May 15 Performance Sub-Committee Meeting Notes
Last Revised May 17, 2000

DRAFT

Introduction

We started by introducing ourselves.

Rob reported related efforts underway at OACC and IUC. Also, OAIR and the independent institutions have expressed interest in our work.

Rob asked for comments on the minutes. No amendments were suggested.

State-by-State Report Card

Rob described a report in our handout titled A State-by-State Report Card on Higher Education. This report is being developed by The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education with little or no consultation from campuses of SHEEO's. The effort is privately funded. States will receive letter grades in the following categories:

1. Preparation
2. Participation
3. Affordability
4. Persistence and Completion
5. Educational Gains and Returns (which include voter registration rates and participation rates).

Authors of this report will use existing data sources such as the Digest of Educational Statistics, IPEDS, national census data, and data from State Budget Officers.

Neither the SHEEO nor the U.S. Department of Education endorses the effort.

The report is due out this fall. We may want to time the publication of our report based on this national report.

Our sense is there will be no distinction between institutions or between public or private institutions, only state by state.

Other State's Performance Reports

We reviewed performance reports from other states. Many of these are on the web at:
http://www.regents.state.oh.us/mainpages/perf_rpt_links.html

We discussed the West Virginia report and their measure of professional licensure statistics. It has a statewide perspective with drill down to specific license and institution. We also discussed their employment reported employment data which indicated whether recent graduates were employed in-state, their incomes, and whether they were continuing their education in the state system.

We will soon get similar data from OBES. Rob discussed our current data exchange with OBES. We send them SSNs of students who have graduated (@64,000 for AY 1997-1998) or stopped-out (@140,000 for AY 1997-1998). OBES will then return four or five quarters of employment data. Employment data returned is restricted to Ohio, excluding Federal jobs and self-employed persons. The data returned is name of employer, zip code of employment, SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) of employer, wages paid and unemployment paid; there is no flag of part time, full time. This are the ES 202 data. We will pursue the acquisition of federal employment data after we have worked with the OBES data for a period of time.

Campus representatives asked if OBR plans to make the OBES data available to the campuses. Rob indicates we hope to do this once we have developed sufficient security protections for these data.

We won't be able to get specific job titles of individuals; therefore, we can't match degree and job title. We can track industries employing students from different subject fields over time. It was reported that Florida, Texas and Alaska have title of the employee in their data base. We will pursue this possibility after we begin to work with the data that we can get from the OBES.

Campus representatives warned that tracking graduate degrees is deceptive because of internships etc. For reporting purposes, we will probably start with undergraduate degrees, although our database will include recipients of graduate degrees and all certificates (graduate and undergraduate).

It was reported that Florida, Texas, and Washington state have data on federal employment. Again, we will work with OBES staff to obtain these data after we have developed expertise in working with the OBES state data.

We discussed the Kentucky report of retention and graduation.

We discussed the Texas report and pointed out that their graduation rates utilize statewide data rather than the federal definition. In response to this we discussed our handout on retention and noted that in HEI we have the capability of examining statewide retention as well as specific campus retention. Ohio' statewide retention rates for first time full time freshmen for AU 1998 to AU 1999 appear to be higher than the campus specific retention. One participant noted that the statewide rates would be even higher once independent college data were added. We discussed how many students, particularly community college students, transfer from the public sector to the private sector to complete their degrees. It was suggested that the Transfer Module might actually favor transfer to independent schools, because they don't insist on using it as a unit.

Discussing retention rates lead us briefly to discuss graduate rates. Harold discussed our planned Cohort Tracking facility to help with graduation rate and retention statistics. With this facility, institutions can identify cohorts of students and the HEI data can be used to identify where they may be enrolled in the state or graduated. We will have this facility available in about a month.

