ASA IPEDS Research

- NEA
- AFT
- AASCU
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Community College Research Center

- NPEC Research Papers
- IPEDS HR Data Quality Study
IPEDS-HR
Analysis of faculty/staff composition & salaries for publications/presentations
IPEDS-HR | Types of Analysis

- Salary & purchasing power trends and comparisons by gender, state, rank, institutional level & control, HBCUs, land grant institutions, unionized/non-unionized institutions
- Trends in composition of faculty & staff
- Erosion of tenure
- Trends in appropriations versus salaries, expenditures on instruction and other expenditure categories

Some Faculty Fare Better... Land-Grant Institutions
Faculty purchasing power for Land Grant Institutions: 1995-96 to 2015-16

- 1862 Land Grants
- 1890 HBCU Land Grants

1995-96
- $68,288
- $59,170

2015-16
- $80,398
- $60,176

$9,119
$20,222
IPEDS: All Surveys

- Easy-to-use data search and reporting tool.
- Features peer grouping tool.
- Includes pre-created figures on key topics.
- Source: US Department of Education IPEDS data.
CUDAS | 10-20 Years of Data

- Faculty salaries
- Institutional finances
- Non-instructional staff
- Enrollment
- Completions
- Student finances
- Tenure
- Disinvestment indicator report
A Picture is Worth a 1,000 Words ... Average Faculty Salaries, 2017-18

- **Professor**
  - Peer Average: $115,738
  - Alabama State U: $98,816

- **Associate**
  - Peer Average: $85,056
  - Alabama State U: $77,837

- **Assistant**
  - Peer Average: $73,140
  - Alabama State U: $68,250

- **Instructor**
  - Peer Average: $53,345
  - Alabama State U: $52,615

- **Average**
  - Peer Average: $85,953
  - Alabama State U: $75,681
Average Salary Trend

- **Alabama State U**
- **Peer Average**
Trends: Expenditures per Student

Operating Expenditures/FTE

Instructional Expenditures/FTE

- Alabama State U
- Peer Average

Years: 1998-99 to 2016-17
The AASCU Story

Taps into a compendium of IPEDS data to tell the association’s story.

- Students (Pell, transfer, URM)
- Degrees, grad rates, outcomes
- Share of enrollments & degrees
- Finances (doing more with less; comparable student services expenditures)

The AASCU Reach

- With a membership of 384 institutions and 37 system offices in the US and US territories, AASCU institutions comprise 55% of the nation’s 725 public 4-year institutions.
- AASCU institutions enroll 3.3 million undergraduate students, or 47% of the nation’s public, 4-year undergraduate enrollments.
- AASCU institutions award about 600,000 bachelor’s degrees, or 49% of all bachelor’s degrees awarded by public 4-year institutions.

*AASCU also has 3 international member institutions: University of the Bahamas, China Center for International Education Exchange, University of Guyana.
On average, 17% of ESPs work part-time, but use of part-time staff is uneven across occupations.

Staff working in all ESP occupations have felt an improvement in purchasing power (salaries corrected for inflation) over the past 5 years.

- On average, purchasing power among ESP staff increased $1,857, or 4 percent, between the 2013 and 2017 academic years.
- Staff working in community service, legal and arts professions experienced the smallest increase in purchasing power, both in percentage and dollars - $844 dollars, or 1 percent purchasing power increase.
- Staff in sales professions experienced both the largest percentage and dollar improvement in purchasing power - $2,332, or 6 percent.
- Among healthcare staff - the highest paid among ESPs - both the percentage and dollar increase in purchasing power were slightly below average, $1,716, or 3 percent.
- The lowest paid ESPs - those working in service occupations, also experienced purchasing power increases less than average among ESPs, $1,205 and 3 percent.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Diversity Study</td>
<td>Relationship between change in faculty diversity and graduation rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinvestment</td>
<td>Analysis of institutions’ expenditure patterns as related to changes in governmental funding and other revenue sources; CUDAS report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Initiatives</td>
<td>Performance metrics &amp; benchmarking; ID potential grantees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NPEC: Assessing the Capacity of IPEDS to Collect Transfer Student Data
Research Questions

- What undergraduate transfer data are currently available through IPEDS?
- How are undergraduate transfer students defined in IPEDS?
- How do institutions define and report undergraduate transfer students for internal purposes?
- What national data are needed to answer important questions about undergraduate student transfer?
- Are there other reliable sources of undergraduate transfer data?
- After documenting the national need for undergraduate transfer data and limitations of IPEDS, how can the current IPEDS data collection be improved?
Methodology

Scan of the relevant literature and datasets

- Emphasis on transfer student data
- IPEDS EF, GR, OM
- National completion initiatives
- Regional datasets

