

Introduction

Rob Sheehan introduced the meeting as reconvening the full committee for a mid-course correction as promised at the last full committee meeting in March 2000. At the meeting today we want to get a clear sense of the content of the report. Next will be the context. The Board of Regents expresses much interest in this report and the Chairman of the Performance Subcommittee wanted to attend the meeting today but had a schedule conflict. We have not yet reviewed the report content with the Governor's office. The time frame for completing the report is mid fall or the end of November. The report may be an annual event with the content changing from year to year. In the report we don't want to use data just because we have it and on the other hand we don't want policy to be based on antidote.

Rob reviewed the report outline in the handout. He noted the combination of parts two and three, outcome and process into Part Two. This is because the two sections overlap and there are no explicit and clear lines between the two.

Part One Context Higher Education in Ohio

Many suggestions were made to describe higher education in Ohio.

1. We are above average in high school and below average in higher education.
2. We are trailing the nation in high tech industry
3. Ohio is under funded in higher education, tuition is high, and state support or subsidy is low.
4. Identify the missions of the institutions and the differences in mission, use abstracts of the institution mission statement and describe the missions of sectors.
5. The data part of the report is a burden, the context is an opportunity.
6. Describe how the system facilitates transfer between institutions.
7. If sector and topic organize the report, rather than by institution, then readers will have difficulty seeing the whole picture of an institution.
8. Explain the limitation of the current race codes, i.e. multiple race identity is not accommodated.

We noticed that the focus of the report outline is undergraduate instruction and excludes research. Perhaps the 2nd year report will focus on graduate education and research.

If the report focuses on statistics rather than context this will force a utilitarian perspective. We need to focus on text as well. The statistics in the performance report need to be consistent with other standard reports such as the Board performance report and the Student Inventory Report.

We noted the federal Report Card on Colleges of Education. For this report, institutions are required to submit course or degree completion rates.

Part Two Student Experience and Outcomes

Freshmen Instruction Aggregated by Characteristics of the Instructor (Who teaches the Freshmen)

We have been advised to replace the term freshmen with first year students.

We discussed the report of Freshmen Student Credit Hours aggregated by characteristics of the instructor (rank, highest degree, full time/part time). Rob described how the reports show the statewide perspective first, then sector finally by individual campus.

An institution representative pointed out that campuses that have GAs, tend to show lower percentages of instruction by professors and associate professors. Of course research institutions will have more GAs.

There was a suggestion to subdivide the sectors into more homogeneous groups using the Carnegie Classification or some descriptor of selectivity.

In classifying the instructors by highest degree, we noted that some institutions do not submit the highest degree of their GAs.

Remedial Instruction

Campus representatives noted that the report shows significantly fewer students enrolled in remedial instruction than is known to be the case on campuses. It may be that not all remedial instruction is reported to OBR as such (we noted the absence of several campuses from the report) and not all campuses require that students who need remediation, take it. We noted that 25% of the first year students need remediation, but the reports show less than 10% enrolled.

The report reflects the effort that a campus puts into remedial education, e.g. a remedial program will attract students. Placement standards for remedial instruction vary from school to school.

NOTE: WE HAVE SINCE RUN SEVERAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSES WHICH MAKE CLEAR THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENT EARLIER ESTIMATES OF REMEDIAL ACTIVITY. THESE ANALYSES HAVE MODIFIED SOME OF THE DECISION RULES APPLIED TO THE ANALYSES, THE RESULTS OF WHICH WILL BE SHARED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE SUB-COMMITTEE

Year to year retention of FTFTDSFR

The context here should be to describe how easy it is to transfer from school to school.

Section Size

Many technical level sections have multiple instructors. There was a suggestion that we should include institution level detail on the average section size.

Student Faculty Ratios

We noted that these ratios are influenced by the level of courses offered. For example, schools that do not offer remedial instruction will likely have higher student faculty ratios at the higher levels.

Remedial education involves a significant amount of ancillary help beyond the instructors, e.g. tutor, CAS and counseling. This does not show up in student faculty ratios.

NOTE: WE HAVE SINCE RECEIVED GUIDANCE FROM CAMPUSES THAT OUR APPROACH TO DETERMINING LEVEL OF COURSES WAS LEADING TO THE INCORRECT CONCLUSION THAT LEVEL OF COURSE WAS THE SAME AS LEVEL OF STUDENTS IN THE COURSE. WE HAVE DEVELOPED AN ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGY TO RESPOND TO THIS PROBLEM AND WILL SHARE THAT AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE SUB-COMMITTEE.

Lunch

Rob pointed out that some of the data reports were not included in the handouts at the meeting today. They will be supplied later. These include reports on IT, study abroad, mobility, market penetration and student demographics. Market penetration is a report of enrollment in technical instruction and undergraduate education by county as compared to the “market” in the county.

There was concern about the race ethnicity codes to be used. The existing IPEDS codes do not support multiple race identification. The suggestion was that we follow IPEDS and use the current codes until we change to the new IPEDS codes. In part one of the report explain the problem.

Residency Reports

Rob noted that with the exception of university main campuses, residency was mostly Ohio so an institution level breakdown for all sectors is probably not necessary. We should use sector level statistics and then institutional breakouts for the 4-year sector.

Graduation Rates

Rob discussed using CT file for tracking graduation rates. We know that some schools are unable to do this due to changes in their data processing systems. In these cases the institutions will report their own graduation rates.

There was a suggestion at an earlier meeting that we use time to degree instead of graduation rates for two year schools. Since only about 13% of freshmen at two-year schools are FTFTDSFR, graduation rate, while important is quite deceptive. However, granting degrees is an important part of the two year mission. The concept of cohort may be the problem. At urban schools students do not start as a group or progress as a group. The number of degrees as compared to number of students is important to report.

