

DRAFT

Performance Report Subcommittee Meeting 7/20/2001

Note: Action Items are indicated in **bold and underlined**

### **Introduction**

We reviewed the agenda and handouts.

### **University Research**

We reviewed this handout. The section on licenses and patents is new. **Action Item: Institutions with missing or incomplete data were asked to submit updates. These include: YSU, Central State, and Shawnee.** There was an observation that showing the % increase in research over such a long period of time is of questionable value. A base for comparison is needed. It was suggested that the per capita share provide this base. **Action Item: This report will be shared with RAGCS for review and edit.** There was a suggestion for a companion document on work force development activities.

### **Employment Outcomes**

We identified the OSU report "The Economic Benefits of an Academic Degree" as a report that campuses may be interested in when it becomes more widely available. We discussed the Employment Outcomes report and the change to Ohio residents only for the under graduate degrees. We indicated that the data for SP 2000 grads plus the 1.5 and 2.5 years after graduation data for the SP 1998 and 1999 graduates would be added to the report. Also data for independent graduates will be added. **Action Items: The recommendation was to report the Ohio residents only for under graduates.**

We discussed the report of salary for graduates and the impact of restricting this report by age, or using age as a categorizing variable. In fact, the associate level graduates are older than baccalaureate level graduates are. To some this suggests that we are comparing starting salaries with continuing salaries. Others argue that the associate level graduates, though older, are changing careers, 81% changing fields was cited. More relevant salaries come from well after graduation. Others argue that long term salaries depend less on education than starting or early term salaries. A suggestion was to get pre graduation salaries and compare to post graduation. There was question as to the relevance of this report. All of the data show that going to college adds value to a person's earning power. Moreover, there is a relationship between subject field and salary. It was pointed out that many associate graduates work full time while going back to school for more education. We exclude the full time students from the report, but it may not be enough.

We suggested separate tables by level and include both an age-restricted group and one with no age restriction. There was a question about augmenting this report with data on high school student's salaries. There was a suggestion to include average age. There was a suggestion to add a category for over 25. There was a suggestion to compare our data with census data. Finally, there was a comment that age is a poor substitute for experience.

**Action Item: Since the consultation we have begun to work with data obtained summer, 2001 and are mocking up salary data using the following strategies:**

- Report salary data for students <24 years separately from students >23 at the time of graduation for students who receive associate degrees and baccalaureate degrees. Do not do an age breakout on masters, doctoral, or professional degree recipients.
- Report the respective n's for these data.
- Report salaries .5, 1.5, and 2.5 years from graduation
- When we report salary by discipline and subject field including different degree levels on different charts.
- Report salary data rounded to the nearest half-thousand.
- When available, consider reporting statewide degree level rollups from census data rather than HEI data.

The following are examples of statewide rollup of the salary data following these guidelines:

Salaries of college graduates* - first year, second year, third year after graduation in Autumn, 2000						
Graduate's Age Upon Graduation						
	< 24 years			> 23 years		
Assoc	30% of all grads			70% of all grads		
Bacc	52% of all grads			48% of all grads		
	First year	Second Year	Third year	First year	Second Year	Third year
Assoc	\$27,202	\$28,757	\$30,547	\$33,785	\$35,100	\$35,553
Bac	\$31,477	\$34,354	\$37,288	\$35,155	\$37,469	\$39,724
Assoc	4,003 grads	3,227 grads	1,727 grads	9,158 grads	7,161 grads	3,735 grads
Bac	11,855 grads	9,058 grads	4,329 grads	10,735 grads	8,497 grads	4,215 grads

**All Graduates, Irrespective of Age at Time of Graduation**

	First year	Second Year	Third year
Masters	\$44,818	\$47,470	\$50,483
Prof	\$50,353	\$54,214	\$56,160
Doc	\$45,043	\$47,347	\$52,754
Masters	6,203 grads	4,431 grads	2,076 grads
Prof	465 grads	318 grads	155 grads
Doc	2,153 grads	1,602 grads	763 grads

**Action Item: Once the accuracy of these data have been verified and further chart development has occurred, they will be shared with the consultation members.**

