

Minutes
HEI Advisory Committee
Columbus, Ohio
January 7, 2000

Members Present:

Rosemary Jones-Director, Institutional Planning & Evaluation, Cuyahoga Community College
Darrell Winefordner-Assistant Vice President for Finance, Ohio University
Robert Hallier-Vice President, Business & Finance, Stark State College of Technology
Eric Kornau-Chief Information Officer, Cincinnati State Technical & Community College
Joan Patten-Interim Executive Director for Institutional Planning & Research, Sinclair Community College
Wynette Barnard-Vice President for Institutional Advancement & Strategic Programs, Lakeland Community College
Patsy Scott-Interim Executive Director for Institutional Research & Planning, University of Toledo

Members Absent:

Barb DeYoung-Senior Budget Analyst, Ohio State University
Nancy Zajano-Director, Legislative Office of Education Oversight
Roberta Sikula- Registrar, Kent State University
Ralph Gutowski- Director, Budget & Institutional Research, Miami University
Harriet Friedsteine- Vice President of Academic Affairs, Southern State Community College
Chris Dalton- Senior Vice President for Finance, Bowling Green State University

Guests:

Bob Burke- Association of Independent Colleges & Universities of Ohio
Jed Dickhaut- Registrar, Ohio State University (for Barb DeYoung)
Susan Cole- Registrar, Kent State University
Cindy McQuade- Assistant Director, Inter-University Council of Ohio

OBR Staff:

Matt Filipic- Senior Vice Chancellor
Rich Petrick- Vice Chancellor for Finance
Harold Horton- Director, Information Systems & Research
Rob Sheehan- Director, HEI Project
Andy Lechler- Senior Analyst
Jay Johnson- Manager, Enrollment Data Processing
Beverly Farmer- Administrator
Stephanie McCann- Faculty-Staff Data Area Analyst
LeAnn Conard- Higher Education Analyst
Chris Doll- Enrollment Data Area Analyst
Stormee Lucas- Administrative Assistant
Jackie Seever- Administrator
Deborah Gavlik- Director of Budget & Information Systems

Handouts

1. Minutes of the November 1, 1999 meeting were reviewed and approved.
2. Letter from the Governor to Chancellor Chu requesting a report that outlines college and university performance measures.
3. Memo from Chancellor Chu to the presidents about a consultation on the Governor's request.
4. Draft memo from Rob, Harold, and Jay about clarifications, modifications, new files and reminders in enrollment data.
5. Draft memo from the HEI Advisory Committee to the presidents on the status of HEI.
6. Reports of the planned changes to the CIP code taxonomy.
7. Description of the query enhancement package.
8. Draft of the Full Time Faculty Survey report.
9. File Submission documents for the new Cohort Tracking (CT) file, Revised First Enrollment (RF) file and changes to the Area Inventory (AI) file.
10. Report of the visit to ACT.

Issues Discussed

1. Users Conference March 24

Committee members were strongly encouraged to give presentations of uses of HEI data on campuses.

2. Memo on HEI Clarifications, Modifications, New Files, Reminders

HEI is preparing to send this memo to campuses. It's content was discussed at length and several suggestions for change were noted. An important digression that occurred during the course of this discussion was discussion of the Governor's request for an annual performance report on Ohio's colleges and universities. The Advisory Committee's attention was pointed to Governor's memo in their packets as well as the memo from Chancellor Chu to University Presidents on this topic. The process that may be followed in developing this report was briefly discussed.

2.1 Aggregated Enrollment (AE) File

A committee member asked if OBR continues to have need for this file. Matt said that we would check and eliminate the file if it is not needed. OBR staff will undertake analyses of this file and report back on its usefulness.

2.2 Degree Seekers and Academic Intention Code (implications of these data for Governor Taft's Requested Annual Report)

The recent request from Governor Taft for an annual performance report on Ohio's colleges and universities includes specific mention of degree completion data. An important variable in computing degree completions is to restrict the computation to degree seeking students. Rob reported that two year schools generally have good data in the Academic Intention field of the SE file, but many four year schools report unknown data. He speculated that the reason is that there are too many options for degree seeking. To comply with the Governor's request for data, we simply need to know if the student is degree seeking or not, and the variety of the degree sought is less important.

Committee members reported that some students report false degree intentions in order to facilitate financial aid. For internal reporting, they derive a degree seeking intention from the student's major code. Other schools use a student reported intention code both internally and for IPEDS reporting.

We discussed that for state financial aid, there is no degree seeking requirement for OIG aid, but there is for the Choice Grant for independent institutions. We also determined that there are substantial numbers of full time students who are not degree seeking.

