus groups, online bulletin boards, in-depth interviews, ethnography)
- online community panels

We combine classic methods with innovative approaches to obtain comprehensive, clear answers.

IOTA Solutions [Booth 512]

IOTA Solutions pioneered the online evaluation industry in the 1990s, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Army Research Institute, the Sloan Foundation, and 250 colleges and learning organizations. We create and customize web-based assessment tools that provide accurate, meaningful, and actionable feedback to college faculty and administrators. IOTA's Embedded Assessment™ methodology has received awards from FIPSE, ASTD and the Department of Education, and was the first & only evaluation system empirically demonstrated to improve instructor performance, remove barriers to learning, and increase student satisfaction. IOTA has hosted the annual "National Survey of Course Evaluation in Higher Education" since 1999.

**LiveText [Booth 511]**

LiveText provides campus-wide e-Portfolio, assessment, and accreditation management solutions.

Our comprehensive technology ensures faculty and administrators have web-based tools to collect, measure, and report actionable data for continuous improvement of the academic experience.

**National Student Clearinghouse [Booth 102]**

The National Student Clearinghouse, higher education's trusted partner



since 1993, provides education verification and reporting to over 3,300 postsecondary institutions, enrolling nearly 97 percent of all students in public and private U.S. institutions. Our educational research service, StudentTracker, enables institutions and researchers to study postsecondary success by querying our unique nationwide coverage of postsecondary enrollment and degree records. The National Student Clearinghouse® Research Center™ collaborates with institutions, states, school districts, high schools, and educational organizations as part of a national effort to use accurate longitudinal data outcomes reporting to make better informed educational policy decisions leading to improved student outcomes. www.studentclearinghouse.org

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) [Booth 108]

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is administered annually to first-year and senior students at participating institutions.



Results provide valid, reliable information on the extent to which students engage in proven educational practices that correspond to desirable learning outcomes. Over 1,500 bachelor's-granting institutions have participated in this effort to assess and improve undergraduate education. Institutions receive diagnostic information about teaching and learning, with customizable comparison groups, and resources to assist in interpreting and using results. Visit our exhibit to learn more about the updated NSSE and redesigned reports, and companion surveys, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE).


Noel-Levitz [Booth 421]

A trusted partner to higher education, Noel-Levitz offers customized solutions in student success and retention, recruitment, and strategic enrollment planning. We partner with institutional research offices across the country to help campuses assess students, intervene early, remove barriers to persistence and document activities for accreditation. Assessments include the Student Satisfaction Inventory, the College Student Inventory, plus surveys for other campus populations. Noel-Levitz also produces national reports and white papers to help campus leaders analyze current enrollment trends and discover more effective strategies. Visit (www.noellevitz.com) or (<http://blog.noellevitz.com>).



PACAT [Booth 501]

PACAT is a leading provider of exits exams for evaluating learning in the major. With over 30 year of experience, we provide the data you need to know what your students are learning. Departments select content components to match their teaching and learning goals. ACATs are available for 12 disciplines and have been administered to students on over 500 campuses. Three formats are available, ACAT pencil and paper, ACAT Online, and ACAT-N for unproctored online administration.



Public Insight [Booth 121]

Public Insight transforms complex higher education data (like data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System or IPEDS) into insight using an easy-to-use web platform so that users can quickly and easily navigate the data, create peer comparisons and benchmarks, and add context to what is traditionally complicated data sources.



QS Intelligence Unit [Booth 503]

The QS Intelligence Unit (QSIU) was formed in 2008 as a distinct and autonomous department of Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) in order to meet the increasing public interest for comparative data on universities and organisations, and the growing demand for institutions to develop deeper insight into their competitive environment. Building on over 20 years of collecting institutional data our portfolio of research projects include the QS World University Rankings®, which has been in existence since 2004.



With over 20 team members in the London and Singapore offices, QSIU is a highly skilled and culturally diverse team. Trusted. Independent. Global.

Rapid Insight Inc. [Booth 502]

Rapid Insight Inc. is a leading provider of predictive analytics software and solutions providing organizations the ability to make data driven decisions. Focusing on speed, efficiency and usability, Rapid Insight products enable users of any skill level to quickly turn their raw data into actionable information. Effortlessly integrate data from disparate sources. Visually build analytic processes to transform raw data into valuable information. Automatically build predictive models to give your organization a competitive advantage. Clients from small non-profits to Fortune 500 companies use the Rapid Insight Analytic platform. <http://www.rapidinsightinc.com/air>



SAP Americas, Inc. [Booth 411]

The new SAP is all about innovation. We have transformed our enterprise resource planning foundation with huge investments in business intelligence, mobile, and data management solutions. The SAP HANA software – our disruptive, new, 100% in-memory data management platform – is replacing traditional relational databases at an exceptional pace. It has transformed the approach to building higher-education data warehouses and dramatically impacted the institutional research organizations' ability to improve student retention rates and perform integrated postsecondary education data system reporting. Come by our booth to see why 97 of the top 100 universities in the world already run SAP software.



