

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT
Performance Report Subcommittee Meeting 7_6_2000

Agenda

We made some additions to the agenda:

1. Add cohort tracking and time to graduation to discuss the data input requirements.
2. Add a discussion of the class size report.
3. Add a discussion of access and stewardship issues.

Minutes

The notes of the last meeting were accepted with the option to update later.

Interest in Work to Date

Rob noted the strong interest that the Regents have in the development of this report. He pointed out that this report is a standing item included on the monthly meeting of the Performance Committee of the Board. He also noted the strong campus interest in the report and that the full Performance Report Consultation had requested a mid-course summer update. This has been scheduled for August 7, 2000 from 10-3 at the board offices.

Draft of Governor's Requested Performance Report Outline

Rob discussed this handout.

We noted that PESOP students can be added to Full Time, First Time, Degree Seeking Freshmen (FTFTDSFR) report by updating the First Year and Term of enrollment via the RF file. We also plan to relate freshmen to OBES employment data to determine student's working patterns. We discussed the plan to use Intention Code for two-year institutions except branches. It was suggested that if Year and Term of First Enrollment come from the RF, then ignore Rank, because PSOP students may matriculate as sophomores.

There was a suggestion to divide remedial enrollments into Math and English. We have data on students taking remedial instruction, not students who require remedial instruction. **The report will include an outcome measure associated with the successful completion of remedial coursework.**

There was a suggestion to change Cost to Price of Higher Education in Part 1 of the report outline.

In Part 2 we should include a description of higher education in Ohio as part of context. We discussed the theme, "a campus for every purpose and purse."

For Part 1 it was suggested that we add percent of each institution's budget that is provided by the state and each institution's share of the total state support.

Financial Reports

We discussed the handout of financial data. In the Senate Bill 6 ratios, comparing each institution to the state mean misses the point that Ohio is low in support of higher education compared to other states. The charts need context. What are we trying to show? We should breakdown expenditures by those that impact students. Explain that IT is part of Institutional Support. There was even a suggestion to break out IT costs. What parts of the financial reports will be by institution, by sector and by state? Define data categories, e.g. POM. Too much detail will lose the message.

Class Size and SF ratio

We discussed class size and student faculty ratio reports. Both versions of class size and student faculty ratio have limitations in terms of accuracy and meaning of the data. Any presentation of data will be enhanced by words, not just statistics. E.g. a class that meets as one large section once per week and has breakouts for discussion appears only as a large section in the statistics, unless the breakouts are separate sections. The question is how many students does a faculty manage. Possibly show class size by type of section.

Section size by section ID is the simplest set of statistics to understand. Also include the frequency distribution of class size and show the data as percentages of total sections. **The consensus of the group was that section size by section ID was the preferred mode of presenting these data.**

It was suggested that we correlate grades with class size. Show proportion of freshmen in large classes. Class size shows scheduling experience, not student experience.

Technology Available to Students

We discussed the Survey of IT availability. One consultation member pointed out that it is a “catch 22” to rate campuses on IT availability to students and at the same time reject requests for fee increases to support IT. We noted that this is an activity measure not a performance measure, but the argument is that the whole report is performance. Maybe we should present IT availability at the statewide level compared to national averages or standard. We noted that a survey of IT is underway in the state. This IT survey was prepared for the budget not for the performance report. Rob says we have a specific request from the Regents to include technology availability in the performance report. The request was repeated at a subsequent meeting with the Regents. We are specifically requested to include a ratio of campus pc’s to students and a measure of Internet access for students. In HEI, technology availability is reported in the AI file and technology use for instruction is reported in the ST file, but these variables are not uniformly reported. A suggestion was to show how much money institutions are spending on IT. We noted that there is a national survey on IT use.

Work Force Training

We reviewed the handout of standards. Data on these standards are collected by OBR Work Force Development. We noted that the definitions in the standards are subject to interpretation. OACC recommends that these measures be at the aggregate level, not by institution. Still better definitions are needed.

Campus Capacity to serve students

We had a specific request from the Regents to include a measure in the report on this topic. Do we have campuses above or below capacity, in terms of students served? The idea is for institutions to set a target student faculty ratio and work toward it. Some institutions measure seats available. Open admissions institutions are never at capacity. Capacity is an overarching measure that is addressed in various means by various institutions. Capacity varies by program within an institution. Education is a multi faceted enterprise. The AI data on net assignable square feet doesn’t really reflect the available classroom capacity. We have a specific request from the Regents to include a capacity measure in the report. **Note: This was clarified in a subsequent meeting with the Regents to mean an inclusion of a measure of classroom and laboratory utilization rates.**

Employment data for graduates

We discussed the handouts. The report for associate degrees should be by campus not institution. These analyses will be re-run for the next meeting.

It was suggested we only report in state students for the report of baccalaureate and associate graduates. On the other hand 25% of out of state graduates are employed in state after graduation. The suggestion was to report out of state at the state level, not by institution.

