

Ohio Board of Regents/Institutional Data Planning Consultation
April 27, 10:00 am to 3:00 pm
Columbus, OH

I. Overview of the Regents Data Planning Agenda – What we want to address over the course of the six scheduled meetings between April and September?

- i. Outcomes Reporting Issues
- ii. Use of Data in the Strategic Planning
- iii. Development of a Statewide Higher Education Research Plan
- iv. Development and Maintenance of Data Resources

II. Discuss our general vision and plan for basic outcomes reporting.

- i. Consolidation of multiple series of reports into one coherent series that is better matched to needs is already available on the Regents website under Data and Reports
 - Starting in May, once all the data is submitted, we will begin to revamp the entire process of our Enrollment reporting.
- ii. Continuous review of how data are used in reporting and our new reporting style will all roll into a data mining effort of catching data errors and anomalies that are occurring.
- iii. Exploration of new ways of getting information to users. What comes after the static report?
 - Online queries are decent, but could be better and more user friendly.
 - Processing of data happens after the fact; however, the future holds some hope for revamping the entire HEI database structure.
 - Sybase tables will become oracle tables and the rest of HEI will be SAS architected.
 - A question was raised regarding the fact that Miami and Cuyahoga Community College have both lost money to SAS. If needed, each institution was available to be contacted regarding this issue.
 - IT staff has stated that the current structure of submitting data to HEI will not change for campus users and all the changes will occur on the OBR end.
 - SAS business intelligence tools will help improve reporting and querying to become more user friendly.

- We do not know how long the gap will be during the conversion and during this time there could be some issues with current queries.

iv. Investigation of new ways in which centralized reporting with HEI data can assist campuses

- Market Penetration Studies
 - A possible creation of a technical working group to help work on this issue to create an easier way to assemble the raw data that is needed for these types of market reports will be discussed in the near future.
- It was pointed out that the old “high school transition report” could be helpful for institutions to use in other ways.
 - Data Management and Analysis staff will update the high school transition report for Fall 2007 (in the old format, which showed every institution and the feeder high school) and make this available to whoever is interested in this report.
- A discussion about the creation of a benchmark report took place. This report would include a list of indicators that would be created and compared to the national level to help answer the question, how is Ohio doing.
- Centralized IPEDS reporting was discussed and based off of preliminary feedback, primarily at the 2 year sector, there seems to be some interest. This issue will be discussed in the future.
 - The annual IPEDS conference is being held in May and OBR staff will report back to campus representatives regarding information about any new requirements, especially financial aid reporting guidelines.

III. Reclassification of CIP (Classification of Instruction Program) codes into new aggregations

A. Why are we doing this?

i. From a basic reporting perspective, the existing Discipline Areas are not detailed enough. “Unclassified” degrees (associate, bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral, and professional, 2006-2008) accounted for 6% of total degrees. Law is in “Unclassified,” which causes problems when reporting on professional degree outcomes.

ii. Existing Subject Fields aren’t detailed enough to describe the range of institutional program offerings. Allied Health in particular contains too many disparate majors (i.e. Physical Therapy, Radiology, etc.)

iii. We are called upon to designate which academic programs are in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math).

- Using the existing Discipline Areas and Subject Fields for this purpose produces inconsistent results. The reasons for this vary. We have

multidisciplinary science field placed in the “Unclassified” Discipline Area. Also, some Subject Fields are so broadly constructed that their CIPs are a mix of Science and Non-Science programs.

B. Goals

- i. Make basic reporting on majors and degrees easier and more informative.
- ii. Produce better information on institutional program offerings, both for public information and policy making purposes.
- iii. Produce a Subject Field mapping that can be used to facilitate the designation of STEM programs.

C. Process

- i. Begin with the current draft revision of Discipline Areas and Subject Fields, which has 10 Discipline Areas (up from 8) and 148 Subject Fields (up from 71).
 - Check the new mappings for accuracy, consistency, etc. We have found misspellings, duplicate CIPs, missing CIPs and so forth.
- ii. Check – Are we on the right track?
- iii. Run summary reports on new mappings to see what our new degree reports will look like.
- iv. Conduct classic “Lumpers” versus “Splitters” discussion. Do we have an informative and workable set of categories?
- v. Mesh this work with the existing mapping of CIPs that is used in the funding formulas. Right now, funding models are constructed from existing Subject Fields and course levels. We need to find a way to flow from CIP to Subject Field to Funding Model that produces minimal funding formula disruption.

IV. Issues in determining which CIP codes are to be designed as STEM, STEM² fields.

A. Why are we so interested?

- i. Policy makers have a belief that the production of graduates in STEM fields (throwing in Health, STEM²) has a positive impact on economic growth.
 - STEM receives preferential treatment in several areas, number of STEM degree awards is Strategic Plan indicator, STEM FTE receives extra weighting in funding formula, etc.

- Due to financial consequences alone, we need to conduct an open review of which fields are designated as STEM.

B. How are we going to decide?

- i. A number of ways to classify STEM and STEM² currently exist. Math and Engineering might be relatively settled. Health is pretty well defined; however, no universally agreed upon definition of Science or Technology exists.
- From the outset, we might want to determine whether we are going to lean towards a traditional, narrowly defined STEM definition, or go in a more expansive direction.
 - The narrow view would limit STEM to laboratory or field-based sciences, fields that have very high mathematical or information technology content, and engineering.

V. Using the new unit-record Tuition and Financial-Aid data

- Preliminary data that has been submitted was used to compile a number of graphs showing the breakdown of gross tuition versus net tuition for full-time, in-state, undergraduate students (for Fall 2007) at the three different sectors (Community Colleges, University Branch and Main campuses) were distributed and discussed.
- More graphs and reports will follow once all the data is submitted and finalized. OBR hopes to release these finalized reports by the end of Summer.