**GPA of Juniors who transfer.**

This report will be associated with the mobility report. There was a suggestion to identify the characteristics of the mobile vs. not mobile students, e.g. OIG status. The GPA for first term as a Junior was suggested to be replaced by a later term. In the current report the GPAs for mobile vs. not mobile students are very similar, this suggests there is no story. Others identified that this is the story. There was a suggestion to segregate the mobile students who have earned a 2-year degree or TM. The need for a breakout by institution was questioned; the message is not to compare institutions, but different paths to degree. Do the report at the state level with internal distribution by institution. It was noted that the "n" for the mobile to CNTL was too small to be significant. There was a suggestion to measure students in good academic standing rather than GPA.

### **Distance Learning**

We discussed the crosswalk between the OLN and Course Inventory (CI) I versions of the Course and Section ID. These files are to be submitted by the end of July. We also need a way to relate OLN classes to academic term. We considered and rejected using the ST file data; an analysis of this showed that current usage is inconsistent. Over the long term, OLN data collection will be expanded to include courses that are not advertised on OLN. Eventual plans are to have the OLN input via HEI data submission and include edits that confirm the consistency between the OLN, CI and CN files. NCA submissions will supplement the report. There was a suggestion that the US News and World Report has more detail than NCS. Institutions are preparing data for this report but are having difficulty. **Action Item: our plans are to stay with the NCS report. We need a broader discussion of the tech code in the ST; if we're not going to use it then it should be deleted.**

### **Graduation Rates**

Schools should submit both IPEDS and CT files. The 3.5-year rate for associate degrees is what we want.

### **Average Time and Credit to Degree**

Extended Programs (EP) and Extended Students (ES) files for associate degrees should be submitted by Aug. 15.

### **College Expense Report**

The ratio we derived for the relative cost of instruction of graduate and undergraduate instruction in Ohio doesn't seem applicable to other states. This is based on limited data we have seen from Minnesota and Illinois. It was suggested that we try to compare only direct costs between Ohio and other states. Fiscal Officers may also have suggestions for this report. It was suggested that we use the Carnegie Classification to identify differences in Universities. When we compare Ohio cost to other states, we will not split out by graduate and undergraduate. For Ohio we will report undergraduate cost by campus. **Action Item: We will share the draft report with the fiscal officers for review and comment.**

### **Degrees**

We noted that some two year students have Subject Codes in their DC record that roll up to an Engineering Subject Field rather than Engineering Tech. There are other Subject Codes to use for Engineering Tech. We will continue to work on this.

### **Amount of Remedial Study**

We reviewed a version of this report by institution. **Action Item: We decided to go back to the campus version but sort the branches to be adjacent to their main campus and show universities with no branches separately. Also, indicate if a school requires remediation.** We wondered why the report is limited to young students; the policy question is how well prepared are college students. There was a suggestion to include a report for older students as well. Another suggestion was to note the open access campuses. We discussed admissions that are partly open. We noted how admission policies vary between main campus and branches. Some argued that NCA may insist on uniform standards across an institution, but this was debated.

### **Faculty Survey**

**Action Item: We should report the response rate by sector. We will note that full time and part are not inclusive of all persons who teach.** This may influence the relative percents of part-time faculty reported, because the percent of GAs is not reported for the universities.

### **Fields to eliminate**

We discussed the need to keep the reports brief. We will eliminate the unnecessary columns once the report drafts become available.

### **Predicting success in college based on FAFSA and ACT data**

We will report more on this later. There was a suggestion to send out material prior to the meeting.

### **Utilization**

A consultation representative suggested that peak utilization may be taken out of context. Rooms that are scheduled but not used show as not used. It was pointed out that average utilization is even less helpful than peak utilization. Other Use of Room data (OR File data) can't be used for peak utilization because it isn't time specific. There was a question about national standards; these exist for average utilization but not peak. There was a suggestion to include number of areas available for utilization in the report. **Action Item: We asked consultation representatives to share the draft report with space representatives on campus for feedback at the next meeting.**

### **Report Name**

We suggested that "Performance Report" has become too narrow for a name for this report. We asked for reactions to his concern, and if others agree with his concern, we invited suggestions for a new name.