

FY 2006 State Share of Instruction Consultation
February 17, 2006
Last revised 3-8-2006
Draft Notes

Goals of today's meeting:

- Receive updates on higher education-related policy proposal and issues
- Receive and discuss the draft recommendations from the Taxonomy Subcommittee and preliminary feedback from the Out of the Box Subcommittee
- Review and discuss the meaning of STEM² enrollments & graduates

1. Call to order
2. Review of the notes of the January 13, 2006 meeting of the consultation.
3. Review of today's agenda
4. Old business

4.1. Revised FY 2006 Enrollment Projections

- 4.1.1. Relative to FY 2005, the FY 2006 FTE projections recently reported by campuses indicate that enrollments are expected to be flat with a projected statewide increase of 0.2%. This represents a decrease from earlier projections that indicated statewide projected growth of 1.9%.

4.2. Professional Doctorates

- 4.2.1. A policy memo will be finalized by Regents staff and sent to campuses within the next few weeks. This memo will outline and clarify the Regents' policy.

4.3. Funding course completions

- 4.3.1. This item will remain on the long-term agenda. There is strong interest in this concept from the General Assembly and other state policy-makers. There remain flaws and drawbacks to such a policy, including:
 - 4.3.1.1. Incentive for increased selectivity and therefore reduced access for at-risk students;
 - 4.3.1.2. Could shift state dollars away from STEM courses because students drop these courses at greater rates;
 - 4.3.1.3. Pre-course screening/testing policies differ by campus, which impacts course completion rates. A first step might be to survey campuses to determine current practices.
 - 4.3.1.4. There has been interest in possibly funding *improvements* in course completions. But campuses like Miami that already have high completion rates would not benefit.
 - 4.3.1.5. There has also been interest in aligning the state enrollment census date with the date used by campuses (i.e., 15th day) that might limit refunds to students and therefore encourage them to complete the course. However, this might discourage students from enrolling in challenging courses.
 - 4.3.1.6. The H.B. 66 Mandates Subcommittee is reviewing this issue and will recommend that SSI dollars not be used for this

purpose. Another committee might be needed to delve deeper into these issues. Such a committee would include chief instructional officers.

5. Reports from SSI-related study groups

5.1. The Taxonomy subcommittee

- 5.1.1. Draft recommendation: Rosemary Jones and Darrell Winefordner, co-chairs of the Taxonomy Subcommittee, introduced the committee's recommendation by thanking Ralph Gutowski for earlier committee efforts in proposing taxonomy changes, during the last biennium. The preliminary structure of the current proposal began with the work of Ralph's committee which provided a valuable basis for analyzing the current taxonomy.
- 5.1.2. The presentation and explanation of each recommendation was lengthy and included questions from the members of the SSI Consultation. During the presentation, the following items were highlighted and discussed:
 - 5.1.2.1. The number of models is expanded from 16 to 26, as a means for reducing the cost variance by 42%, within each model;
 - 5.1.2.2. The clear categorization of STEM courses allows for a clearer understanding of state funding policy;
 - 5.1.2.3. Six-year resource analysis data is recommended, as opposed to the current use of one year's data, for determining average costs;
 - 5.1.2.4. The data in the Course Expert System should be reviewed by the Board of Regents for consistency and accuracy, in order to guarantee that each campus is reporting course subject and level data appropriately and consistently;
 - 5.1.2.5. The subcommittee recommends the use of total cost data, as opposed to the component costs (i.e., student services costs, POM costs, etc.), in order to eliminate certain formula adjustments that complicate the SSI formula;
 - 5.1.2.6. The recommendation includes the elimination of four adjustment/weights, specifically the: (1) POM square footage adjustment; (2) POM Activity Weight; (3) student services weight; (4) use of the average student services cost;
 - 5.1.2.7. The subcommittee recommends the introduction of an adjusted uniform state share that starts with a 41% share, which provides a powerful communication tool. This state share is then adjusted for:
 - Doctoral set-aside;
 - 25% weighting to the graduate models;
 - Various STEM² weights that hold the models harmless relative to the current taxonomy and formula allocation for FY 2006. (Note: STEM² includes Med 1 and the Med 2.)
- 5.1.3. There were questions about a possible phase-in strategy for making a transition to the proposed changes in taxonomy and formula allocation. Darrell Winefordner advised that the Taxonomy Subcommittee did not recommend a specific transition strategy

since the redistributive effects could not be measured until their recommendation was accepted in total, or in part. It was noted that the taxonomy's recommendation (as a whole) was greater than the sum of its parts. Furthermore, the consensus reached within the subcommittee may erode if the formula recommendations, as presented, were not adopted as a whole. Nevertheless, Darrell ended the presentation by outlining the various transitional strategies included in the draft recommendation.

5.1.4. There was a discussion of the significant funding losses incurred by a few campuses that rely on funds from the current POM NASF adjustment. It was noted that these campuses have unique missions and campus structures. Therefore, the Taxonomy Subcommittee recommends that the square footage adjustment be addressed outside the SSI formula.

5.1.5. Issues and concerns

5.1.5.1. The SSI Consultation agreed that the report represents a tremendous effort and an excellent product. They applauded the Taxonomy Subcommittee and expressed trust in the subcommittee's work. The new taxonomy and formula should be embraced and implemented as early as FY 2008.

5.1.5.2. HEI reporting needs to be refined to improve consistency among campuses.

5.1.5.3. There must be further discussion of the appropriate transitional strategy to provide funding stability to each campus.