SAS [Booths 309, 311]

SAS' roots were established over 36 years ago when it was founded at North Carolina State University. Today, more than 3,000 educational institutions use SAS® to obtain accurate, critical and timely information. With SAS, users can aggregate and analyze data to improve decision making and strategic planning. SAS helps institutions:



- Analyze data on students, faculty, programs, facilities, etc.
- Provide self-service reporting to all users.
- Proactively manage enrollment, retention and programs.
- Target potential students and ensure the success of those currently enrolled.

Since 1976, SAS has given educators The Power to Know®. www.sas.com/ir

Scantron [Booth 403]

Need a better course evaluation or assessment solution? Scantron provides intelligent assessment, data management, and analytics solutions that help learners, educators, and leaders around the world. From web-based and desktop software to reliable scanners and guaranteed forms, Scantron products help you use your data instead of just collecting it. Scantron's proven solutions have helped colleges and universities simplify and speed up crucial data collection for decades. Effective decisions depend on reliable and meaningful data. Scantron software, scanners, and forms turn raw data into actionable results that drive organizational performance. See what Scantron can do for you today! www.scantron.com

**SmartEvals (GAP Technologies, Inc.) [Booth 106]**

SmartEvals.com (GAP Technologies, Inc.) prides itself on developing new technologies for colleges, universities and companies which allow you to improve with the least amount of effort. We do this by understanding how you, our customers, analyze data to make decisions, and by providing you with the tools to do it effortlessly. Founded in 2001 with an initial focus on web-based course evaluations, SmartEvals.com's Evaluation, Retention, and Assessment products now cover all of a school's needs for helping complete the "student success puzzle". We currently serve the needs of hundreds of collegiate institutions.

**Strategic Planning Online [Booth 410]**

Strategic Planning Online is highly effective,



Strategic Planning Online™
Empower Your Planning Process®

integrated, web-based solution for planning, budgeting, assessment, and accreditation. SPOL not only documents these efforts, but keeps users focused on priorities and thoughtfully engaged in institutional effectiveness. Designed to optimize communication and collaboration, use of SPOL builds institutional intelligence and brings consistency to IE.

Tableau [Booth 509]

Tableau Software helps people see and understand data.



Tableau's award-winning software delivers fast analytics, visualization and rapid-fire business intelligence on data of any size, format, or subject. The result? Anyone can get answers from data quickly, with no programming required. From executive dashboards to ad-hoc reports, Tableau lets you share mobile and browser-based, interactive analytics in a few clicks. More than 9,000 organizations, including some of the world's largest enterprises, rely on Tableau Software. www.tableausoftware.com

Taskstream [Booth 508]

Taskstream provides a central place online to manage assessment, accreditation, analytics, and e-portfolio activities across your institution. With Taskstream, you can manage learning outcomes assessment, address accountability requirements, and demonstrate continuous improvement. Our powerful technology and renowned support help you ensure that your students, and institution, are prepared to succeed. www.taskstream.com



The Outcomes Survey powered by CSO Research, Inc. [Booth 423]

The Outcomes Survey (powered by CSO Research, Inc.) is a first-of-its-kind national turnkey solution for first destination graduate outcomes data collection. It was designed specifically to meet existing reporting standards of BusinessWeek, U.S. News & World Report, NACE and MBA CSEA and existing and emerging reporting requirements in the White House College Scorecard, the Department of Education's proposed Gainful Employment rules, and the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act. CSO Research, Inc. is the global leader in next-generation career services automation, connecting students with employers through college career centers and measuring employment and graduate school admissions outcomes.



Thomson Reuters [Booth 104]

Thomson Reuters supports the full research lifecycle for all involved in the process. Our expertise allows us to integrate and centralize data across multiple sources for reliable research and development analysis. The systematic and objective assembly of data lets administrators, researchers and faculty explore and build upon research at the institutional, regional, national and global levels. To learn more, visit researchanalytics.thomsonreuters.com or contact the Thomson Reuters office nearest you.



THOMSON REUTERS™

Tk20 [Booth 405]

Tk20 CampusWide™ is a comprehensive assessment and reporting system for managing program, departmental, and institutional data, both academic and non-academic, for the measurement of institutional effectiveness and preparation for accreditation reviews. Plan assessments, link courses and assignments to your LMS (including Blackboard, Canvas, Desire2Learn, Moodle, and Sakai), collect data systematically, compare desired outcomes/objectives, and generate reports for program improvement, analyses, institutional reviews, and accreditation. Additionally, data imports from student information systems and other sources provide a comprehensive view of student learning and program quality. A dedicated Product Consultant helps ensure you're equipped to use the system fully and confidently.



