

**DRAFT**  
**Performance Report Subcommittee Meeting Notes 6/8/2000**

*Note: Indented Items in italics below are flagged as areas where there appeared to be considerable agreement or consensus or areas where next steps were promised.*

Last Revised June 14, 2000

**Agenda**

We reviewed the agenda and there were no objections. We speculated that the next meeting might be with the full committee. This turns out not to be the case.

*We will attempt to schedule a meeting of the full performance report subcommittee in August, 2000. This decision was made subsequent to completion of the 6/8/2000 meeting.*

We continued on with the process of reviewing data elements that supported recommended performance measures discussed at earlier meetings. The data elements included:

- **Fall to Fall Retention of First Time Degree Seeking Freshmen**
- **Enrollments of First Time Freshmen**
- **Enrollment of first time freshmen in all courses by level**
- **Enrollment of first time freshmen in developmental courses**
- **Success of first time freshmen in developmental courses**
- **Average Section Size of Classes**
- **Exposure of students to faculty by rank of instructor and type (part-time/full time)**
- **Employment of Graduates**
- **Graduation rates**

**Data Updates**

**AU 1998 to AU 1999 Retention Report**

We examined the latest version of this report and wondered if these data are similar to the campus calculations. The changes we made since the earlier version were to include summer starters, relaxed intention code expectation for branches of universities that did not use this code (KENT, CINC, and BGSU) and relaxed the first time in college switch test for EDSN and CNTL. We still do not include PSOP students who matriculated in summer or fall, 1998. With these changes made, we appear to be very close to reflecting campuses own published retention data.

We discussed how to report the transition PSOP to “regular” student, using either the new Revised First Enrollment (RF) file or, in the future, changing the Admission Area in the Student Entrance (SE) file.

We discussed the data anomalies at CNST and NCTC. NCTC plans to correct their data. The prognosis on CNST is unclear.

*There was a suggestion to include race and ethnicity breakdowns in the report. Also provide counts of total undergraduate or freshmen enrollments to add context to the report. We will prepare such reports for a subsequent meeting.*

Other context discussion about this report included:

1. admission standards,
2. part time Vs full time student population,
3. number of transfer students,
4. national benchmarks for year to year retention,
5. student preparation.

There was a suggestion to focus on the performance of the state rather than or as well as individual institutions and sectors. Low retention at the state level may indicate lack of state support or poor K – 12 preparation.

Also discussed a report of graduation rates using the Cohort Tracking (CT) file, currently described on the WWW but not yet in production. Also, tracking non-degree seeking student's graduation rates.

It was suggested that the degree seeking data indicators in HEI (Academic Intention field in the Student Entrance file and Rank in the Student Enrollment file) are unreliable for undergraduate students due to financial aid requirements.

*Overall, the HEI system does seem able to provide accurate fall to fall retention, with the noted limitation that all federal and state reporting probably overstates the number of "degree seeking" students there are on campus.*

### **First Time Freshmen Enrollment and SCH report**

We discussed several reports that showed SCH and enrollments for first time freshmen, aggregated at several levels:

1. statewide by level,
2. by sector and level,
3. by campus, sector and level,
4. statewide by level and Award of Academic Credit,
5. by sector, level and Award of Academic Credit,
6. by campus, sector, level and Award of Academic Credit.

Some or all of these reports exclude enrollments in zero SCH course sections.

We focused on the developmental level and noted the differences between sectors. We noted that the % of developmental enrollments is less than the % of the number of students enrolled in any developmental instruction and may give

a more accurate picture of the involvement of higher education in developmental instruction.

We wondered why there is so much B level instruction among first time freshmen at the universities. We thought that it might be because many fields of study use B as the level for their introductory courses.

It was suggested that we have a breakout of developmental instruction in math and English.

