

Draft For Committee Review - Last updated 4/24/00
Performance Evaluation Subcommittee Meeting Notes (4/17/2000)

Introductions

Rob Sheehan discussed the basis for nomination to this subcommittee. He recognized OBRs need for expert advice on performance reporting and that campuses as well as other states have experience to share. Rob and Matt Filipic have met with a group of urban institution's representatives last week and insights gained from these meetings may prove useful to our work.

There were no suggested changes to the agenda.

WWW Site

We reviewed the WWW site for the committee, at http://www.regents.state.oh.us/mainpages/he_perf_report.html

This site will serve as an important vehicle for assuring campus representatives (including committee representatives and all other campus representatives) that we welcome their input and guidance. There is a discussion group on the WWW and subcommittee members were invited to participate. We reviewed how to register for the discussion group. The site is currently linked from the "What's New" page of the OBR home page. There was a suggestion to link from the HEI home page.

Review of the full Committee Meeting on March 2, 2000

Matt Filipic reviewed the full committee meeting held on 3/2/2000.

OBR and campuses agreed on the importance of a quality report.

We discussed the work of the Board Performance Committee, which has been cautious in identifying performance measures. We have been critical of U.S. News evaluations, especially for open admissions campuses. Institutions with this mission are automatically 4th tier institutions. Matt contrasted this with the more balanced perspective provided by the series of IUC retention reports focusing on retention and graduation. Matt & Rob stressed the importance of measuring against peers and this idea was broadly accepted by the subcommittee.

Matt reviewed the governor's charge and some negative aspects of our experiences with Service Expectations.

We discussed measuring collective performance, statewide, as well as by institution. The report might be used to help students select the institutions they wish to attend.

We want to use existing data as much as possible. HEI and IPEDS are available, however, IPEDS data are suspect, because they are not edited. Probably, at some point, we will need data that are not included in HEI. We want to avoid

one-time data collections, because of inconsistency of data. If we feel we need more data elements, we will consider adding them to the HEI system.

We discussed the need for annual reporting. One suggestion was a cycle of reports, varying between topics.

Several participants stressed that the report needs context, e.g. IUC retention report classification or Carnegie Classification. IUC uses the admissions selectivity used by ACT. We may need different classifications for different questions. ACT classifications will allow national comparisons. We also discussed comparing institution against predicted rates for that institution. Then each institution has its own benchmark group, especially with graduation rates.

We discussed how to organize the effort, e.g. the subcommittee and the timetable for deliverables. We concluded quality is more important than timeliness. We plan to reconvene the full committee before the subcommittee has a draft report. We will support continuing discussions in an electronic format. An optimistic target is for the draft report to be finished by this summer.

We discussed the matrix on performance measures.

While there is some danger involved in producing performance measures, that they may be misinterpreted, there is also potential benefit. As society changes higher education becomes more important and we do not do a good job of reporting our contributions to this changing society. We should try to make the performance report a positive contribution to “telling the story” of higher education in Ohio. We should look for honest and illuminative illustrations of the contribution of higher education.

Assumptions we start with

Rob Sheehan suggested that we confine our discussions by the scope of these assumptions.

1. Data elements must be measurable. Numbers and indices which are unambiguous. Remember, numbers can represent judgements, e.g. the degree to which you agree to something.
2. Definitions must be rigorous. Rigor enforces consistency.
3. Measures must be publicly accessible.
4. Data must yield capacity for comparison within context. Comparison can be the primary focus or it can be subordinate to statewide data. For example, we can tell the state story and then show institution comparisons. Comparisons to peers, standards, or national are all acceptable types of comparisons. Comparisons are beneficial for students who are not place-bound.
5. Not all institutions will be above average on all measures. We should show both strength and challenges.

A campus representative wondered what our assumption is relative to the balance of increasing the cost of data collections, vs. use of existing data? We

cannot answer this today, but it will be a constant discussion item in this process as we move along.

Goals of the report

Campus representatives wondered about the goals of the report. They suggested that the goals should be clear before we move forward. The rationale of the report will drive our direction. The charge from the Governor has 4 or 5 goals and these will guide the report. What audiences will the report be directed to? Again, the Governor's request for this report also spelled out several different audiences and each of these audiences will be included in the report. It was suggested that we should identify which measures relate to which audiences, for example we want to relate to the legislature that Ohio public higher education is under-funded and fees are high. This is not a message we want to send to prospective students.

The Performance Report might be used to motivate new performance challenges.

We need to ask if a measure is of value to an audience, not just of interest.

It was suggested that we relate the performance report elements to newly developing processes of the North Central Association (NCA).