Interviews with nine institutional and state stakeholders

- Semi-structured protocol
- Range of institution types, state agencies
- Recommended by external advisor
## Transfer Data Sources - IPEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>EF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • **First-time, full-time**, degree-seeking students.  
  • Fall or full-year cohort  
  • Dual enrollment students not included. | • **First-time, full-time** degree/certificate-seeking entering students.  
  • **First-time, part-time** entering.  
  • **Non-first-time, full-time** entering.  
  • **Non-first-time, part-time** entering.  
  • Dual enrollment students not included.  
  • Full-year cohort beginning 2017-2018 | • Undergraduate, degree/certificate-seeking, **first-time**.  
  • Undergraduate, other degree/certificate-seeking, **transfer-ins**. |
## Transfer Data Sources - Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>BPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>A degree/certificate undergraduate entering the institution for the first time but known to have previously attended a postsecondary institution. The student may transfer with or without credit.</td>
<td>Can be computed; no explicit definition.</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Not applicable.
## Transfer Data Sources - Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AACC VFA</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>CCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer-in</strong></td>
<td>• Earned postsecondary credits after HS at another institution, if enrolling for the first time at your institution.</td>
<td>Includes transfer-in students in reporting, but does not provide an explicit definition of transfer-in.</td>
<td>• “Transfer at entry:” Previously attended a postsecondary institution. • With or without credit/degree award. • Does not include students entering with credit earned in high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer-in cohort required for: • Full-time AA, BA seeking • Part-time AA/certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional for: • Part-time BA seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transfer Data Sources - Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>BPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transfer-out**       | Did not complete a program and transferred.                       | Students who have not completed a program or graduated but have subsequently enrolled in any program of an eligible institution. | † Not applicable. | Can be computed; no explicit definition.                          | Student leaves one institution (the origin) and enrolls at another institution (the destination) for four or more months consecutively without being concurrently enrolled at the origin institution.†2
|                        | • Report if mission includes providing substantial preparation for students to enroll elsewhere without completing. | • Report transfer out regardless if the institution has transfer prep as part of mission. |            |                                                                      | • Transfer status is checked at each follow-up.                                               |
|                        | • Must document that the student transferred; required to report only students known to transfer to an eligible institution. |                                                                      |            |                                                                      |                                                                      |
|                        | • If not part of mission, transfer-out reporting is optional.     |                                                                      |            |                                                                      |                                                                      |

† Not applicable.

1 This transfer definition does not consider whether course credits were accepted by the destination institution. Students who co-enroll in a second institution without leaving the first institution are not considered to be transfers.

2 Derived from student-unit data that include information about the date of transfer, the destination program, the type and level of the destination institution, the direction of transfer (4-year to 4-year, 2-year to 4-year, etc.), the time between enrollments, number of transfers per year between follow-ups.
Transfer Data Sources - Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>AACC VFA</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>CCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-out</td>
<td>A student enrolling and taking courses at another postsecondary institution after their last enrollment at your institution. The start date of the enrollment at the new institution does not matter. <strong>What is reported:</strong> <em>Two-year outcome:</em> Number of students in the two-year cohort who have not earned a formal award (e.g., AA or certificate) from your institution by the end of two years but have evidence of transferring to another institution by the end of the second year. <strong>Six-year outcome:</strong> Number of students in the six-year cohort who have evidence of transferring to another institution by the end of their sixth year. Students who have not earned an award and those who earned a certificate or AA are considered to have transferred if there is an enrollment at another institution.</td>
<td>BA Seeking: Transferred/graduated from one or more subsequent institution; transferred/are still enrolled at a subsequent institution. <strong>AA/Certificate Seeking:</strong> Transferred to one or more subsequent institution (includes students who transferred and are still enrolled, graduated, or whose status is unknown). <strong>What is reported:</strong> Six-year for full-time BA seeking and AA/certificate seeking cohorts; ten-year outcomes for part-time BA seeking cohorts.</td>
<td>Number of students from two-year colleges who enroll at a four-year institution of higher education. <strong>What is reported:</strong> Four-year outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Transfer Data Sources - Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>SREB</th>
<th>MHEC</th>
<th>NEBHE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer-in</strong></td>
<td>†</td>
<td>- Entering undergraduates for fall terms. - Includes full-time and part-time, degree/certificate- and non-degree-seeking; - Includes students who initially attended the prior summer term and returned again in the fall.¹</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer-out</strong></td>
<td>†</td>
<td>- Student who leaves the institution in which s/he is included in the cohort and enrolls at another institution. - Documented by fall of year 2 from the cohorts, within 150 percent of normal time.</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Not applicable.
¹ Included in cohort, but not disaggregated in report.
## Transfer Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregate</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>BPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Race/ethnicity  
• Gender  
• Gender and race/ethnicity  
• New in 2016: Pell Grant and Subsidized Stafford loan recipients. | • Pell Grant receipt (new in 2017-18).  
• Full- and part-time attendance (based on first term of attendance).  
• First-time versus non-first-time.  
• Data are collected for combinations of the disaggregations above, e.g., the number of first-time, full-time, Pell recipients can be analyzed.) | Full- and part-time students. | • Required: Enrollment Status; Date of birth; Class/level; First-time, full-time degree/certificate seeking undergraduate flag; Degree-seeking; Gender; Race/ethnicity; Program information.  
• Optional: Veteran’s status; Pell Grant recipient; Remedial; Citizenship. | All NPSAS demographics and background data elements are available. |
## Transfer Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregate</th>
<th>AACC VFA</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>CCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Race/ethnicity, gender, Pell Grant status, age, college-readiness, and full-time/part-time status. • Main Cohort (all students new to the institution) and Credential Seeking Cohort.</td>
<td>• Full-time/part-time. • BA v. AA/Certificate seeking.</td>
<td>• Race/ethnicity, gender, income (Pell Grant recipients), age group, attendance status. • Degree type, discipline. • Number of transfer credits (12 or fewer, 13 to 30, more than 30 credit hours but not an Associate’s degree), completed an Associate’s degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Findings