There was debate about various interpretations of Award of Academic Credit. Consider the cases of:

1. a student who drops the course before completion,
2. a student who gets an incomplete or progress grade,
3. a student who fails the course,
4. a student who completes but the course is not eligible for academic credit or is eligible for academic credit but the credit can't be used for graduation.

There was a suggestion that this field should show persistence, not award of credit.

A suggestion was to focus on the continuing success of students after developmental instruction. We need to deal with problems of defining subsequent courses, lag time between developmental and regular instruction, and transferring between institutions.

We were reminded that some students continue in a developmental course until certain standards are achieved, never mind how many terms it takes.

We were reminded that there are variations in student levels of capability even within developmental.

The two-year schools have developed standards that we may use for evaluating developmental instruction.

It was suggested that we report developmental instruction for students just graduating from high school (e.g. age 17-20) separately from developmental instruction taken by older students.

There was concern expressed that reports of developmental education might lead to the conclusions that some students in higher education do not belong there.

*Overall, there was a consensus that we should be including a measure of developmental instruction in the report, although this is a context measure rather than a performance measure. We accepted the challenge to try to look at the success of students who complete developmental courses and then go on to attempt to take non developmental coursework in the same subject area. This would provide a more appropriate performance measure associated with developmental education.*

## **Section Size Report**

We discussed a report on section size that was extracted from the Resource Analysis output. It shows class size in a frequency distribution, rather than just averages.

The suggestion was that the ranges of class size to use in the frequency distribution are: 1 – 3, 4 –10, 11 – 25, 26 – 50, > 50. There was a suggestion that we use class schedule rather than section identification to determine the scope of a section. Also, exclude summer term and lab sections. Look at the way U.S. News does it.

*Overall there was agreement expressed that we should report on section size but include the entire range of coursework in this presentation.*

## **Exposure of students to faculty by rank of instructor and type (part-time/full time)**

This report needs better documentation in order to understand the columns. The report is needed to answer the question, do the instructors know how to teach or are they just learning themselves. Years of experience are a good measure. The report covered only the G level. There was a suggestion that we do it for other levels as well.

*There appeared to be a consensus that student exposure to full time (vs. part-time) faculty for all sectors was a valid indicator for the report and that student exposure to faculty by academic rank (just for 4 year campuses and branch campuses) was a valid indicator for the report.*

## **Employment data**

We discussed a report of the students who earned a masters degree in FY 1998 related to employment data that we have received from OBES. The graduates were classified by:

1. residency (Ohio, Other State, Foreign),
2. student identifier (SSN or Institution Assigned), because the match with OBES data is by SSN,
3. employment status subsequent to graduation (Ohio employment or not)
4. continued enrollment after graduation (were enrolled at some public Ohio institution after graduation or not).

We suggested that the cases were a positive indication if the graduated students either got a job in Ohio or returned to school in an Ohio public institution. It was suggested that the graduation of an Ohio resident be considered a success regardless of post graduation outcome.

This report is for masters degrees but the data we have is for all degrees earned in FY 1998. We expect to establish a regular data exchange with OBES. There was a suggestion that we do this for all students, so we can track their

employment both during and after enrollment. Current data is for graduates and “stop-outs” only.

There was a suggestion that this report, without context, might be hurtful to some institutions. We acknowledged that in this subcommittee reports are for data only, style, format and context will come in the published reports.

There was a request to have queries available to the campuses include employment data and/or allow institutions to download the employment data for their students.

The suggestion was made that the performance report may reflect the performance of the state rather than individual institutions. The state’s economy is not controlled by higher education.

*There appeared to be agreement that inclusion of employment outcomes was appropriate for the performance report. We will attempt to provide these analyses for 2 year degrees and certificates as well as 4 year degrees and certificates. There was also a request that we include employment of current students (e.g. full time undergraduates) as a measure of context, particularly for the urban institutions. We will attempt to obtain these data as well.*

## **Financial Reports**

We discussed several different financial reports relative to inclusion in the performance report.