5.1.5.4. Concerns remain over funding stability, both generally and at the individual campus level. This issue will need to be refined prior to a final product being recommended by the full Consultation.

5.1.5.5. *The SSI Consultation supports the concept of ensuring that funding adjustments are made for those campuses, such as MUO, Central State University and Ohio State's ATI campus, which are disproportionately disadvantaged by the SSI taxonomy changes, so these campuses are protected or made whole. The mechanism by which this will occur has not yet been determined. [Editor's note: Added 3-8-2006]*

5.2. The H.B. 66 Mandates subcommittee – Rich provided a brief update of the subcommittee's discussions.

5.3. The 'Out of the Box' subcommittee

5.3.1. Review of the proposal matrix developed by this subcommittee.

Due to time constraints, the group did not discuss each item in the matrix. This was simply a review—the Consultation was not asked to take action on these items.

5.3.1.1. Universal course redesign was revised by the subcommittee to the rapid adoption of course redevelopment. This is an opportunity to reduce costs and improve quality. It was noted that faculty are generally supportive of such efforts, but the

actual cost-savings is too often over-stated. Kate Carey from OLN would be invited to the next meeting to discuss this issue.

5.3.1.2. Awarding degrees on the basis of competency: the Consultation recommended referring this to the provosts and/or to the Teacher Standards Board.

5.3.1.3. Requiring all seniors to participate in PSEO: The Consultation recommended that this be encouraged but not required.

5.3.2. There was a discussion of whether the items identified by the OOB subcommittee should be referred to the Funding Study Council and whether such a referral meant that the SSI Consultation endorses the ideas. It was noted that the Funding Study Council is waiting for recommendations from the Consultation—they don't want more items to study.

5.3.2.1. It was suggested that the OOB subcommittee should emerge with a limited number of 2-3 radical ideas since most of the items on the matrix have already been discussed in one venue or another. However, it was noted that these items may not be new but they are good ideas that do not presently have much support—the actual implementation of any of these items would be radical.

5.4. The Clinical Teaching consultation: no update.

6. Update on other higher education policy groups

6.1. Higher Education Funding Study Council

6.2. Higher Education Leadership Coalition (HELCO)

6.2.1. HELCO is coordinating higher education's role and activity with respect to the tax expenditure limitation amendment that will appear on the November ballot.

7. Governor's State of the State

- Remedial education at two-year campuses
- The Ohio Core – High School Academic Course Standards

7.1. Each of these proposals is expected to be on the fast track in the legislature.

7.2. Physical capacity is an issue for college campuses, as is the related need for more math, science and foreign language teachers at the middle and high school levels.

7.3. It was noted that data exists only on students who have been labeled as needing remediation without a uniform statewide standard of what remediation actually means. In most cases, students requiring remediation are in need of only one remedial course, which is often just a brush-up course. The broad assertion that 38% of college students require some remediation is an overstatement.

8. New Business: Roundtable discussion

8.1. STEM roundtable discussion

8.1.1. What is STEM? (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math)

- 8.1.1.1. STEM² includes medicine (health). This was suggested by Rep. Webster as a way to avoid confusion with stem cell research. But it's not clear how inclusive this is with respect to medical/health programs.
 - 8.1.2. What should we promote?
 - 8.1.2.1. STEM course enrollments, degree completions; for residents only?
 - 8.1.2.2. Math/science teacher education majors should be a major focus. But what about foreign language majors?
 - 8.1.3. How should we promote this goal?
 - 8.1.3.1. Need to include the capital needs associated with STEM, particularly with respect to university research facilities. A *New York Times* article recently noted that more and more U.S. corporations are outsourcing research activities to China. Higher education must be responsive to business needs.
 - 8.1.3.2. We should consider whether the U.S. and Ohio in particular are net importers or exporters in STEM fields. We should explore the availability of Ohio jobs in STEM fields, lest we subsidize students more likely to leave the state after graduating from college. Fields in which Ohio is projected to have a shortage should be targeted.
 - 8.1.3.3. The STEM focus should also include raising math and science literacy, and not solely promoting STEM degrees. Businesses need workers who understand these concepts but who are not necessarily scientists or mathematicians.
 - 8.1.3.4. Challenge-like incentive funding is the best approach to promote increased STEM course offerings and degree production.
 - 8.1.3.5. Because the preparedness of college students is often too low to succeed in challenging STEM courses, a more comprehensive strategy is needed.
 - 8.2. Tracking Students through the Pipeline: Use of the SSN
 - 8.2.1. Because of privacy issues and concerns over identity theft, Ohio may need to wean itself off the use of Social Security numbers for student tracking purposes. Federal restrictions could in the future prohibit the use of SSN's.
 - 8.2.2. One option might be to work with the Ohio Department of Health, which issues birth numbers to those born in Ohio. But this would not capture students from outside Ohio.
 - 8.3. *The Toolbox Revisited*
 - 8.3.1. This data essay follows a nationally representative cohort from high school into college and identifies key issues. Available online: <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/toolboxrevisit/index.html>
9. Mapping out future meetings – topics? studies? data?
10. Next meetings: March 14th (not March 1st)

10.1. Due to a conflict with a March 14th IUC Presidents meeting, the date and time of the March 14th Consultation meeting is subject to change. If the March 14th meeting date is maintained, the Consultation would delay any major policy considerations and recommendations until the IUC representatives arrived.

11. Other items

12. Adjourn