

Performance Subcommittee meeting 10/12/2000

Introduction

Rob identified the minutes of our last meeting in the handouts and asked for corrections to be sent in.

Meeting with the Governor's Staff

He discussed a meeting with representatives of the Governor. We presented the PowerPoint slides. Paulo De Maria plus two others represented the Governor. Some campus representatives attended the meeting. There was general agreement with our direction. They felt that we were responding to the Governor's request in a positive way. This PowerPoint presentation has been shared with several executive level boards and committees.

More Introduction

The report has been reversed in order. The student outcomes section comes first and the context second.

A report on Law Bar exams is included even though other certification exams are not included. This is due to special interest of the board and the fact we have data for the Law Bar.

The performance Report for next year may focus on research for the four-year institutions and workforce training for the two-year institutions.

Format of the individual reports

Rob discussed the format of the individual reports and pointed out that we avoid identifying institutions in the narrative section of the report. He wondered if we should put the campus specific data in an appendix.

The consultation discussed both electronic and paper distribution of the reports. There was a suggestion that in the electronic version a reader could select an institution and see all of the data for that institution exclusively and another suggestion that the reader could select a data question and see all of the answers to that question. We also discussed the benefit of the flow of having the institution data included with the narrative.

The format of each report or question is:

1. the question
2. why the question is important
3. national answers
4. statewide answers
5. sector answers (showing it as a column heading defines the term)
6. institution answers .

Rob expressed a goal of 2 pages per question sans the institution specific data.

Suggestions on the format included:

1. Provide a section on limitations of the data.
2. If the report is for casual reading include the graphs up front.
3. The report should be skim-able, take narrative out, and put in bullets. On the other hand specifics are necessary to describe complicated situations. There was a suggestion to include a summary and the detail.
4. The narrative should point out issues that are not obvious in the data, avoid simply repeating what is obvious from the data.
5. Reasons for variations in the data should not be included if the reasons are not measured.
6. We must balance between brevity and clarity.

7. Some basic definitions need to be included, e.g., SCH, FTE, Sector, Course Level. It was suggested that using Sector as a column heading in a column that shows the campuses by sector would provide a definition.

The Particulars of the Reports

The purpose of this document is to provide campuses with enough specifics to replicate the data for their institution. There was a suggestion to include the report SQL with the particulars.

Persistence Report

We should include admission criteria of the campuses. Include some indication of total enrollment in the report. Identify which years the data represents. We no longer need to exclude CNTL from the test for First Time Ever in College Switch.

Credits and Time to Degree Report

There was a question about normalizing the time to degree for extended programs. Currently the report does not do this. It does use the extended credits in an extended program in the determination of assumed transfer students. We discussed the case of schools that award all degrees on main campus, we should use the terminology that the degree is awarded through the main campus instead of offered through the main campus.

We wondered why we have a column showing "Percent of First Year Students Who are Degree Seeking and Full Time" in this report. It is to help explain the time to degree.

In other context, time to degree is measured by cohort not by student, i.e. what % graduated in 5 years, 6 years etc. We wondered how differences in definitions and methods of calculation would effect the interpretations of the reports. There was a suggestion that if we show less precision, we might avoid some of these differences. Show the time to degree as 1 decimal place.

It was pointed out that selective admissions are a function of level of degree.

Remediation

It was suggested that the report contains too much information. The estimate in the comparison to national benchmarks need not be included. The numbers reflect that the 2-year sector is much more in the business of remediation, plus they are more involved with non-traditional instruction.

We should put the 2-year sector at the bottom of the report so that the high remediation rates do not stand out. De-emphasize the national data. Some campuses use national tests to determine if a student needs remediation.

We wondered when high school proficiency testing started and how passing this test relates to enrollment in remedial instruction.

It was pointed out that quality of K-12 in the geographic area of a 2-year college determines the need for remediation. Rob pointed out that the magnitude of remediation is not shown at the campus level. Large amounts of remediation deflate persistence.

The Non persisting column in the report is misleading. We should rename it "did not take college level English or math".

We identified some typographical errors on first two paragraphs of page 2 of the report.

The absence of English remediation on the OHUN main campus is not a data anomaly, it is a fact.

Employment Outcomes Report

We noted that average earnings include both part time and full time jobs. This is a dilemma since other state reports do the same and yet it clearly understates the salaries paid full time college graduates. The suggestion was that in the report of salaries only, we exclude the part time salaries. We will need to assume the distinction between full and part time because this parameter is not in the data. We should show total number of graduates but average salary of the assumed full time workers. Also point out that these are starting salaries, however, not all graduates are new employees. We should refer to national census data to identify the value of a college education to life long earnings.

We reviewed the exclusions from the report. Out of state jobs are more significant for schools near the borders of Ohio. Self employed people, who earn no salary, and federal workers are excluded.

The high average salary for Assoc. graduates on the GEAG campus was questioned. Depressed areas impact salaries. The suggestion was to exclude campus level salary comparisons as well as comparisons by discipline and level. Another suggestion was to show the average salary in ranges.

We noted that the employment data does not reflect if the student is working in their field of study.

Rob summarized the suggestions as follows:

1. Combine the data for the FY 1998 and 1999 graduates,
2. Include a reference to lifetime earnings of college graduates,
3. Use an assumption of \$16K per year for the cutoff between part time and full time work,
4. Present salary data by state, sector and discipline, not by campus.
5. Present only the employment and return to school outcomes campus.
7. Identify salaries as starting salaries, call it "Avg. starting salary for full time". Note that some are not starting employees.

Who Teaches the Freshmen Reports and Class Size Report

In other performance reports these statistics are for lower division, not just freshmen.

We noted the differences in uses of the ST file, some campuses include instructor of record, who may not meet with the class, and others do not.

There was a suggestion that we combine the V and G levels? In V level classes there is much out of class support that is not shown in the report. This report and/or the one on class size may cause negative reaction from the faculty if we show the data by campus. Readers will not understand the meaning of course levels.

Perhaps we should consider Section Type in these reports.

Graduation Rates

IPEDS graduation rates should be submitted for Bac. degrees. Some volunteer schools will submit CT files.

IT Report

OBR has the IT survey and will share it with the subcommittee.

Campus Level Mission Statements

We debated having these at the institution level or generic descriptions of the sectors. Some schools are one of a kind. We also discussed a table of parameters of campus characteristics. We will take this question to the institution presidents.

Suggestions for all of the Reports

1. Cut volume wherever possible.
2. Include conclusions as to the meaning of the data, so as to preempt uninformed conclusions on the part of those external to higher education. Rob suggested that we will prepare these conclusions and share with the subcommittee.
3. Don't make the output statistics more precise than the accuracy of the data. Slight differences in exact numbers attract attention to the wrong focus.
4. We shouldn't have campus level data for some reports and not others. Rob suggested that we only exclude campus level data from the salary report.
5. This collection of reports has the potential for the worst backlash for higher education in seven years. It is overkill. We should focus on damage control. Imagine the worse case scenario in interpreting the reports and develop our reaction to this case. On the other hand, "the horse is out of the barn" on the question of producing these reports.

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education Report Card

We discussed this report. There has been little consultation and the report comes out this fall. Draft documents are available on the WWW.

Next Steps

We will provide a list of files used in the performance reports and specify a cutoff data for data corrections.

The next meeting of the subcommittee will be in November and the full Committee in December.

We discussed sharing data with all campuses prior to publication.