We discussed the Tennessee report. They use satisfaction data collected by survey. Rob noted that our board does place a high value on survey data, assuming that the data are publicly accessible and statewide. Currently we have no such data. Most campuses currently have satisfaction survey data. Detail questions may vary, but the main question, are you satisfied, is on all surveys. The general questions tend to have positive response, but the detail questions get more negative feedback. Sampling technique also influences responses. We discussed the 1999 Image Assessment Survey conducted by Triad Inc, for OACC. Rob expressed that a similar survey designed for the two and four-year sectors may be useful to us. There was support for this idea. Regional data was suggested over statewide data. This will require a larger sample with questions targeted to the educational opportunity in the region. Main benefit of the survey will probably be to the state. Institutions already know who their potential students are.

The survey can add context to our statistics.

IUC has recently done a similar survey. It is a survey of how people view higher education in Ohio. Registered voters and opinion leaders are surveyed. The consultation wants to review the IUC survey.

Subcommittees

We decided not to form sub committees at least at today's meeting due to the press of time and acknowledging that discussion in the whole group was proceeding well. See large classes are better.

Retention Report

This is a widely accepted performance measure to be included in the report. We discussed the HEI year to year retention report for full time, first time degree seeking freshmen students. The data (with few exceptions) appear to match the retention statistics currently being reported by campuses. We discussed 4 areas which could improve the accuracy of these data. First, we should employ the logic of 4 year campuses (ignoring HEI's academic intent field) for the branch campuses who do not report such data. Second, we should use the year and term of matriculation for PSOP and PSOP++ students. Third, to match the federal retention data we should include summer students in with fall students to capture full time, first term freshmen. Two campuses would have to revise their HEI data for Autumn 1998 (and summer 1998) on the use of the first time ever enrolled in college switch (Central State & Edison). Fourth, we should calculate retention in three different scopes: on the same campus, at the same institution and in the state system. In addition to these modifications in our statewide algorithm, and clean-up of a small amount of campus data, we may need institution specific rules. Rob invited campuses to specify criteria for their institution. It may also be that campuses can explicitly identify their own cohort via the cohort tracking system.

Time to degree

This is a mandated part of the performance report. There are 2 different approaches to computing time to degree and we may wish to consider one or both of these approaches. First, we can compute time to degree using as retrospective data the graduates who are reported to us in the Degree Certificate (DC) file. This is the current basis for success challenge. If we employ this approach, we could eliminate outliers through computation of the average time to degree for the inner-most 90% of students. We presently have no method for including in such an analysis a measure of the remedial coursework students must take before they can begin their degree related coursework. It was pointed out by participants that we should consider remediation and part time students as a factor affecting time to degree. A suggestion was to accompany time to degree statistics with other statistics about remedial instruction and full time part time student ratios. We should collect race and gender data for students with unusually large or small time to degree.

As a second approach to computing time to degree, we discussed using the cohort tracking system as a means of determining graduation rates for pre HEI graduating classes. This approach identifies a cohort and then asks the question: "What percent of students in the cohort receive their degrees within 4 years, 5 years, or 6 years?" We can focus prospectively on a cohort and national standard time to degree, e.g., 6 years for a baccalaureate and three for an Associate. IPEDS graduation rates relate to full time and part time students. In IPEDS a cohort is based on starting time and degree intent can change over the 3 to 6 years investigated.

Some campus representatives questioned the usefulness of time to degree statistics. Short degree times might come at the expense of quality instruction. Student choice is perhaps the most significant factor in time to degree. Other representatives acknowledged that time to degree is a performance measure that has great public credibility. The Governor's charge to the OBR was to specifically include time to degree in the Performance Report. We will compute some version of time to degree statistics and we will also make an effort to place these statistics in context of the institution mission, paying particular attention to remediation activity and part time/full time student status.

Remember:
The taxpayers think:
1. Baccalaureate degrees take four years.
2. The Governor asked for credits to graduation as well as time to degree.

