

**Performance Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of January 18, 2001**

The meeting of the Performance Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents was held on the campus of Edison State Community College in Piqua, Ohio. In attendance were the following:

Ohio Board of Regents members:

Edmund Adams, Committee Chair
Jeanette Grasselli Brown
J. Gilbert Reese

Ohio Board of Regents staff:

Deborah Gavlik, Director, Budget & Resource Planning
Earl Mackey, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs
Neal McNally, Assistant Director, Budget & Resource Planning
Richard L. Petrick, Vice Chancellor for Finance
Robert Sheehan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Performance Reporting & Analysis
William Wagner, Financial Analyst

Guests:

Larry Christman, Association of Independent Colleges & Universities of Ohio
Jim Johnson, Sinclair Community College/Ohio Faculty Senate
Keith Kameron, Edison State Community College
Earl Keese, Lima Technical College
Jim McCollum, Inter-University Council
Sally Perz, University of Toledo
Terry Thomas, Ohio Association of Community Colleges
Lynn Willett, President, Muskingum Area Technical College

The meeting was called to order by Regent Adams. The minutes of the December 2000 Committee meeting were approved without objection.

Follow-up on the Governor's Performance Report

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted the relatively widespread media coverage of the Performance Report and told the Committee that the report had been modified to express the average time to degree completion using the median rather than the mean. This change was suggested by several campuses, and represents a more meaningful measure since the median is unaffected by extreme periods of time that often occur when students stop-out but subsequently re-enroll to complete their degree. Larry Christman noted a recent newspaper article suggesting that the use of a calendar year in the Performance Report (instead of an academic year) might have distorted the data. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted that differences between calendar year and academic year are worth noting. Regent Adams requested that the type of year used be clarified in future reports. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan also noted that a consultation had been scheduled for February 22, 2001, to discuss the possibility of including in the Performance Report more content specific to campuses with urban

missions. So far, 30 representatives from 19 campuses have indicated that they would attend this consultation.

Update on Law School Performance

Regent Adams updated the Committee on the discussions with the private law college deans regarding the performance of Ohio's law schools. Larry Christman asked if the discussion should occur at the dean, provost, or presidential level. Regent Adams stated that he would be comfortable with holding the discussions with the deans. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted that there are issues common to both private and public law schools. The possibility of scheduling a discussion with law school deans in May was discussed.

Statewide Financial Aid Study

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan outlined the issues causing the need for such a study: We learned in developing the performance report that it is currently impossible to determine the actual net cost that students pay for college (vs. stated tuition and fees or "Sticker cost"). We also learned that we cannot currently report students' degree of indebtedness for college expenses. This raises a host of issues including the ability of students and/or graduates to repay loans, the appropriateness of need-based aid versus academic-based aid, and the costs experienced by campuses.

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan suggested that a statewide consultation be convened to frame an agenda and guide the discussions on these issues. Regent Adams asked if data would be developed on an institutional level. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan responded that this would be done at a statewide level but would also describe institutional financial aid packages. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted that because of the way institutions structure financial aid packages, the net cost of attending a private college or university is sometimes *less* than the cost of attending a public institution. Regent Brown noted the relevance of the Joint Council of the Ohio Department of Education and the Board of Regents, and its goal of improving access to college. Vice Chancellor Petrick stated that the Hope Scholarships represent a complicating issue, and suggested that the General Assembly be consulted to ensure that the policy goals of this study are aligned with state and federal policies. Regent Adams agreed that such a study was worth conducting and that he was willing to have it be conducted with the oversight of the Performance Committee.

OACC Survey of Perceptions of Community and Technician College Education

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan said that the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) is exploring the possibility of broadening the sample size for its survey, which could then be conducted in conjunction with the Board of Regents. A larger sample size would allow for survey results to be presented regionally. The cost of this survey (with a 10% margin of error for campuses) would be about \$40,000, which would be shared by the OACC and OBR. Terry Thomas noted that a broader survey would offer more value to OACC member campuses, but expressed concern over the relatively large margin of error caused by the larger sample size. Regent Adams suggested that it would be worth spending even more to reduce the margin of error, and asked that this issue be revisited. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan stated

that the data compiled from this survey would be incorporated into next year's annual Performance Report and made available through the HEI system.

Deregulation of Higher Education

Vice Chancellor Petrick outlined the draft document of *The Case for Further Deregulation of Higher Education in Ohio*, stating that it was prepared by a collective effort of Regents' staff. Vice Chancellor Petrick told the Committee that the issue of deregulation arose, in part, from Regent Miller's desire to reduce barriers to competition in higher education. According to Vice Chancellor Petrick, further deregulation is consistent with the Regents' role as a coordinating board, as opposed to an oversight or governing board. Campuses have been invited to review and comment on the document, which will be reviewed by the full Board for action at the March or April meeting.

Vice Chancellor Walters provided the Committee with some background information on the issue of academic program review, and stated that the growth of technology on campuses has created an excellent opportunity to review this issue, especially for programs not widely available but are in need and/or in demand. The ultimate goal would be to simplify and expedite the process of program review by the Regents. Terry Thomas suggested that issues specific to the two-year sector, such as service districts, also be reviewed. Regent Reese asked why legislation would be necessary to begin taking steps toward further deregulation. Vice Chancellor Petrick stated that because all of the requirements being considered for deregulation are included in legislative language, a change in law would be required. Regent Reese expressed concern that accomplishing further deregulation might take too long. Vice Chancellor Petrick was optimistic that this could occur expeditiously, particularly with regard to the tuition cap policy.

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted that the Committee would not hold a meeting in February since the Board's next meeting is scheduled for March. Regent Adams adjourned the meeting.