HEI Advisory committee meeting 2/23/01

Members present

Bill Knight	Bowling Green State University
Roberta Sikula	Kent State University
Jeff Chen	Cleveland State University
Darrell Winefordner	Ohio University
Rosemary Jones (Chair)	Cuyahoga Community College
Wynette Barnard	Lakeland Community College
Ralph Gutowski (Vice-Chair)	Miami University
Donna Krile (for Joan Patton)	Sinclair Community College
Chris Tomlinson (for Joan Patton)	Sinclair Community College
Jed Dickhaut	Ohio State University
Bob Hallier	Stark State Community College
Eric Kornau	Cincinnati State Community and Technical College

Members Absent

Lu Phillips	Lorain County Community College

Ohio Board of Regents Staff Present

Harold Horton
Stephanie McCann
Jay Johnson
Chris Doll
Michael Long
Rob Sheehan
Andy Lechler

Others

Nancy Zajano	Legislative Office of Education Oversight
Cindy McQuade	Inter University Council
Bob Burke	Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio

Review of minutes from last meeting

Minutes from last meeting were approved as written with no changes.

File Changes/Additions and Other Issues

Concerns were expressed in an email to Jones from a campus liaison about the burden placed on institutions by data requests for HEI. The liaison asserted that since the inception of HEI there have been numerous file modifications, additions, and changes that amounted to new requests for data. According to the liaison there are insufficient resources available to meet the demands placed on the institution by HEI. The liaison requested a moratorium on further modifications and file changes.

In response to this email Horton provided a memo outlining the changes to Enrollment files from 1999-2001 (see insert Web link here). Horton noted that Regents staff do not of their own accord ask for data

absent a reason and do make an effort to attempt to minimize burdens. When possible, Regents staff provide at least six months notice of changes to files and file additions and provide updates to the data submissions documentation on the Regents web site, as well as publishing the revised edit specifications on the Regents web site. Additionally, Regents staff solicit comments from campuses about submissions and do often incorporate their feedback into the documentation. Often times requests for information arise in such a fashion that Regents staff cannot always provide six months notice. Horton stressed though that Regents staff modify or add files only when there is a clear need and when campuses have been consulted.

Members observed that Regents staff is generally good about communicating changes and additions. A member stated that it might be time to reassess the system and think more strategically about its implementation. In a memo to Horton he proposed that all involved with the system take a step back and assess the data integrity of the system. As the system evolved there was a need for flexibility to capture new data elements and to define what data needed to be captured. As the system matures, the member suggested that Regents staff, the Advisory committee and others think more systematically and strategically about the direction of HEI. Data integrity of the core system needs to be examined in order to provide feedback about the direction of the system.

Sheehan stated that HEI is making progress in minimizing burdens on campuses. For example Sheehan cited a recent legislative query that would have in the past been answered with a survey of campuses, but was instead answered with HEI data. Increasingly, Regents are relying upon HEI to answer questions that previously would have been answered through a survey of campus personnel.

Both a member and Jones observed that often campus issues may impede communications about and responsiveness to HEI. Many campuses across the state are going through changes such as information system changes and calendar conversions and that often HEI priorities conflict with campus priorities. In some of those instances campus priorities will take precedence over HEI. Moreover, the member observed, silos exist on campuses and that often communications may not be getting to the correct personnel. HEI is placing a stress on those silos.

Another member noted that changes and modifications to HEI files cause programming changes at the campus level and another noted often times HEI is driving the agenda on campuses. The member suggested that campuses be better informed about the use of data in order to determine best how to respond to data requests.

A member suggested a gathering of campus information technology architects to discuss HEI. The member noted that often times there is redundancy in tasks being performed on campuses in support of HEI because of a lack of coordinated communication on campuses and that often the individuals gathering the information are unaware of the larger picture. Horton stated that Regents could do that and promised to work with the member to invite those personnel to the User's Conference in March.

Gutowski noted that identifying these folks may be a difficult task, since it's not always obvious on a campus who is supplying the data. He also noted that Miami has undergone a system conversion and complimented Regents staff for their assistance during the transition. He noted that it is not reasonable to expect no more changes to the system. He suggested that the Regents communicate with presidents and other campus decision-makers concerning the value of HEI and to remind them of the importance of supporting HEI operations on their campus.

An attendee echoed those comments and noted that data will beget data and that the Regents openness with information is likely to invite more questions from the legislature.

A few members noted that they would like to comply with HEI information requests, but that the resources are lacking on campus. Gutowski noted that higher visibility for HEI may help to generate greater campus support for HEI. Sheehan noted that Regents staff will be more proactive in generating research using HEI data which should bring higher visibility to HEI. Horton asked what Regents could do to get more resources for campuses.