U.S. News & World Report [Booths 321, 323]

U.S. News & World Report has developed an analytics dashboard which features an historical archive of rankings and rankings data. Utilizing high-level graphic capabilities and data visualizations you can create reports and tell compelling stories about your institution in a matter of minutes. We will be showcasing the functionality of the platform as well as discussing the proprietary data points we have never released until now. Benefits of subscribing to the platform will be covered, such as access to our proprietary customized Rankings Report.



ZogoTech [Booth 504]

With ZogoTech's data warehouse and analytics tools, colleges and universities can effectively leverage student and institutional data for decision-making. From enrollment management and longitudinal cohort tracking, to measuring key performance indicators, ZogoTech's solutions enable users at every level to easily access the information they need, when they need it.



Presenter Index

A

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Abbey, Craig | 19, 51, 114 |
| Aboufadel, Kathy | 71 |
| Acquah, Edward | 21, 89 |
| Adams, Megan | 18 |
| Ahonen, Cynthia | 65, 100, 109 |
| Alioto, Nicole | 70 |
| Allen, Carmen. | 95 |
| Alvarado, Adriana Ruiz | 55, 102 |
| Anson, Robert | 76 |
| Anuszkiewicz, Michael | 98 |
| Appel, Michelle | 102 |
| Armstrong, William | 104 |
| Asano, Shigeru | 45 |
| Aselas, Erin | 56 |
| Ashby, Jamie | 52, 77 |
| Atchison, Eric | 13 |
| Atwood, Julie | 110 |

B

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Baca, Bobby | 68 |
| Bachler, Paul | 104 |
| Bae, Yunhee | 31, 93 |
| Bailey, Erin | 54 |
| Ballagh, Amy | 18 |
| Barber, Rebecca | 18, 19, 85 |
| Barbu, Diana | 40 |
| Barrett, Sheri | 99 |
| Barrow, IL Young | 82, 104 |
| Bartholomew, Patricia. | 91 |
| Barton, Gary | 28 |
| Bates, Abigail | 55 |
| Baumann, Joseph | 47, 74 |
| Baumgartner, Mike | 65 |
| Beard, Melissa | 30 |
| Beckett, Tim. | 32 |
| Begelman, Ilya | 97 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Belcheir, Marcia. | 44, 76 |
| Belerique, Rosa. | 71, 89 |
| Bell, Erin | 95 |
| Beneteau, Francois | 40 |
| Bennett, Preston | 91 |
| Benson, R. Todd | 37 |
| Berndt, Matthew | 54 |
| Bernstein, Stanley | 101 |
| Betts, Noel | 75 |
| Beynon, Ann | 78 |
| Bhati, Divya | 28 |
| Blaich, Charles | 45 |
| Blankenberger, Bob. | 77 |
| Blasi, Laura | 26, 35 |
| Blume, Grant | 30 |
| Bohannon, Tom | 12 |
| Bohlig, E. Michael. | 19, 56 |
| Bolen, Michael | 47 |
| Bontrager, Katie. | 110 |
| Booth, Kathy | 29 |
| Borcoman, Gabriela | 80 |
| Borden, Victor. | 76, 94 |
| Boronat, Consuelo | 71 |
| Boswell, Ellen | 67 |
| Boudinot-Amin, Ann | 75 |
| Bowers, Pamela. | 29 |
| Bowman, Nicholas | 39, 88 |
| Bramblett, Sandi | 26, 49 |
| Braskamp, Larry | 54 |
| BrckaLorenz, Allison | 27, 37, 73, 112 |
| Brewer, Christopher. | 96 |
| Brey, Julliana | 31, 92 |
| Brooks, Eric. | 40 |
| Brooks, Susan | 98 |
| Brown, Andrea | 32, 95 |
| Brownell, Briana | 50 |
| Brunner, Jason | 97 |
| Bryant, Julie. | 34, 76 |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Bubnova, Elena | 97 |
| Buettner, Stefan. | 21, 46, 68, 79 |
| Buhrman, William | 83 |
| Burley, Hansel | 57 |
| Busby, Philihp. | 56 |
| Bush, Josh | 103 |
| Bustillos, Terry | 28 |
| Butson, Bethany | 96 |