- Importance of Transfer Students & Data
  - Role of transfer in strategic plans and completion initiatives
  - Emphasis on transfer metrics and reporting
  - Specialized transfer programs, policies, and services
Interview Findings: Sample Reporting

- **Transfer-in by:**
  - Feeder/sending college.
  - Student level, enrollment status, number of credit hours, associate degree completion.
  - Student characteristics (race/ethnicity, international status, military status, first generation status, Pell Grant receipt, and residence).
  - Number of credit hours BA completers earned from each community college.
  - “Native” vs. junior-/sophomore-level transfer GPA, persistence, and completion.

- **Transfer-out by:**
  - Enrollment and completion at receiving institution using NSC.
  - Major, articulation, GPA, dual credit, transfer-in status, number of credits transferred in, and receiving institution.
  - Transfer intent vs. transfer rates.
  - Out-of-state awards.

- **Both (2/4-year partnership)**
  - Excess credits, credits accepted by the receiving institution, associate’s degrees awarded, course failure and success rates.
Interview Findings: Transfer definitions

- **Transfer-in varies by:**
  - **Number of credits:** Two interviewees require a minimum of 12 credits.
  - **Dual enrollment:** Two interviewees include students with dual enrollment credit in their transfer definition (if the student earned credits at a different college than the one in which they are enrolled after high school graduation).

- **Transfer-out:** Typically, no definition, or simply enrolling in another postsecondary institution. Tracked via NSC.

- **Reverse transfer - 2 definitions:**
  - Transferring from a 4-year to a 2-year institution, or
  - Retroactive awarding of an associate’s degree.
Interview Findings: 

IPEDS Transfer Feedback

- Mixed levels of satisfaction with student transfer representation in IPEDS.

- OM survey is a good start to tracking outcomes of transfer-in students.

- Waiting to use the OM survey until it is more established due to recent changes.

- Most interviewees rely on more detailed institutional or state-level transfer datasets.

- IPEDS not as useful for community colleges, “huge reporting burden.”
  - Perceived value may change with the addition/use of OM.
Interviewee Recommendations: OM Changes

- Disaggregate non-first-time by:
  - Number of credits
  - Upper/lower division
  - Transfer vs. stop-out students

- Clarify data display:
  - Include information about the data source.
  - Clarify in Navigator whether the award received is at the same or a different institution.
Interviewee Recommendations: Additional Transfer Data “Wish List”

- Transfer retention rates
- Financial aid receipt
  - native vs. transfer
  - average loans and debt at graduation
- Transfer admissions data
- 12-month enrollment: first-time, continuing, transfer
- GR: transfer rates
- EF transfer-in characteristics (age and residence) on Navigator
Interviewee Recommendations: Broader Changes

- Classifying transient students:
  - When to remove from cohort
  - 4-year/non-degree student summer classes

- Institutional classifications

- Data dissemination/display (Navigator)
  - See College Portrait visual aids

- Dissemination of IPEDS transfer-related data

- Integrating data systems (Banner/Peoplesoft, NSC)

- Student Unit Record Data System

- Net price reports
Transfer Recommendations

1. Clarify transfer-out definition (note students who earned credentials excluded).
2. Add transfer items to Admissions survey.
3. Further disaggregate OM non-first-time by number of credits.
4. Collect transfer-in and transfer-out by institution level (EF and GR).
5. Explore the possibility of a transfer-specific survey.
Upcoming ASA NPEC papers

Admissions
Institutional Characteristics/IC Header