Credit Hours Delivered by Type of Instructor

We reviewed a partially complete set of data addressing the percent of student coursework that was taught by full time vs. part time faculty. We were reminded that the percent of faculty in the various ranks varies considerably between institutions. This would impact the delivery of credit hours. The definition of full time part time varies between institutions. The distinction between permanent part time and temporary part time was mentioned and the possibility of part-time faculty being tenured was mentioned as a data area to

explore. Length of Service is a data item we should consider collecting, or perhaps obtain it from the retirement system. We will look into the availability of such data. One representative mentioned that contact hours are a better measure of faculty involvement than credit hours. We were reminded that faculty do more than teach and that some of the best teachers are part time teachers. There was some agreement that a ratio of FT to PT student credit hour generation might make sense for lower division coursework (perhaps General Studies and Technical coursework). We will review such data for a larger set of campus at our next meeting.

Financial

We reviewed some HEI data drawn from the recently completed Resource Analysis. The data that were reviewed represented the portion of institution's budget devoted to paying for instructors. Participants appeared to value the measure of percent of budget devoted to instruction but to not support this specific method of approach. Instead of comparing the cost of direct compensation for the faculty with the total cost of instruction, we were advised to use the NACUBO categories of Instruction and Departmental Research, Separately Funded Research, and Academic Support. We were also advised that Change in percent over time is important. It was pointed out that these data elements are also reported to the OBR in HEI. We will gather and report these data at the next meeting.

Class Size

We discussed class size statistics reported to the group from HEI. There appeared to be widespread agreement that the HEI class size data closely matched campus own data, and that campuses did present such data to prospective students as a process measure rather tan a performance measure. A suggestion was made and widely accepted that we use ranges of class sizes rather than average. Class size reflects the mission of the institution as well as the field of study. Fine arts, for example, has studio time and individual studies. Accreditation requirements may impact class size. A suggestion was to restrict the statistics to GS level classes. A second suggestion was made that we present average class size by discipline.

We have significant data problems with class size:
1. Cross listed sections,
2. Sections with multiple components, such as lecture and lab,
3. Sections for which we have no schedule,
4. Sections scheduled into the same time and place that really meet in different places.

These problems are not specific to the HEI data system, they are widely experienced on all campuses.

Next Steps

- We may have market penetration data to discuss at our next meeting.
- We may also have data from the Ohio Department of Education to share at our next meeting on the size of graduating high school classes by school building. These data may be useful in assessing access issues for the performance report.
- We may also have employment data to share at our next meeting. We do hope to have a version of this measure included in the performance report.
- Graduation rate measures (in some form) will be included in the performance report. Campus representatives will give their staff a heads up that cohort submissions for graduation rates (and perhaps freshmen retention) are likely to mean additional data requests. Campuses should pay immediate attention to the data submission document found at: http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/datasubdoc/enrollment/production/ctfile.html
- We will re-run retention statistics modifying our algorithms. A version of this measure will be included in the performance report.
- We will re-run class size statistics, focusing on GS & T and attempt some type of discipline based analyses. This variable appears to be a likely measure in the report although perhaps as an activity measure rather than a performance measure.

- We will re-run PT/FT faculty student credit hour generation statistics for the next meeting including additional campuses and including in our algorithm some reflection of tenured part-time faculty. This available (in some form) appears to be a likely measure in the report.
- We will present some analyses on enrollment data (distinguishing between part-time and full time students) and degree production data for the next meeting.
- We will seek to eliminate statistics about athletes from our planning for this report. We will consult further with the Governor's office on this subject.
- The consultation should consider non-traditional student populations at our next meeting. What measures do we need?
- We will also discuss surveys conducted by campuses. What survey instruments are used? What is the sample size? Include surveys on financial aid.

Request for Campus Input By Next Meeting

Campus representatives are asked to provide information by the next meeting about any institution wide surveys conducted on their campuses. These are surveys that are more than the effort of a single department of academic unit (e.g. the business college for accreditation purposes). Representatives are asked to share, by email or snail mail, the instrument, the timeline for data collection, and the sampling plan used in data collection. Rob will receive and collate these materials and they will be included in the next meeting's discussion.

June 8 is next meeting.