C

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Campbell, Throy | 53, 96 |
| Case, Matthew | 57 |
| Casper, Cheryl | 76 |
| Cataldi, Emily | 102 |
| Chamberlin, Christopher | 91 |
| Chan, Eva. | 86 |
| Chapman, Heather | 49 |
| Chen, Hui-Ling | 45 |
| Chen, Jin | 81, 94 |
| Chen, Pu-Shih | 39 |
| Cheslock, John | 99, 100 |
| Chiang, Yi-Chen | 92, 112 |
| Childress, Janice | 79 |
| Cho, Ah Ra | 39 |
| Chow, Timothy | 72 |
| Clark, Andy | 111 |
| Clark, Renee | 52 |
| Clasemann, Cory | 81 |
| Clayton, Ashley | 52 |
| Clery, Sue. | 102 |
| Coates, Hamish. | 80 |
| Cobbett, Erin | 52 |
| Coble, Kris | 55, 93 |
| Cogan, Michael | 70 |
| Cohen, Margaret | 67 |
| Cohen, Shoshannah | 37 |
| Cole, James. | 95 |
| Conn, Cynthia. | 77 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <hr/> | |
| D'Allegro, Mary-Lou | 95 |
| D'Aquisto, Sondra. | 68 |
| Dalrymple, Margaret | 96 |
| Daly, Robert. | 37 |
| Das, Tania. | 92 |
| Davidson, Cody | 56, 103 |
| Davison, Sigrid | 96 |
| De, Tondra | 33 |
| Dean, Meredith | 36 |
| Delaney, Jennifer | 78 |
| Delgado, Cathy | 33, 114 |
| Denecker, Christine | 98 |
| DePaepe, Jim | 96, 101 |
| Devos, Loraine | 35, 48, 111 |
| DeVries, Henry | 70 |
| DeWitt, Jason | 53 |
| Dickmeyer, Nathan | 31, 46 |
| Dinin, Alessandra | 34 |
| Dixon, Margaret. | 96 |
| Dong, Suhua | 93 |
| Doran, Erin | 110 |
| Doykos, Bernadette. | 51 |
| Drake, Brent | 93 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| D'Allegro, Mary-Lou | 95 |
| D'Aquisto, Sondra. | 68 |
| Dalrymple, Margaret | 96 |
| Daly, Robert. | 37 |
| Das, Tania. | 92 |
| Davidson, Cody | 56, 103 |
| Davison, Sigrid | 96 |
| De, Tondra | 33 |
| Dean, Meredith | 36 |
| Delaney, Jennifer | 78 |
| Delgado, Cathy | 33, 114 |
| Denecker, Christine | 98 |
| DePaepe, Jim | 96, 101 |
| Devos, Loraine | 35, 48, 111 |
| DeVries, Henry | 70 |
| DeWitt, Jason | 53 |
| Dickmeyer, Nathan | 31, 46 |
| Dinin, Alessandra | 34 |
| Dixon, Margaret. | 96 |
| Dong, Suhua | 93 |
| Doran, Erin | 110 |
| Doykos, Bernadette. | 51 |
| Drake, Brent | 93 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| E | |
| Eagan, Kevin | 18, 34, 57, 69, 84, 102 |
| Eckelmann, Baerbel | 77 |
| Edge, Noel | 21 |
| Eimers, Mardy | 85 |
| Einaudi, Peter | 65 |
| Ellertson, Shari | 37 |
| Eubanks, David | 41, 64 |
| Evans, William | 100 |
| Evers, Billy | 41 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| Eagan, Kevin . . .18, 34, 57, 69, 84, 102 | |
| Eckelmann, Baerbel | 77 |
| Edge, Noel | 21 |
| Eimers, Mardy | 85 |
| Einaudi, Peter | 65 |
| Ellertson, Shari | 37 |
| Eubanks, David | 41, 64 |
| Evans, William | 100 |
| Evers, Billy | 41 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| <hr/> | |
| Fallucca, Amber | 29 |
| Fan, Xitao | 41 |
| Fatima, Nasrin | 43, 92 |
| Femino, Donald | 27 |
| Ferguson, Linda | 111 |
| Fernandez, Frank | 74 |
| Ferro, Bernadette | 34 |
| Figueroa, Tanya | 84 |
| Fingerson, Laura | 82 |
| Fink, Gayle | 113 |
| Fiorini, Stefano | 46 |
| Fitzgerald, Barrie | 111 |
| Flanigan, Samuel | 40 |
| Flory, Scott | 67 |
| Flynn, Daniel | 36 |
| Fosnacht, Kevin | 29 |
| Foster-Johnson, Lynn | 91 |
| Franklin, Doug | 77 |
| Fujiwara, Koji | 69 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Fallucca, Amber. | 29 |
| Fan, Xitao | 41 |
| Fatima, Nasrin | 43, 92 |
| Femino, Donald | 27 |
| Ferguson, Linda. | 111 |
| Fernandez, Frank | 74 |
| Ferro, Bernadette | 34 |
| Figueroa, Tanya | 84 |
| Fingerson, Laura | 82 |
| Fink, Gayle | 113 |
| Fiorini, Stefano | 46 |
| Fitzgerald, Barrie | 111 |
| Flanigan, Samuel | 40 |
| Flory, Scott | 67 |
| Flynn, Daniel | 36 |
| Fosnacht, Kevin. | 29 |
| Foster-Johnson, Lynn. | 91 |
| Franklin, Doug | 77 |
| Fuiiware, Koji | 69 |