When we show revenue per FTE, it should be restricted to revenue related to subsidy eligible students. Show the dependency of the institution on various kinds of revenue, e.g. dependency on fees or state support. Compare academic expenditures to support expenditures. Note the movement of cost toward support for information technology. Show the breakout of the use of fees revenue, where does the money go, student services, instruction, POM. Show the breakout of the source of fees, out of pocket, loans, and financial aid.

We discussed the level of detail for financial reports, statewide, sector or institution? Since the governor didn’t ask for financial reports, maybe we should just report at state or sector level. Do it at state and sector level first, then compare to national data.

If we want the report to indicate institutional solvency, we need data at the institution level. The suggestion was that the report need not deal with solvency questions about institutions unless there is a solvency problem. A suggestion was to use the ratios at the state level, perhaps present the ratios as below or above expectations.

We noted that tuition doesn’t tell the whole story on what is the cost to students. Pay from the institution sometimes exceeds fees.

A suggested context was that of a buyers guide. The primary audience is the consumers, then the legislators. Categorize institutions and focus on a typical student in each category. What questions should the student ask. Show our state data and national data.

*Inclusion of some financial reporting in the performance report appeared to be desirable to the group. We will consider the suggestions made and present some mock ups of financial reports to consider for the performance report at the next meeting.*

## **Review of the Reports**

Rob presented a review of the discussion of reports.

1. Persistence – use this including PSOP.
2. A report of developmental activity should be included. Do not include Award of Academic Credit. Include subsequent success in related courses. Be sensitive to context of developmental instruction. Repeated enrollment in developmental instruction is also success. Put it in the context of access.
3. Include a report of student experience from instruction, e.g. class size. Do all levels using both definitions of section.
4. Include as report on Rank and type of instructor. Part time vs. full time is important for all institutions, Rank is mostly for universities and branches.
5. Include financial reports with benchmarks.

## **Benchmarks**

We are downloading IPEDS data to help with a benchmark. Campuses should consider identifying peer groups.

*We need to discuss benchmark indicators. We will re-schedule this discussion for the next meeting.*

## **Discussion of Including a Focus on Non-traditional Students and Instruction in the Performance Report**

*HEI data does not include enrollment data in non-credit instruction. We do capture expenditures and we also capture revenue from non-credit instruction. We will prepare some data on this for the next meeting.*

A suggestion was made that we report credit hours completed by non-degree seeking students as well as part-time students. We will prepare drafts of such data for the next meeting.

Some two-year schools (and many urban 4 year schools) have the mission of serving non-traditional students. We began the discussion of who these students are and how they might be described.

We discussed age of non-traditional students. One measure is students over 25 years old, another is students who start after age 21.

A suggestion was made that we report average time to degree for non-traditional students and course completion for non-degree seeking students.

Non traditional instruction comes under the umbrella of services offered by higher education.

We listed several types of non-traditional students and instruction. The items flagged with \* below could be described now within the HEI data system:

1. \*PSOP (students currently in high school and also enrolled in college),
2. \*Older students (60 or older) receiving free tuition (and subsidy)
3. \*Tech prep students
4. \*Ohio students studying abroad and international students studying in Ohio
5. \*Students studying via distance learning
6. Graduates (with 4 year degrees) returning to school for coursework but not as degree seekers,
7. students on public assistance,
8. partnerships for service, Iowa State has a good system for this.
9. Co-op programs,
10. Distance learning,
11. Study abroad.

*There appeared to be strong interest in including in the performance report measures on non-traditional students and non-traditional delivery mechanisms as a way of describing the variety of services and delivery systems existing in Ohio's higher education institutions.*

### **Other topics to return to in subsequent meetings**

- We could use the faculty survey to measure time spent on public service.
- Present higher education as an employer and purchaser of goods and service.
- Focus on programs mandated by the legislature, e.g. Program 60.
- Benchmark indicators

### **Next Meeting**

Next meeting July 6.