The report should describe a pattern for a sector then show the data for the sector.

We noted the anomaly in time to degree at Cincinnati State; this data needs to be analyzed.

Time to degree needs narrative to describe the factors involved. Many of the choices are with the student not the institution. The student may not be full time during their whole career.

We should show degree requirements along with credits to degree.

Rob suggested that credit to degree for the doctoral degree vary too much between institutions to be included in the report. **NOTE: WE HAVE SINCE CLARIFIED THAT CLEVELAND STATE'S DATA WERE CINFOUNDED BY THEIR TRAINSITION TO SEMESTERS. THESE DATA HAVE SINCE BEEN CORRCTED.**

In the aggregation of degrees by Subject Field we noted significant inconsistency between Subject Field and degree programs. For example, the number of associate degrees earned in the Interdisciplinary Subject Field is much higher than interdisciplinary programs on campuses. In another case an institutional representative saw degrees in a Subject Field for which the campus has no program. We need to check the accuracy of the report.

Each degree awarded in the DC file is assigned a Subject Code by the campus. These codes are aggregated into Subject Fields according to the mapping in the Subject Code mapping file, on the WWW at <http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/datasubdoc/vertables/subjcodes.html>

In this mapping the Subject Codes related to the Interdisciplinary Subject Field are:

Subject Code	Name
240101	LIBERAL ARTS AND SCI/LIBRL STUD
240103	HUMANITIES/HUMANISTIC STUDIES
240199	LIBRL ARTS/SCIENC, GEN ST/HUMAN,OT
300101	BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES
300501	PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES
300601	SYSTEMS SCIENCE AND THEORY
300801	MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE
301001	BIOPSYCHOLOGY
301101	GERONTOLOGY
301201	HSTRIC PRSRVN,CONSERV&ARCH HISTORY
301301	MEDIEVAL/RENAISSANCE STUDIES
301401	MUSEOLOGY/MUSEUM STUDIES
301501	SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & SOCIETY
309999	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES,OTH

NOTE: THIS CONTINUES TO BE A PROBLEM WITHOUT A CURRENT SOLUTION. THE STUDENT INVENTORY DATA ALSO INCLUDE CLUSTERING OF SUBJECT CODES INTO A SUBJECT FIELD. ONE POSSIBILITY WOULD BE THAT SUBJECT CODES 240101, 240103 AND 240199 BE PUT INTO A SINGLE SUBJECT FIELD CALLED LIBERAL ARTS AND HUMANITIES. CAMPUS REACTION TO THIS SUGGESTION WILL BE SOUGHT AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE.

There was a suggestion to show graduation rate in longer periods such as ten years. At two year schools, industry certification (e.g., Novel, Microsoft) are more important than degrees.

We should show persistence as well as graduation rates. Show the effect of the system on graduations, e.g. students transferring then graduating. For two year schools show the entire array of outcomes, graduations persistence, certificate, no degree intention, show average time, credits and number of degrees but not the percent graduated in x years.

There was also a suggestion that we measure credits earned vs. credits attempted.

We wondered about the national average for graduation rates.

Rob recommended that both two and four year schools attempt to submit the CT file so we can learn what is involved in preparing and processing these files.

Employment Outcomes Data

Rob suggested that institutional level breakdown be for graduate degrees only. Undergraduate should be for in-state students only.

Showing that medical and law students stay in the state after graduation is important. **CAMPUS SUGGESTIONS FOR THESE, OR OTHER DISCIPLINES, TO BE INCLUDED IN THE EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES REPORT WAS SOLICITED WITH A SUGGESTION THAT THESE BE EMAILED TO ROB.**

Conclusion

Rob discussed the legislative initiative for IT. There is a survey underway. We get the message that the student experience with IT should be a part of this report.

We discussed facilities utilization. We wondered about utilization at co-located campuses.

At the next meeting will start to focus on context.

NOTE: IN RETROSPECT THE NEXT MEETING (SEPTEMBER) OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE MAY FOCUS INSTEAD ON FINALIZATION OF TECHNICAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE MANY REPORTS.

The number of employees and employers served is a good measure for two-year schools. Mike Taggart has this data in Work Force Development.

Graduation rates for two year schools remains an unresolved issue.

NOTE: REGENTS STAFF' POSITION ON THIS BECAME CLARIFIED IN A NUMBER OF SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSIONS. WE SUPPORT THE ARGUMENT THAT GRADUATION RATE DATA ARE OF VALUE AND SHOULD BE INCLUDED FOR THE TWO YEAR SECTOR, BUT ONLY WITHIN A CONTEXT THAT RECOGNIZES GRADUATION RATES WITHIN OTHER OUTCOMES, SUCH AS THE AWARDS OF SPECIALIZED CERTIFICATES. THE FULL CONTEXT WILL BE DEVELOPED JOINTLY BY THE REGENTS STAFF AND THE OACC PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT GROUP AND BE INCLUDED IN THE SECOND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT USING HEI DATA. A PLACEHOLDER FOR THESE DATA WILL BE IDENTIFIED IN THE FIRST REPORT. GRADUATION RATE DATA WILL BE REQUESTED, IN AGGREGATE FORM FROM FOUR YEAR CAMPUSES FOR THE FIRST YEAR'S PERFORMANCE REPORT WHILE HEI'S CT FILE BECOMES MORE WIDELY USED BY ALL CAMPUSES.

The next meeting of the subcommittee is in September. The full committee will meet again in late October.