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Gabriel, George | 83 |
| Gampert, Richard | 52, 86 |
| Gao, Song | 95 |
| Garcia, Arlene | 109 |
| Garcia, Ruben | 80 |
| Garcia, Valeria | 47 |
| Garczynski, Amy | 48, 111 |
| Gardiner, Couper | 43 |
| Gardner, Daniel | 20 |
| Gargano, Michael | 57 |
| Gaskin, Sylvester | 51 |
| Geise, Mary Jo | 73, 98 |
| Germaine, Ron | 28 |
| Giani, Matthew | 100 |
| Goldstein, Robert | 66, 82, 104 |
| Gonyea, Robert | 29, 40 |
| Goodall, Patricia | 81 |
| Goodman, James | 76 |
| Graham, Nicole | 75 |
| Grann, Jeff | 70 |
| Grant, Jeff. | 56 |
| Graunke, Steven | 38, 57 |
| Greaney, K. C.. | 29 |
| Green, Patricia | 65 |
| Greenland, William | 37, 99 |
| Gregg, Patricia | 52 |
| Gregory, Tiffany | 12 |
| Griffin, Kate | 62 |
| Grove Jameson, Crissie | 13, 21, 47, 63, 92 |
| Gualee, Uttam | 43 |
| Guan, Ken | 94 |
| Gunnell, Kurt | 87 |
| Guthrie, Lou. | 55, 71 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Gabriel, George. | 83 |
| Gampert, Richard. | 52, 86 |
| Gao, Song | 95 |
| Garcia, Arlene | 109 |
| Garcia, Ruben | 80 |
| Garcia, Valeria | 47 |
| Garczynski, Amy | 48, 111 |
| Gardiner, Couper | 43 |
| Gardner, Daniel | 20 |
| Gargano, Michael. | 57 |
| Gaskin, Sylvester | 51 |
| Geise, Mary Jo | 73, 98 |
| Germaine, Ron | 28 |
| Giani, Matthew | 100 |
| Goldstein, Robert. | 66, 82, 104 |
| Gonyea, Robert. | 29, 40 |
| Goodall, Patricia | 81 |
| Goodman, James. | 76 |
| Graham, Nicole | 75 |
| Grann, Jeff | 70 |
| Grant, Jeff. | 56 |
| Graunke, Steven | 38, 57 |
| Greaney, K. C.. | 29 |
| Green, Patricia | 65 |
| Greenland, William | 37, 99 |
| Gregg, Patricia | 52 |
| Gregory, Tiffany | 12 |
| Griffin, Kate | 62 |
| Grove Jameson, Crissie | 13, 21, 47, 63, 92 |
| Gualee, Uttam | 43 |
| Guan, Ken | 94 |
| Gunnell, Kurt | 87 |
| Guthrie, Lou. | 55, 71 |

Haeger, Heather 42, 73

Hagen-Foley, Debra 17, 36, 50
Hahn, Tom 90
Hamilton, Susi 62
Hansen, Michele 38
Hansman, Erin 94
Hardin, Christina 26
Harrington, Mary 12
Harrison, Dominique 69
Hart, Peter 27
Haugabrook, Brian 111
Hayward, William 37
Helm, Jennifer 110
Henderson, Angela 94
Herzog, Serge 114
Hiemstra, Heidi 56
Hill, Jennifer. 100
Hills, Jacqueline. 93
Hinds, Teri. 37, 49
Hingson, Sara. 73
Hinote, Brian 96
Hnetkovsky, Nixie 62
Hoffman, Laura 42
Holland, Nicole 92
Holt, Janet 33
Honda, Hirosuke 45
Hondula, David 69
Hook, Arnold 82
Horissian, Kevork 43
Howard, Maureen. 64
Howard, Richard 97
Hoyt, Jeff 96
Hughes, Bryce 34, 84
Huie, Stephanie Bond 113, 114
Hundley, Stephen 101
Hung, Ya-Chi 74
Hurtado, Sylvia 34, 55, 84
Huston, Daniel 39
Hwang, Jihee 110

I

Iboshi, Pearl. 30, 101
Ibrahim, Jamil 30, 48
Ikenberry, Susan 54
Imran, Kashif 35