Student Faculty Ratio

Student faculty ratio was discussed first as a proxy for average section size. As a proxy, the consultation group rejected this variable. Student faculty ratio data may be used in another context even if it is not a replacement for class size. Campuses should look at the handout report for consistency with their own data. There was a suggestion that we use sector a specific divisor for part time faculty. Also, consider part time as 1/3 full time, the same as IPEDS. We should test our HEI data to see if part time really have a load of 1/3 of full time. We have had a specific request by the Regents to include student faculty ratio in the report.

Cohort Tracking and Graduation Rates

The current outline of the performance report calls for reporting graduation rates for baccalaureate degrees only. This is a request from the two-year sector. We discussed the need to report for associate degrees and how we collect the data to report baccalaureate degrees, e.g. via the Cohort Tracking System and decided to return to this question at the next meeting.

Associate degrees are only a small part of the business of the two-year schools. Some two-year schools have a very low graduation rate. With the Cohort Tracking system we can report graduation at any institution in the system, not just the home school. However, this was felt to be a marginal improvement. Also, employer demand and certifications drive down the graduation rates at two-year schools. On the other hand, if we omit graduation rates at two-year institutions it may give the impression that these schools do not offer degrees. Average time to degree may be a good substitute for graduation rates. Open admission four-year schools have the same problems with baccalaureate graduation rates.

We need to discuss, what is success for a student, earning a certificate, completing a sequence of courses, senior citizens that come back for course work? Student's intention needs to be factored in, but if we use the Intention Code note that schools do not always get the data. With sufficient context graduation rates may be acceptable. Measure the number of FTFTDSFR at different schools to reflect their mission.

We will also include average time to degree and credits to degree for degrees granted at all sector levels. We can get average time to degree and average credits to degree from HEI data.

Cohort Tracking System is a way for campuses to identify the cohort of FTFTDSFR for a year. Currently FY 1999 data is the last year for which HEI has complete data. So we should start with the FTFTDSFR for the 1993, 1994 and 1995 cohorts for the baccalaureate graduation rates. Some schools cannot report these cohorts. Using the IPEDS reports is an alternative.

Access and Stewardship

The Access measures suggested are: public awareness of cost and participation of disadvantaged students. OIG eligibility is not a good measure of disadvantaged because it is limited to full time students. However, it was reported that currently, SSN for part time students eligible for state aid are reported to SGS. HEI should get this data. We can also get 12th grade graduates by school from Dept of Education.

We also mentioned percent of recent high school graduates admitted to higher education, other market penetration data and campus crime statistics.

For Stewardship Senate Bill 6 data is used.

Benchmark Indicators

Consider benchmarks for comparing to the state.

For institutions, the peer groups vary by institution and within institution. Even by data element, peer groups vary in an institution. Rob asked if all institutions maintain lists of peers. These do exist at the office level, but the whole institution does not endorse the list. Colleges in an institution have their own peer groups.

It was suggested that we compare Ohio with other state benchmarks, where available. We were advised to avoid institutional benchmarks. We can simply report that institutions do benchmark themselves against peers. In comparing the state we should compare to the region and the nation, not just contiguous states.

FTE Delivered by Faculty of Various Rank, Full Time and Part Time and Highest Degree

We reviewed draft data on student credit hours resulting from faculty with various levels of highest degree earned. It was pointed out that such a measure does not really measure instructor's competence for technical programs. It was suggested that what we really need in years of experience in the field for technical programs and for fine arts, although we do not have such data in HEI. If we report these data (highest degree earned) it was suggested that we combine associate degree, certificate and baccalaureate degrees and combine masters doctoral and professional.

The following suggestions appeared to have a consensus:

Use the full time part time status of faculty as a breakdown for all schools,

Use Faculty Academic Rank for the four-year institutions and branches

Use highest degree for the two-year institutions, with technical schools reported separately.

Review

Rob reviewed the discussions and suggestion conclusions of the day:

1. Wait a year or two on IT data; focus on the resources going into IT. **Note: This suggestion is not acceptable to the regents as reported at a later time.**
2. For class size use the measure by section definition, rather than class schedule or student faculty ratio, and show the frequency distribution of classes of various sizes using percentages.
3. Campus capacity isn't sufficiently definable to include in the report. We noted that selective campuses have their enrollments capped. **Note: this issue was clarified later by the Regents to be classroom and laboratory utilization rates, statistics currently available in HEI and previously reported in Regents reports.**
4. Rerun the employment data for associate degrees by campus not institution.
5. Clarify the financial data.
6. Agree in principle in Cohort Tracking file submissions.
7. Get high school aggregated graduation data from DOE.
8. See if we can get crime rate data.
9. We should analyze credits to graduation and time from the DC files.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Performance Report committee is August 7 and the entire statewide consultation is being invited to this meeting for the summer mid-course update that was requested and promised at the March 2 meeting of the consultation.