A proposal was made by OBR staff (see item 2 on draft memo) to include a new response category for the academic intention field that would be DS (for Degree Seeking) and it, when taken together with existing degree seeking codes would denote IPEDS cohort classification. There was considerable discussion about this proposal. The consensus was that we need to have a code that is consistent with IPEDS reports as well as one that more regularly reports the student's degree intention, therefore we need two different intention codes. It was proposed at this point in the discussion that OBR will add a second intention code field to the SE starting with AU 2000 reporting that will simply indicate degree seeking or not. (This suggestion was modified in item 2.3 below.)

2.3 Cohort Tracking (CT) File

HEI staff have recently completed a pilot effort with 7 campuses to collect the SSN's of their federal tracking cohorts from previous years. The 7 campuses included Kent State, Cleveland State, Bowling Green, Miami, Sinclair, Columbus State, and Cuyahoga Community College. Campuses indicated that gathering these data was not overly cumbersome and did yield useful tracking information. Building on these experiences, and anticipating work that must be done for the Governor's requested performance report, it was initially proposed in the draft memo (see item 2 on draft memo) that a new CT file be created. This CT file would be used as a temporary means of determining student tracking cohort membership until the HEI data has sufficient longitudinal data to be used for graduation rate statistics.

Committee members reported that supplying the CT file will present no data collection problem and recommended that the CT file be considered a permanent means of identifying cohort membership for cohorts of statewide interest, because this will be more consistent than the SE data.

A committee member reported that our data was too porous (too many leakages) to be useful for student tracking purposes. Instead, we should consider periodic market research sampling as a means of tracking students over time. Matt wondered if the partial data we have is better than none at all.

A committee member suggested that our first priority in student tracking is to present statistics that are consistent with IPEDS. Then we can focus on inconsistencies between the schools. We wondered if IPEDS statistics are consistent with Student Right to Know.

We identified the need for full-time as well as part-time cohorts and athletes. We should distinguish between cohorts for federal reporting and those locally defined.

A proposal was then made (with consensus being evident) that rather than have any field in the SE to identify IPEDS cohort classification, the CT file should be required annually of all campuses, requested as necessary for retrospective cohorts, and modified to handle part-time vs. full-time status (12 hours or more for undergraduates) as well as one or more additional fields to handle special student statuses (e.g. athletes, etc.) Some version of this proposal will be included in the memo that goes out on HEI clarifications (Item 2 above).

2.4 Revised First Enrollment (RF) File

Rob and Jay described this new file as a short-term means of reporting the year and term in which a student who starts college as a high school student finishes high school. The need for this data was evident in the timely graduation part of Success Challenge for the four year schools. It is possible that other initiatives might make use of time to graduation data from 2-year institutions as well.

Some committee members report that they have no records of when these students graduate from high school, especially those who are not in the PESOP program. The statewide value of having high school students be enroll in college was noted as was the difficulty that some schools may have in tracking when those students actually receive their high school degrees. Use of the RF file would be voluntary, for those campuses wishing to correct their starting date of enrollment to reflect year and term of students' obtainment of their high school degree.

In the longer term, the plan is to introduce a new Admission Area, effective autumn, 2000 in the SE for high school students enrolled in college courses. Again, this admission area would be used by campuses that are aware an enrolling student may not have a high school degree. Jay also pointed out the possibility of submitting a revised SE record at a later date if that became known to a college or university.

2.5 Freshmen Remedial Enrollment (FE) File

Rob and Chris described this file as a temporary replacement for the Remediation Report that has been processed by OSU. In the longer term we plan to add ACT High School code to the SE and eliminate the need for this file.

3. Subsidy Ineligible enrollments not accounted for in HEI

A committee member reported that there are two cases in which enrollments occur, that are ineligible for subsidy and the only way to report the HEI data is to exclude these enrollments from the files.

First, there is the case of a single section of a course, rather than the whole course, which is ineligible for subsidy. An example is a special course that really starts before the 14th day, but the official reporting of the enrollments happens after the 14th day.

Secondly, there are cases when a student is generally eligible for subsidy, but one or more of the student's course enrollments are ineligible, again perhaps due to timing of the registration.

It was pointed out that UIS accommodated these enrollments without excluding them from the data collection. Exclusion impacts head count statistics as well as subsidy.

We discussed remedies including new files, new attributes, and a new value for the Attempt for Academic Credit attribute in the CN file. OBR should run queries of the UIS data to determine the magnitude of these enrollments. The results of this analysis will be reported to the Advisory Committee at the next meeting.