A campus representative offered a list of suggestions:

1. Context including identification of peer groups is important.
2. We need careful definitions of data elements.
3. Don't be driven by what we can measure.

A campus representative suggested that we should not develop this report "just because we were asked". Rather, we need an overriding purpose for the report. We should measure for something, to effect change in something. Our strategy should be:

1. Identify what we want to do.
2. Determine what we need to measure.
3. Determine if we have progressed toward what we want to do.

We noted that new accreditation processes are geared toward making the institution better.

It was suggested by one campus representative that we need more input from the Governor. On the other hand, we may have gotten what we will get and we will be providing progress reports to the Governor as well. The Governor has provided us some latitude with regard to the questions guiding the report as well as the answers to these questions. The Governor initially reacted to published graduation rates for athletes at OSU, and then pursued this interest to all students. Thus, we do need some graduation rate statistics.

A campus representative suggested that an over-riding purpose of the report should be to assess college and university success in preparing students to make the transition from working in a traditional manufacturing economy to a high technology/information based economy.

It was pointed out that a sole focus on graduation rates was inappropriate in light of the diverse missions of our institutions. Rather, it was suggested that increasing educational attainment is a better goal than increasing graduation rates.

Matt Filipic discussed the Milken Report and the dismal story it tells of high tech industry in Ohio.

Rob shared data that relates degree attainment with per capita income and shows Ohio declining in both with respect to national averages. Ohio graduates more high school students, but fewer go to college.

OBR Vision Mission Goals

A consultation participant pointed out that the goals of the Board of Regents might also be considered in developing an over-riding purposes for the performance report. This document is linked from the "What's New" OBR page at: http://hei.regents.state.oh.us/cgi-pub/vmg_site_map?ActionType=main

We reviewed the goals in the document.

Major Themes of the Measures

It was suggested that we should show how institutions cooperate in the education of students, e.g. transfers within the system.

Measures should be simple, e.g., explainable in an elevator ride. On the other hand, readers should not rush to judgement.

A campus representative asked for a quick look of the raw statistics by sector, for HEI data.

Rob discussed our cohort tracking feature being added to the HEI system. IPEDS data are available for retention and graduation rates, but the accuracy is suspect and we may not wish to keep the same reporting rules as are used at a federal level.

Conceptual Model

We discussed the conceptual model of concentric circles, included in the hand out materials.

A suggestion was to add larger circle for national context, also rearranging the 2nd and 3rd circles.

We discussed:

1. mission vs. condition, condition is who we serve
2. mission vs. constraints,
3. mission vs. how the students use the institution.

We should relate institution goals to state goals. There are two points of view: black and white, e.g., a school either is for the purpose of research or not, secondly, all schools contribute to all goals more or less. So we measure all

institutions but with different expectations. If something has value it has value across the whole system. This attitude is consistent with the Ohio approach to higher education. The institution missions blend.

Rob suggested that we find one or two goals that are common. The following were proposed:

1. Higher education can and does contribute to the economic well being of Ohio,
2. Higher education contributes to an educated citizenry, promoting general well being.

It was suggested that we focus our discussions first on economic well being.

The Nested Circle Model

We reviewed the components and proposed data elements of the draft report related to the nested circle model.

Circle One: Reporting on increased importance of Higher Education in Ohio's emerging knowledge based economy

We reviewed the following performance report elements:

- # residents in the state
- residents by age
- # students in K-12 system
- # high school graduates/year
- Economic basis of state (income, employment issues]
- Movement of state from industrial to knowledge based economy
- Cost of public higher education
- State support for higher education
 - Compared to other portions of state budget
 - Compared to nation
- Median income of Ohio
- % residents with:
 - some college, 2 year degrees, 4 years degrees, graduate degrees, certificates

The reactions from Consultation members were generally positive to the proposed performance reporting elements in this circle.

We are encouraged to get data from DOE and ACT. We also need technology data. Other sources identified include: Census data, EPI, Statistical Abstract of the US.

It was suggested that we establish goals in focusing on various Industries. Then it was suggested we broaden the context to industry vs. service (high tech and low tech). ASPD has data on industry needs but it is not related to degree attainment.

Matt noted:

1. We are obligated to educate Ohio students wherever they go after graduation.
2. We are obligated to educate Ohio's future workers wherever they come from.

Sponsored research and non-credit training, are best treated separately from the degree attainment.

We need data on public support for higher education in Ohio, not just state support.

Circle Two: Describing the Context in which higher education performance is occurring in Ohio

We reviewed the following reporting performance elements:

- Types of higher education institutions in state
- Missions of higher education institutions in state
- # institutions (2 year institutions, 4 year institutions, branches)
- geographic distribution of campuses in state

The reactions from Consultation members were generally positive to the proposed performance reporting elements in this circle.