Gutowski noted that higher visibility would be useful. He also observed that efforts to gain more state resources for HEI may be impeded because of term limits affecting the membership in the General Assembly. An attendee noted that there is recognition by presidents of the constraints placed on campus personnel, and suggested that better identification of the data need and its usefulness may be productive in allocating campus resources to HEI reporting needs.

Members suggested that it might be useful for Regents staff to coordinate best practice presentations to share campus experiences more broadly. Horton allowed that Regents staff does this as part of the enrollment audit and that Regents could do this as part of future User's Conferences.

HEI Progress Report

Horton shared with the committee a PowerPoint presentation outlining the status of HEI,current projects underway, and proposed projects for 2001-2002. Jones suggested that segments of the presentation would be useful for campus decision-makers to see.

Non-degree seekers versus Degree Seekers

The issue arose in the OAIRP listserve and is under consideration by the OACC. The issue is how to distinguish between students legitimately seeking a degree or certificate from the institution and those seeking a certification from a body other than the institution, such as CISCO, Microsoft, or Oracle. Jones and others observed that institutions are supplying instruction for an award that is granted by another body. An attendee asked if it were possible to differentiate degree seekers from non-degree seekers by use of the intention code. Jones noted that the intention code is not used uniformly across campuses and that students may provide inaccurate information on their applications to gain financial aid. Jones invited others to share their thoughts and ideas.

High School of Graduation (HG) File

Doll discussed the High School of Graduation (HG) file that campuses will submit this fall. The file replaces the Freshmen Remedial Enrollment (FE) file and will be used as the basis for the remediation report. The HG captures the high school of graduation for freshmen students entering the institution at a unit record level, rather than an aggregate level. Sheehan offered that Regents could match ACT data against HEI data and share those data with campuses, and ask campuses to fill in missing data. Gutowski noted that the data in the file pertained to enrollments in the last academic year, and that there might be problems in supplying those data. The committee recommended that HEI capture those data in the fall of the academic year when the student matriculates.

Facilities Utilization Query

McCann demonstrated the facilities utilization query that has been available to query users for the past few months. The query shows how facilities and areas at an institution are utilized during the week and allows users to see graphic displays of how facilities and areas are used. Sheehan stated that the query uses data in the CS and OR files, which are collected in autumn of odd years. He noted that if it would be helpful to campuses HEI can accept voluntary submissions of these data for other years and terms for the purposes of viewing through the query. The committee thought that there might be interest in this suggestion from campuses, and suggested that the query be more widely demonstrated to gauge interest.

McCann stated that users of the query need to be somewhat familiar with coding conventions used to describe their buildings. The committee suggested that the query include the capability for users to search for a structure by name rather than code. McCann assured the committee that HEI staff would look into it.

Future Role of the Advisory Committee

Jones introduced the issue of the future role of the HEI Advisory Committee by discussing an e-mail that had been exchanged between Jones, Horton, Sheehan and Gutowski.
Jones referenced the minutes from the very first Advisory Committee meeting, when the group was known as the BORIS Steering Committee. The group was originally intended to provide feedback at a policy level about the design and implementation of the system. As the system evolved the issues brought before the group have had less to do with policy and more with discussions of operations and technical issues. Jones noted that there are fairly senior institutional personnel in attendance at the meetings, and that these types of discussions may not be the best use of their time. Jones asserted that nothing had been predetermined yet, but that she saw two options:

1. Dismantle the committee and determine if a new committee would be more appropriate.
2. Keep the committee in tact, but redefine its purpose.

A member sought out the staff perspective to which Horton responded that preparing for quarterly meetings of the advisory took a significant amount of time. However, Horton noted that Regents staff would not want to proceed without some type of campus involvement. Ad hoc committees to meet various needs may be appropriate to provide input on various issues as they arise. Horton stressed that it is critical to the success of HEI to maintain a relationship with campuses.

Gutowski suggested that the group meet only when issues arise that warrant their attention. He noted that there are fewer policy issues being brought before the advisory committee and that ad hoc groups could discuss a good number of the issues that are discussed at the committee. Gutowski did assert that it was important to have a group of campus personnel advise Regents staff about the growth of HEI.

Another member advised the committee to keep the “big picture” in mind and noted that issues communicated to the committee might not otherwise be communicated. The member suggested that the committee meet less frequently and maintain an ability to cancel meetings if there are no issues warranting the committee's attention. The member further advised that operational issues be discussed by campus personnel more acquainted with the operational aspects of the issue. Another member stated that technical discussions may be best left to campus information technology personnel.

A member raised some concerns about the assignment of liaisons and whether there may still be communication lapses on campuses. The member suggested that the committee be kept, and that there be meetings with liaisons beyond the user's conference.

An attendee stated that Regents offered private colleges a proportional representation on the committee in order to gain their cooperation in participation in HEI and that dismantling the committee would likely kill private college participation in HEI. The attendee suggested that there should be a committee to guide HEI development at a policy level and concurred with the recommendation that it meet less frequently.

