

Introduction

Rob Sheehan opened the meeting with introductions. Rob discussed the handouts and agenda.

Overall plans for the 2001 report

We start the process with the questions we want the report to answer not with the data we have at hand. Last year's theme was a focus on first year students. This theme is agreeable to the Governor. Another possible theme for this year is issues related to access, cost barriers etc.

Some needed improvements on last year's report are in research. We still may not have sufficient research data. Also work force related activities, including non-credit instruction.

The timeline for the report this year is to report in late October or Early November. Remember, after the subcommittee committee has reviewed the reports, we need to pass them by the institutions in general before we publish. Last year it was this final iteration that caused us to delete one report from the package. We will have a more technically oriented subcommittee to develop the reports the same as last year. This group will meet monthly and the full committee will meet again in the summer for any mid course corrections. This is the same process as last year. Sign up for the subcommittee via email if you didn't already sign up on the sheet.

Campus representatives suggested we need a purpose for the report and suggested several:

1. respond to the Governor's request,
2. lobby for higher education,
3. generate media attention as well as control it,
4. reference material for prospective students.

The more purposes we have for the report, the less focused it will be on a main theme.

We wondered about the magnitude of interest in the 2000 report. How many WWW page hits and media uses have we had. Rob will supply a report of media interactions from a file we have of newspaper articles.

There was a suggestion that we get input on what the president's need for progress reports. We suggested a one-page summary of the goals of the report and a short progress report or executive summary after each meeting.

Last year we tried a list proc; it did not work well. We did and will continue to use a listserv for both the subcommittee and full committee. We will use private WWW sites to share drafts of the reports. Last year we produced both paper and WWW based final reports. We plan the same for this year.

There was a campus suggestion that the performance report should show the state leaders that state support is the problem, not the schools. High tuition, low aid and low cost. It was suggested that the low cost dimension should be used in the current budget negotiations.

International Studies

Rob discussed international studies issues possibly for the 2001 report. Exporting subsidy is an issue with the legislature. We need data to support the value of international instruction. The issue is bi-directional, international students on Ohio campuses and Ohio students studying abroad. There are also partnerships with international industry, sister institutions and foreign countries. There are programs with both two and four year institutions. We want to broaden the focus beyond exporting subsidy.

Capturing international students into the Ohio economy after they graduate is something we want to include in the report.

There is strong legislative support for paying Ohioans to study abroad. What is the performance that we're trying to report? 60 - 70% of high school students identify that want to study abroad, but only 3 - 4% do so. What does the state get out of educating foreign students? ACE publication summarizes internationalization of higher education. We might compare Ohio to these national data. Some foreign experience is not for credit. There is a WWW site that identifies Ohio's 4-year foreign programs.

Time to Degree

Rob discussed the change from mean to median time to degree in the report last year. Also, we did not recognize programs that require extra time for completion, e.g. engineering and pharmacy. We currently have data on extended programs in the four-year sector. We need to extend this facility to the two-year sector. Then we could normalize the median time to degree.

Class Size

We deleted this from the 2000 report at the last minute because it did not reflect the reality of large lectures broken into small labs, discussion or recitation groups. We changed the methodology to use the class schedule, rather than the section identifier, to measure class size. This version of the report was distributed to the committee at the beginning of January and is in the handout for this meeting. Subsequent campus reaction to the use of class schedule identified two problems:

1. Classes with multiple schedules have more impact on the statistics.
2. Large sections with low credits and few meetings (e.g. orientation courses) have the same impact as classes that meet every day.

So, in the meeting handout, we had a version that measures enrollments in each class meeting, rather than each schedule of meetings. Another change we might make is to weight the meetings by their length. As it stands a 5 credit hour course that meets once a week for 4 or 5 hours has less impact than the same class meeting for an hour each day.

There was a question of the value of a class size report. Do we want class size to be a strategic goal of the institutions? Schools might abandon independent study in favor of smaller sections. On the other hand, there is a general assumption in the public as well as among school administrators that smaller sections are better. Using a frequency distribution to report the data is helpful and we plan to do this. Also, our report shows enrollments rather than classes in the distribution.

Reports to include independent schools

Based on the state's support of independent students via financial aid, we need data on graduation rates for students from independent institutions. We are integrating some data on independents into HEI that will support reports on mobility between sectors. We also need data on the major field of study for independent students.

Distance Learning

The Governor has requested distance learning be included in the report. We need to refine the research questions.

Graduation Rates

In addition to including data on independent schools we should add a column for predicted graduation rate report based on ACT data.

The 2000 report was limited to four-year degrees; in 2001 we plan to expand to two year. We should augment it with other data about the two-year experience. Regional campuses are included in this.

Out of state linkages

There was a suggestion that we might use federal FAFSA (financial aid) data to track out of state. The National Student Load ClearingHouse can provide out of state data, but the exchange is based names and birth date rather than SSN.