J

Jackson, Pamela 46, 79
Jankowski, Natasha. 27, 55
Jean-Leger, Sherby. 74
Jenson, Eric. 92
Jia, Ning 84
Johnson, Elizabeth 100
Johnson, Gina 84
Johnson, Jeffrey 67
Johnson, Kendra 52
Johnson, Mimi 66, 86
Johnson, Nathaniel 65, 78
Jones, Bonnie. 42
Jones, Darlena 20, 21, 22
Jones, Evan. 29
Jones, Jason 82
Jones-White, Daniel 97
Jorissen, Shari 92
Joseph, Alison 19, 34, 75
Jowers, Angel. 21
Juno, Martin. 77

K

Kacira, Ozlem. 47, 63
Kallina, Wendy 13
Kang, Kelly 65
Kato, Hiroshi 87
Katzman, John 54
Kawanabe, Takashi 88
Kaylie, Matthew 74
Keiser, Jonathan 72

Keller, Christine 49, 81
Kelly, Heather 54, 68
Khlal, Maha 21
Kiec, Michelle 31, 48
Kinzie, Jillian 40, 55, 100
Kirby, Yvonne 11
Kistner, Natalie 51
Knepler, Erin 20
Knight, William 83, 98
Kollasch, Aurelia 51, 80
Kot, Felly Chiteng. 90
Krieb, Dennis 38
Krill, Austen 55, 75
Krist, Paula 13, 64
Kuh, George 27
Kulich, James. 54
Kumar, Thulasi 12

L

Laguilles, Jerold. 51
Laird, Thomas Nelson . . . 65, 90, 112
Laitinen, Amy 84
Lambert, Amber. 38, 45, 65
Lancey, Patrice 28, 112
Larkan-Skinner, Kara 47, 74
Larzabal, Alex. 35
Le Sante, Danilo 37, 91
Leany, Mark. 13, 17, 36, 74
Lee, Elizabeth. 96
Lee, Giljae 111
LeFever, Lee 26
Lelik, Mary 18
Lenchner, Erez 65
Lenio, Jim. 13, 22, 39
Lennon, Mary Catharine 80
Lenth, Charles S. 80
Leonard, John 110
Levick, Bruce 103

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Levine, Mona | 80 |
| Levy, Alice. | 99 |
| Lichtenberger, Eric | 71, 77 |
| Lillibridge, Fred | 20 |
| Link, Rachel. | 51 |
| Lintner, Chris | 29 |
| Liu, Jessie | 91 |
| Liu, Lu. | 56 |
| Liu, Min | 41 |
| Liu, Rita Xiaoyan | 43 |
| Liu, Tao | 46 |
| Liu, Ying. | 65 |
| Long, Alegneta | 84, 97 |
| Loveridge, Robert. | 74 |
| Lowman, Jennifer. | 33 |
| Loya, Karla | 74 |
| Lyddon, Jan. | 52, 77 |
| Lydell, Lesley | 28 |

M

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Ma, Yanli | 54 |
| Ma, Yingyi. | 65 |
| Maas, Paula. | 37 |
| Machamer, Amber | 27, 73 |
| Mack, Jennifer | 18 |
| Mack, Qing | 62 |
| MacNeil, Jacqueline | 41 |
| Major, Chris. | 48 |
| Martin, Geoffrey. | 65 |
| Martin, Laura | 27 |
| Mason, Bryce | 70 |
| Massa, Tod | 81 |
| Matsuda, Takeshi | 87 |
| Matthews, Daniel | 96 |
| Matthews, Geoff | 99 |
| Maxon, Joseph | 55 |
| McCann, Clare | 84 |
| McCarthy, Kevin. | 94 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| McClintock, Patricia. | 111 |
| McCormick, Alexander | 27, 80 |
| McGrath, John | 74 |
| McGuire, April. | 35 |
| McGuire, Katherine | 67 |
| McIntosh, Kadian | 76 |
| McLaughlin, Gerald | 33, 112 |
| McLaughlin, Jacqueline. | 112 |
| McLaughlin, Josetta | 112 |
| McNaughtan, Jon | 90 |
| McNeice-Stallard, Barbara | 56 |
| Mecoli, Noelle. | 57 |
| Mehl, Andy | 30 |
| Mehra, Shabnam | 47, 95 |
| Meintjes, Anneri. | 28 |
| Menon, Ajita Talwalker | 113 |
| Mercer, Laura | 27 |
| Merrill, Tim | 76 |
| Merson, Dan | 76 |
| Metzger-Mugg, Lisa. | 37 |
| Michalowski, Sam. | 42, 54 |
| Milburn, Trudy. | 67 |
| Miller, Angie. | 38 |
| Miller, Annette. | 73 |
| Miller, Katia | 79 |
| Miller, Mary | 44 |
| Millikin, Mary | 53 |
| Mills, Gordon | 21 |
| Milner, Bridgett | 66 |
| Moderson, Kurt | 73 |
| Moncada, Ramon. | 17, 109 |
| Mongold, David | 41, 92 |
| Moore, Brianna | 69 |
| Morse, Andrew | 82 |
| Morse, Robert. | 40, 101 |
| Moses, Anna | 29 |
| Moske, Amanda. | 39 |
| Moynihan, Amy | 63 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| Muller, Lisa | 67 |
| Mulligan-Nguyen, Erin | 110 |
| Mullin, Christopher | 21, 102 |
| Munley, Margaret | 44 |
| Murillo, Marco. | 101 |
| Murray, Ann | 31 |

