

**Performance Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of July 20, 2000**

The meeting of the Performance Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents was held in the Spitzer Conference Center on the campus of Lorain County Community College in Elyria, Ohio. In attendance were the following:

Ohio Board of Regents members:

Edmund Adams, Committee Chair
Ralph Schey
Gerald Miller

Ohio Board of Regents staff:

Roderick G.W. Chu, Chancellor
Richard Petrick, Vice Chancellor for Finance
Robert Sheehan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Performance Reporting & Analysis
Michael Brown, Director of Communications
Clyde Eberhardt III, Director for Capital Development
Kristina Frost, Director of Operations
Earl Mackey, Vice Chancellor for External Relations
Laura Massie, Administrator for Public Information & Media Relations

Guests:

Roy Church, President, Lorain County Community College
Rosemary Jones, Cuyahoga Community College
Craig McAtee, Cuyahoga Community College
Ginny Hamilton, Shawnee State University/Ohio Faculty Council
Gitanjali Kaul, Ohio University
Jessica Popricki, AICUO
William Rickert, Wright State University
Ron Rutti, Cleveland *Plain Dealer*
Lou Suarez, Lorain County Community College/Ohio Faculty Senate
Sandra Suoboda, Toledo *Blade*
Terry Thomas, Ohio Association of Community Colleges

The meeting was called to order by Regent Adams. The minutes of the June 22nd meeting were approved as amended to clarify that Regent Adams had not initiated the ongoing discussions with the law school deans but rather the deans had made contact with Regent Adams (concerning the performance of Ohio's law schools).

Graduate Funding Commission Update

Noting that a policy on fee waivers does not currently exist, Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan stated that the Graduate Funding Commission is working to develop such a policy. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan said that a policy on tuition waivers would establish regulatory language and accountability measures, which would enable OBR to respond to questions such as those that arose at the University of Toledo two years ago.

Higher Education Funding Commission Update

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan told the Committee that the Higher Education Funding Commission is scheduled to meet only two more times, August 10 and September 6, 2000, and will continue to focus on performance-related funding strategies such as the Jobs, Research, and Success Challenge line items. The Commission is also reviewing performance-based funding strategies for law schools and potential new challenge line items having K-12 and technology themes. Regent Miller noted the possibility of providing funds for communities to study and identify local needs to determine the type of K-12 initiatives that may be needed locally, particularly in areas that do not enjoy leadership from a college or university campus.

Status of Law School Funding Proposal

Regent Adams stated that there was no progress to report since the last Committee meeting, but that he hoped to have something within the coming weeks. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted the three interrelated goals of a new law school funding mechanism: (1) to improve the quality of Ohio's law school graduates – something the law school deans have a keen interest in; (2) to improving the employability of the graduates of Ohio law schools, which should be rewarded by a new funding system; and (3) to downsize Ohio law school enrollments in a fiscally responsibly manner. Regent Adams stated that in addition to concern about downsizing, there is concern among the law school deans about the use of a job placement element in a new funding formula.

Requested Report on Enrollment Caps

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan briefed the Committee on the policy of enrollment caps at residential campuses, stating that although the intent is not entirely clear, the caps were probably established to encourage enrollment growth at newly created urban universities during the late 1960's and early 1970's. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted that all of Ohio's state-supported residential campuses are under their enrollment caps but that Ohio and Miami Universities are approaching their respective caps. Regent Adams said that the original intent of these caps is not clear nor is the modern purpose. Regent Adams added that although more information is needed, the caps seem to contradict the Statewide Marketing Plan. Vice Chancellor Petrick agreed, stating that Ohio is in fact an undereducated state. Chancellor Chu put the caps in a different context, stating that the era in which the caps were established (1969) was a time when higher education was seen as having an educational monopoly – a perception that no longer exists. Regent Adams asked how campuses would view the removal of the enrollment caps. Chancellor Chu responded that all campuses have a stake and would probably respond by altering their individual marketing strategies. Chancellor Chu continued, stating that the entire higher education community should discuss this issue together, and because the caps exist in statute, the General Assembly and Legislative Office of Education Oversight should also be included in this discussion. Noting the relevance between the enrollment caps and the actual size of campuses, Regent Schey suggested that land would increasingly become a scarce resource.

Status Report of Governor's Requested Annual Performance Report

Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan briefed the Committee on the status of the performance report, citing items not receiving support from the performance report committee, one of which was the technology-related measure of a PC to student ratio, which some campuses felt would be too difficult to measure. In response, Regent Adams stated that the Regents' Performance Committee strongly supports including such data in the governor's performance report and asked why these data would be difficult to measure. Chancellor Chu suggested that definitional issues might block some campuses from effectively collecting and/or reporting such data. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan said that campuses do not see such a ratio as being unimportant but that campuses are reluctant because they perceive it as a measure of capacity or utilization of instructional space. Regent Adams stated that such data should at least be included at some point in a future performance report. Vice Chancellor Petrick said that a facilities audit would be conducted for the next capital bill (FY 2003-2004), which might provide data for a future performance report. Regent Miller asked if there had been any consideration for a subjective measure for mission fulfillment, which would supplement and put into perspective the hard data included in the report. Regent Miller continued, stating that portions of the report should be identified for audiences such as the legislature, parents, and prospective students. Regent Miller asked if the final report would be posted on the Internet. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan responded that the report would be posted on the OBR website as a searchable document. Regent Adams asked about the extent of Governor Taft and/or his staff's involvement in the report's development. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan said that Chancellor Chu had been keeping the governor's office informed of the committee's progress on the report. President Church suggested that students' intentions and goals should be distinguished from student achievement. According to President Church, this represents a challenge related to upgrading Ohio's workforce, which will continue to be done through noncredit instruction and training. President Church added that no vehicle exists to demonstrate the impact of higher education on local communities and that such a measure would be ideal for the governor's performance report. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan responded that a market penetration analysis will be included in the report and that Howard Gauthier is currently updating this analysis with the most recent census data. Regent Schey noted the absence of feedback on satisfaction on the higher education experience from college graduates ten years after graduation. Regent Miller asked if there has been discussion of using customer satisfaction surveys. Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan noted the possibility of using state-funded campus surveys to gather data from students and alumni.

Employment Data Outcomes

Because of time constraints, Associate Vice Chancellor Sheehan deferred this item until a future Committee meeting.

Campus Efforts to Assess Academic Outcomes

Ohio University Provost for Assessment and Institutional Research Gitanjali Kaul made a presentation to the Committee about OU's efforts to assess academic outcomes. Dr. Kaul stated that (1) program review, (2) annual student outcomes, (3)

external accreditation, and (4) student credit-generating units are assessed. Reasons for this assessment are both internal and external, including accountability and improvement, state mandates, and NCA and Board of Regents' requirements. Wright State University Associate Provost William Rickert also made a presentation on WSU's assessment programs. According to Dr. Rickert, WSU's outcome-focused program is conducted for purposes of accountability and improvement, and boasts broad participation that includes students, faculty, staff, and alumni. Chancellor Chu noted that NCA has entered into a similar study with the Pew Institute on alternative methods of accreditation that is also outcome-based. Dr. Rickert stated that although he was familiar with this study, WSU is not participating.

The meeting was adjourned by Regent Adams.

\\REGENTS\BUDGET\NM\Board\Performance\FY2000\Minutes_July_20.doc