4. Drilling down to SSN in the Student Tracking queries

The latest ruling from the state's AG office is don't do it. OBR is in the process of seeking legislative remedy.

We discussed a short-term alternative of drilling down to SSN, revealing only that the student transferred, but not the identity of the school transferred to. Harold indicated that this too would be in violation of FERPA regulations.

Committee members recommend proceeding with the option of drilling down to smaller aggregations, not at the SSN level. Use the Kent State transfer tracking system as a model

5. HEI Status from the Advisory Committee

We discussed a draft of this report, which is to come from the Advisory Committee to the presidents of the institutions. Suggestions were:

1. The report should identify a purpose at the beginning so as to capture the president's attention.
2. It should make the point that in changing our name from BORIS to HEI, there was a change in emphasis from the Regent's data to the campuses' data.
3. Names of the Advisory Committee members should be included.
4. The report should offer to present the HEI system to the presidents.
5. Consider adding the status of RA to the report, because it is a process that utilized a large part of the HEI data and we now have sufficient data to produce the report.

6. Status of Query improvements

We discussed a package of 10 new queries and improvements to existing queries that will be put into production in time for the Annual Conference (March 23 and 24).

The draft Report of the 1999 Full time Faculty Survey was distributed to the Advisory Committee for subsequent email comment and suggestion. Additionally, a Full Time Faculty Survey query tool, using the same data, was demonstrated and we decided to put it into the restricted output area for awhile then release it to the unrestricted space.

Committee members identified that the faculty survey data would be more valuable to campus if the data was identifiable at the campus level. We determined that this change would need to be discussed with the campus representatives that are consulting in the survey designs. Faculty representatives are insistent on not identifying the institution. Stephanie pointed out that if we make this change we should do so with the next full-time survey, so that the initial full-time and part-time surveys can be consistent.

We agreed that data in the reports could be misinterpreted. For example, the definition of Rank at some two year schools is different than rank at the four year schools. We noted that whether or not OBR publishes this data, some third party with an agenda would do so.

7. Report of ACT visit

Rob reported on discussions with ACT about cooperative efforts. He wondered if schools could send the admissions data that they currently send to ACT, to OBR instead, on a voluntary basis.

Committee members pointed out that ACT data (as an admission measure) is largely an issue related only to four-year schools. In contrast, ACT data for placement and planning (using COMPASS) is commonly used in the 2-year sector.

They wondered if collaborating with ACT on outcomes assessment is another possibility. We noted the irony of sharing SSNs between OBR and ACT while not sharing with the campuses in transfer tracking.

8. Network Code in the Area Inventory (AI) File

Jackie reported the need to expand the use of the network code in the AI to room types other than classrooms and labs. OBR needs data on the wiring status of offices and dorm rooms. Such data could have been used, for example, in preparing proposals for use of the tobacco settlement money.

Committee members pointed that these data are better known by network staff on the campuses than by the facilities office. We wondered if wireless LANs are a facilities issue. OBR staff will attempt to email campuses again on this issue including in the email a request that it be routed to network personnel on campus who may be familiar with the wiring of offices and dorm rooms.

Rich pointed out that we are planning a consultation of facilities utilization reports in a few months.

9. Planned changes in the CIP Code by IPEDS

We noted the upcoming plans for changes in the CIP Codes and wondered if this means the Subject Codes need to change. We noted that when we decided to use the CIP code taxonomy for our Subject Codes, we decided that we did not necessarily have to keep these consistent with CIP codes. When the change comes, we can decide to change or to keep the existing codes.

10. Need for new Subject Codes and new combinations of Subject Codes and Level

Committee members identified need for new valid combinations of Subject Code and Level to accommodate such programs as Bac level engineering technology and health technology. They also pointed to a need for more Subject Codes for home economics.

OBR needs to establish a process for campuses to request changes to the Subject Codes and Subject Code Level combinations.

We pointed out that this problem is an example of our need for academic program data.

11. Standard Reports

The subcommittee is reviewing current reports as well as performance support indicators to determine the scope of standard reports in HEI.

12. Additional comment on The Governor's request for a report on college and university performance measures

A committee member suggested that the report include a composite score for each institution, for ease of interpretation. Rob reported that planning for this effort is in the early stages and will include a statewide conference in early March, a notice of which has already been sent to the presidents.

13. Next meetings

Upcoming meetings were scheduled for:

March 3, in the Board Room
May 5, in the main conference room
July 7 in the main conference room