ACT Data

Rob discussed our agreement with ACT. We have ACT data for Ohio high school students who took the test in 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000. The data reflects things such as core curriculum taken in high school, high school GPA, courses taken, parents income etc. The two-year sector doesn't require ACT tests, but many two-year students take the ACT. ACT data is part of the access initiative. We discussed the ACT report data handout. There was a comment that composite ACT scores are very similar from school to school. It doesn't seem to supply much differentiation. We will share the ACT data layout and welcome suggestions as to possibly useful fields.

With ACT data we can relate college success to the student's high school.

Remediation

There was a question as to whether we should measure at the state level or institution level. We made a distinction between developmental study (to make up for omitted instruction earlier or to bring it up to date) Vs remedial (repeated instruction that was not successful the first time). The Governor does not want a report to compare Ohio to other states. He wants campus comparisons. There is no statewide standard for placement in remediation.

Campus Specific Code

We identified the reports that had campus specific code in 2000 report, in order to compensate for data anomalies. If we are to repeat these reports in 2001, we need to update the campus specific code.

Cost of a College Education

Last year we did not include the entire scope of cost. Ohio is a high tuition and low aid state. Ohio's Pell grants are lower than national data. This may be due to our higher tuition, resulting in better to do students enrolling in Ohio schools.

Mobility Reports

The Governor wants to see data on students who transfer (or mobile) between institutions. It would be better for us to wait a few years for more HEI data. There was a comment that students tend to stay in the two year sector less at 2 year before transferring because this way they can graduate with a four year degree with fewer courses. Transfer data will show that these students are successful.

We discussed swirling and it was suggested that reverberation or Ping-Pong is a better name. With this process Ohio is keeping the student in state.

Student Access to Technology and Facilities Utilization

These issues are of interest to Board members. We discussed some survey data on number of student accessible PCs and wired classrooms. There was a suggestion that we add workstations to the Area Inventory (AI) file. We need to identify the quality of the PCs in the classrooms. With all the current emphasis on IT we need more data. The use of IT in instruction is more important than PCs in the classroom. We need to identify the purpose of the IT question in order to see what to measure. Some campuses may have more PCs on campus because the student's do not have their own.

We reviewed the handout on utilization data. The handout included only the daytime hours. The actual report covers, evenings, nighttime, and weekends as well. There was a comment that the public will not understand this data. We might report peak hours for each institution. Off site instruction reduces utilization. Classify schools as residential or commuter, with some schools being both. Use national space utilization norms.

Time to Degree

Time to degree seems to be increasing year by year. We identified several factors:

1. need for remediation,
2. transferring,
3. adult students returning to school,
4. cost of education,
5. part time students.

We identified that going to school part time is a form of financial aid.

OBES (change to ODJFS) and FAFSA

We discussed the ODJFS query and the new FAFSA data we have. In a month or two we plan to share FAFSA data with campuses via a query like the ODJFS query.

OHSU reported their study of return on investment using the ODJFS data. Generally the return on investment for a college degree is 3.5 years, this is faster than paying off a car. Others commented that it takes about 8 years to pay back the state, in increased taxes, for its support while in college. This is a model that the legislature would understand. We should tie the data to the economic region. Our current data exchange with ODJFS is for contemporary employment data. We can request archival data.

There was a question of supplying analytic models that smaller campuses can plug data into.

The 2000 Performance Report on salaries for graduates, understated the value of a college degree. We used the ES202 data from ODJFS and we reported starting salaries. An alternate source is to survey the graduates. This may provide an over estimate. We are reporting salary, but income is higher for college graduates. We may need salaries 2 or 3 years after graduation. We were cautioned not to overestimate the value of professional education compared to liberal arts. We should show that college benefits go beyond the jobs.

Faculty surveys

We discussed the Full Time and Part Faculty Surveys. We expect to use the survey data for the performance report.

Licensure outcomes

Other state's reports include this data. We did only Law. We need more data input on passing rates. DOE has passing rates for teacher certification. The passing scores have recently been increased. Passing rates relative to other states should be normalized relative to cutoffs. Two-year schools report licensure passage to Perkins in the federal system.

Student satisfaction

The state would pay for a common survey of student satisfaction. We discussed existing surveys to use as models. NSSE, HERI (Higher Education Research Institution), and Noel Levits (spelling???) were mentioned. The Board wants something that is from the student's standpoint.

With the budget cuts, this survey will probably be for next year. Rob suggested a subcommittee to identify common questions for an all Ohio survey. Campus reluctance is with the comparison to other schools. The goal should be to sell the public and state leaders that students are satisfied. The survey will not tell the schools something they do not know. Campuses already have elaborate surveys, we need to be careful of the interface between this new survey and existing surveys.

Financial Aid Packaging

Rob discussed the handouts on this. It was suggested that in addition to showing aid from various sources, we show:

1. total % of students with aid,
2. amount of aid,
3. % of unmet need.

Closing

Sign up for the technical subcommittee.