N

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Nabors, Jennifer | 64 |
| Nailos, Jennifer | 42 |
| Nair, Uday. | 112 |
| Nauffal, Diane. | 75 |
| Nettles, Stephen | 35, 48, 111 |
| Nevill, Stephanie | 102 |
| Nguyen, Bach-Mai Dolly | 101 |
| Nguyen, Patricia | 101 |
| Nicholas, Tekla | 41 |
| Niu, Lian | 44 |
| Noble, Julie | 40 |
| Noh, Kyung-Im | 47 |
| Norton, John | 70 |
| Norville, Dereck. | 52 |
| Novak, Heather | 64 |

O

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| O'Malley, Timothy | 68, 101 |
| Oien, Karissa | 103 |
| Oliveri, Maria Elena. | 43 |
| Olney, Douglas | 69 |
| Olsen, Danny | 30, 92 |
| Onder, David | 19, 34, 75 |
| Ornelas, Fermin. | 39 |
| Ortagus, Justin | 48, 88 |
| Ostrow, Jessica | 91 |

P

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Packer-Muti, Barbara | 49, 81 |
|--------------------------------|--------|

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Padgett, Kathy | 50 |
| Pagano, Neil | 72 |
| Pankey, Robert | 42 |
| Parke, Scott | 81 |
| Parmer, Penelope | 27 |
| Parnell, Amelia | 22 |
| Patel, Monal | 93 |
| Patterson, Rebecca | 66, 82 |
| Pearce, Kimberly | 70 |
| Peck, Leah | 27, 92 |
| Pei, Qinglin | 57 |
| Peters, Shawn | 76 |
| Peterson, David | 97 |
| Petoskey, John | 49 |
| Petrie, Christopher | 29 |
| Petty, Tanjula | 62 |
| Pfaff, Shawn | 32 |
| Phillippe, Kent | 34, 49, 81 |
| Piegza, Larry | 79 |
| Pieper, Sue | 77 |
| Pierre, Mia | 26 |
| Pike, Gary | 57, 102 |
| Prescott, Brian | 30, 81 |
| Pryor, John | 20, 38 |

Q

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Qi, Wen | 98 |
| Quigg, Dan | 29 |

R

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Radulovich, Nichole | 103 |
| Radwan, Rasha | 75 |
| Ralph, Michael | 73 |
| Ramirez, Joseph | 55 |
| Raney, Dave | 70 |
| Redlinger, Lawrence | 29 |
| Reed, Matt | 78 |
| Reeves, Richard | 21, 22, 38 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Reyes, Nicole | 110 |
| Ribera, Amy | 65, 90 |
| Ribich, Laura | 63 |
| Rice, Annemieke | 83 |
| Rincones Gomez, Rigoberto | 17, 75 |
| Rittner, Laura | 27 |
| Roa, Leah | 98 |
| Robinson, Christine | 32, 103 |
| Robson, Shannen | 32 |
| Rocconi, Louis | 45, 90 |
| Rod, Alisa | 48 |
| Rodriguez Campos, Liliana | 17 |
| Rogers, Gregory | 83 |
| Rogulkin, Dmitri | 57 |
| Ronco, Sharron | 64, 102 |
| Roscoe, Heather | 54 |
| Ross, Leah Ewing | 20, 102 |
| Rossol-Allison, Patrick | 55, 71 |
| Rowen, Cate | 37 |
| Rozaklis, Lily | 52 |
| Rudawsky, Donald | 49, 69, 81 |
| Rudniy, Alex | 109 |
| Rusinko, Paul | 55, 93 |
| Ryan, John | 35, 102 |