It was noted that OBR has functional mission statements from each institution and these should be consulted in developing this area. Additionally, we may need data on selectivity, scope of students served, Carnegie Classification, type of institution, residential vs. urban. Consider describing the range of missions statewide. Different sections of the report will call for different level of specifics on mission and different classifications.

It was suggested that we start with statistics that the general public is expecting, then go on show how well do more.

The format of question and answer has appeal and a provides a way to go from general to specific.

Circle Three: Describing current activity in Ohio's state supported higher education sector

We reviewed the following reporting performance elements:

- # students statewide (2 year, 4 year undergraduate, graduate
 - contribution of campuses to statewide enrollment
- # first time freshmen (headcount/FTE) statewide
 - contribution of campuses to first time freshmen
- Average size of instructional events for lower division students
- Degrees/certificates/majors offered statewide
 - contribution of campuses to statewide academic offerings
- Enrollment by major areas statewide
 - contribution of campuses to statewide major enrollments
- Full time vs. Part-time faculty instructional staffing in Ohio
 - contribution of campuses to Full time / Part-time instructional staffing
- Mobility measures (transfers within the state supported institutions statewide)
 - Contribution of campuses to mobility measures

The reactions from Consultation members were generally positive to the proposed performance reporting elements in this circle with the exception that computing size of instructional events (class size) was both problematic and of questionable value.

We need statistics:

1. to show who teaches the students,
2. on student activity, e.g. distribution of SCH by student,
3. constituency partnerships, with industry etc
4. research,
5. non-credit training.

There are myths in higher education, e.g., most students graduate in 4 years, most students go to the same school throughout their career, most students know their intention when they start school.

Circle Four: Describing the performance of Ohio's state supported higher education sector

We introduced but did not thoroughly review the following reporting performance elements:

- **Performance aligned with federal measures**
 - Retention for full time degree seeking freshmen
 - Contribution of campuses to retention measures (mission grouping)
 - Graduation rates for full time degree seeking freshmen
 - Contribution of campuses to graduation rates (mission grouping)
 - Time to degree completion for full time degree seeking freshmen
 - Contribution of campuses to time to degree completion (mission grouping)
 - Stats for athletes for 4 year institutions
 - Contribution of campuses to athletes' stats (mission grouping)
 - Employment patterns of recent graduates – statewide
 - Contribution of campuses to employment patterns (mission grouping)
- **Performance aligned with the alternate perspectives?**
 - Enrollment of non-traditional students
 - Completion of certificates/modules
 - Graduation rates for transfer students
 - Others?
- **Describing other items of importance with data yet to come**

Further discussion of these performance report elements will occur at the next meeting, including data on athletics will complicate our job and these statistics are available from the NCAA. It was suggested that we eliminate this item from the list of performance measures to be included in the report.

We should relate retention by race and minority status.

We discussed defining a transfer cohort. Statistics on transfer students make sense at the state level, not by institution. We considered the cohort of students

with an associate degree that go on for the baccalaureate, but this generated little interest. We considered students who come to higher education with deficiencies?

Even though we will have graduation rates, we need to broaden them to include other educational attainments. We need to consider what is included in educational attainment.

Campuses were asked to suggest how HEI can collect data on non-credit instruction, not necessarily unit record data?

Class Size

We had handouts that contained some sample HEI data on class size. These generated many comments about how class size is misleading, e.g., some students do well in large classes, and some classes are designed to be large.

On the other hand a study at one school indicated that class size is inversely proportional to grade, i.e. the smaller the class the higher the grade. This study was segmented by discipline and level. We should consider class size from the perspective of the student experience. Class size and type of instructor are part of this picture, as well the degree to which the student is challenged, and the amount of writing required. These may all have a relationship to class size. We need to measure whether or not students learn more in small classes.

OBR staff will send subcommittee members an email that describes the class size report for purposes of campus representatives comparing this report their own experiences.

Logistics

Does the subcommittee need to get smaller? Some institutions have multiple representatives.

A consultation representative suggested dividing the work and forming sub-sub committees. We could meet for two hours in the a.m. as sub-sub committees and all get together in the p.m. The organization into sub-sub committees would be by circle in the model.

Advice Regarding Continuing Input

Subcommittee members were instructed to send lengthy comments via email, and use the WWW discussion facility for specific subjects.

Draft report is due this fall (or summer?) and the first final report this fall.

Focus on measures we all agree on and save the controversial ones for later.

We have not yet dealt with the question of the value of more data for HEI. Next meeting is 5/15/2000.