A member sighted the diversity of members as a positive, but noted that the committee needed members who get the “ear” of their presidents.

An attendee noted that not all institutions are represented on the committee and proposed a format similar to other ad hoc committees of the board. Proposed names for membership were sought from Presidents and their representative bodies (IUC and OACC) chose members.

Gutowski stated that discussions may need to be forwarded to presidents to reinforce the benefits of campus collaboration with HEI, and ensure that policy issues are not ignored. Gutowski suggested that the board be reconstituted as a policy board with standing meetings scheduled. Another member suggested incorporating the meeting with a user's conference held twice annually. Gutowski advanced the idea of having an executive committee that could meet more frequently as the need arose. Horton endorsed the idea of having a user's conference twice annually and of having advisory committee meetings held in conjunction with these meetings.

Lechler noted that consulting the Advisory Committee has been widely useful in the development of HEI, but that there are inherent weaknesses because not all campuses are represented. Gutowski stated that memberships on either the ad hoc committees or the advisory committee could be rotated to ensure that all institutions are represented.

A question was raised about whether the right personnel were on the committee to deal with policy issues, and a member suggested that others such as provosts and other similar institutional officers might be better suited to deal with policy issues.

Jones summarized the sentiment of the committee as follows:

1. There is a consensus not to dismantle. The Advisory Committee will address policy issues only. However, there is a need to put in place a standing sub-committee of the Advisory Committee to deal with operational issues as they arise.
2. There is consensus that the Advisory Committee should meet twice annually in conjunction with a user's conference.
3. There needs to be a formal mission statement and meeting schedule and defined membership requirements and term limits for the Advisory Committee.
4. Advisory Committee appointments are made by the IUC, OACC, and AICUO

In response to a question from Horton, Gutowski stated that while the re-constituted advisory committee will handle issues of policy, diversity in its membership will be vitally important. The goal of the Advisory Committee (including its sub-committees) is to ensure that the proper folks are addressing issues.

Johnson noted that consultations and groups other than the advisory committee often drive HEI policy decisions. To be successful HEI needs a level of campus buy-in.

Members discussed how to ensure that consultations affecting HEI have representation from individuals associated with HEI. There was some discussion of having a liaison to the advisory committee attend meetings of outside constituencies that could affect HEI, and noted the importance of having people present who are aware of the consequences for HEI of decisions made at such meetings. There was agreement that the advisory committee and others should be notified when a decision is made that could affect HEI.

A member sought clarification about who would be invited to future committee meetings. Horton replied that just committee members would be invited. A member reminded the committee that memberships were institutional and not individual.

Jones passed around a draft guideline for the reconstituted advisory committee and solicited volunteers to edit the drafts. The following people volunteered:

Darrell Winefordner (Subcommittee chair), Ohio University
Bob Hallier, Stark State Community College
Cindy McQuade, IUC
Bob Burke, AICUO
Terry Thomas, OACC

The subcommittee was asked to have the edits complete by the March 23 User's Conference at which time a plan on how to proceed would be agreed upon.

<u>User's Conference</u>

Jones suggested adding a session at the user's conference for campus information technology personnel to discuss HEI. She further suggested sessions to train campus personnel in the use of HEI tools to aid them in decision making, as well as a demonstration of the queries.

Gutowski suggested demonstrations of campus best practices would be useful

McCann asked if would be better to have one session with a mixture of demonstrations or to break up the sessions among the various data groups. Jones suggested that breaking up would be better but to stagger the sessions so that a participant could attend more than one.

Updates and Other Business

Horton and Doll announced that the first Remediation Report taken from HEI data will be released in draft form for campus review the following week. Gutowski asked that the term “freshmen” be reconsidered in the report since it is falling into disuse on campuses.

Horton and Johnson discussed that campuses will be able to download data from HEI in a format for submittal to the National Center for Education Statistics for their Spring IPEDS data submissions.

Lechler mentioned the March 9 Performance Report consultation to discuss the next iteration of the statewide performance report.

Horton made the committee aware of a March 29 consultation with private colleges and universities to investigate further their participation in HEI.

Jones asked about some missing data from the Resource Analysis reports. Lechler responded that not all institutions have submitted Faculty Demographics (FD) data. Though some FD data are used in the Resource Analysis, the file itself is not part of the Resource Analysis allocation. Consequently its collection is not coordinated with the other files that are used in the Resource Analysis. Members suggested that HEI staff prepare lists of missing files to share with liaisons when reports come past due to keep them informed of what data are still missing.

The committee extended its thanks and gratitude for the invaluable contributions of three senior members who are stepping down from the committee:

Rosemary Jones (Chair) from Cuyahoga Community College
Bob Hallier from Stark State Community College
Chris Dalton from Bowling Green State University.