S

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| Salmon, Jon | 69 |
| Samson, Marisol Arredondo | 42 |
| Sanchez, Edgar | 66 |
| Santos, Susana | 46 |
| Sapp, Mary | 13, 78 |
| Sarraf, Shimon | 95 |
| Sauermelch, Stephen | 101 |
| Sausa, Marco | 98 |
| Savage, William | 35 |
| Saw, Amanda | 77 |
| Sawtell, Ellen | 74 |
| Schaible-Brandon, Sonia | 83 |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Schlenbecker, Darlene | 55 |
| Schroeder, Katie | 84 |
| Schwartz, Robert | 99 |
| Scott, Cheryl | 97 |
| Scott, Kenneth | 66, 86 |
| Seidel, Ewa | 81 |
| Sen, Rummy | 32 |
| Sen, Tarun | 32 |
| Sharkness, Jessica | 18, 62, 79 |
| Shepard, Linda | 46 |
| Shepherd, Justin | 99 |
| Shigeta, Katsusuke | 87 |
| Shimada, Toshiyuki | 45 |
| Sidle, Meg | 89 |
| Silber, Donna | 83 |
| Simon, Jason | 39 |
| Simpkins, Benjamin | 96 |
| Skillrud, Kirsten | 45 |
| Sklar, Jeffrey | 72 |
| Snead, Shavecca | 42 |
| Snyder, Elizabeth | 79 |
| Song, Wei | 93 |
| Soni, Jaya | 109 |
| Spirgel, Arie | 69, 81 |
| Spirrison, Hannah | 45 |
| Stack, David | 111 |
| Stafford, Linnea | 44 |
| Stafford, Thomas | 44 |
| Stanley, John | 114 |
| Stanley, Tim | 13, 17, 32, 72, 99 |
| Stevens, Brian | 69 |
| Stewart, Theresa | 55 |
| Stimers, Mitch | 89 |
| Stolzenberg, Ellen | 69 |
| Stonecipher, Paul | 88 |
| Straney, Rachel | 112 |
| Stromp, Steven | 71 |
| Sujitparapitaya, Sutee | 11 |

Sulka, John 32
 Sun, Jie 80
 Suspitsyn, Dmitry 72
 Swearingen, Garrett 79

T

Taft, Michael 51
 Tamashiro, Dustin 56
 Tandberg, David 40
 Taylor, Howard 73
 Taylor, Michelle 55
 Teeter, Christina 70
 Teranishi, Robert 101
 Ternes, Reuben 28
 Thomas, Christine 62
 Thompson, Kimberly A. 11
 Thornton, Jessica 100
 To, Khoi 100
 Tolis, Diane 40
 Torii, Tomoko 88
 Toven-Lindsey, Brit 90
 Troutman, David 33, 113, 114
 Troy, Mark 31, 93
 Trujillo, Daniel 109
 Trumpower, Peter 87
 Tuchmayer, Jeremy 52, 63
 Turner, Jere 45
 Tysse, Jon. 38

U

Umbach, Paul 34, 52
 Umbricht, Mark 48, 100
 Usinger, Peter. 112

V

Van Ommeren, Alice 29
 Vasilieva, Maria 47, 63

Vohra, Akil 101
 Voight, Mamie. 84, 97

W

Wallace, Andrew 111
 Wallinga, Michael 94
 Wang, Chris. 35
 Wang, Minghui 46
 Wang, Ning 71
 Wang, Xueli 88
 Wang, Yan. 88
 Wartel, Max 54
 Watanabe, Yuki 87
 Watson-Stone, Novadean. 66, 86
 Webber, Karen 67, 99
 Weiss, Joanne 31, 54, 67
 Wheatle, Katherine 100
 White, Carla. 112
 Whitfield, Christina 34
 Wiley, Andrew. 74
 Williams, Tracy 86
 Wilson, Nathan 81
 Wimbley, Arlene. 33
 Wiorkowski, John 29
 Wise, John 76
 Wise, Kathleen 45
 Witt, Mary Allison 77
 Wooley, Kendi. 35
 Woosley, Sherry 73
 Wright, Melinda 103
 Wu, Hui 86
 Wu, Shuqi. 39
 Wygant, Steve 30

X


Xie, Yan 104

Y

Yao, Chunmei 100
 Yin, Chengbo 63
 Yokoyama, Teruo 43
 Young, Lauren 53
 Yu, Fen 103
 Yucel, Gokhan 51
 Yue, Hongtao 45


Z

Zaruba, Karen 37
 Zehner, Andrew. 62
 Zhai, Meihua 68
 Zhang, Robert 89
 Zhang, Yi 66
 Zhang, Zhicheng 68, 111
 Zhu, Chunjuan 31, 46
 Zilvinskis, John 73, 94






Rosen Shingle Creek Convention Center, Upper Level




Floor Plans and Maps

Rosen Shingle Creek, First Floor





Hyatt Regency, Lobby Level





Notes

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

Notes

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

Notes

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve

Notes

AIR | FORUM

ORLANDO, FLORIDA • May 27-30, 2014

MyForum Where I

Share • Network • Learn • Inspire • Achieve