

Performance Report Subcommittee meeting 8/20/2001

Note: Action Items noted in ***bold and italics***.

Introduction

Rob Sheehan announced the upcoming HEI move (the system will be unavailable from Aug 28 until Sept. 7 at the latest). ***Action Item: Data for the 2001 Performance Report must be finalized by 8/28/2001 and data for Subsidy FTE for FY 2001 should be finalized by 9/15/2001.*** Rob reported that some updates on a few topics would be found in the minutes of the last meeting.

Work Force Training

Data from the campuses for this report are due 8/22/2001. Rob described the data in the report as including both process data and outcome data. Sandra Spann and Michael Taggart were available to answer questions about the report. We discussed the possibility of campus specific data in the report. The OACC Performance Group suggested that no campus specific data is needed, but we questioned that and Rob suggested that campuses discuss this question. The scope of the current draft report is the Enterprise Ohio campuses. The report describes Enterprise Ohio schools as two-year school; however, YSU is in the group. We noted that there is workforce training at universities too. We discussed reporting revenue for work force training by campus. Data consisting of total revenue received, total revenue matched and number of students trained might be available for workforce training that is outside the scope of Enterprise Ohio. The group felt that we should maximize the scope of work force training reported. Number of trainees is more meaningful than costs or revenues. ***Action Item: The report will be re-written to clarify that state workforce training is a large area of activity, represented in part by the campus reported Non-Credit Instructional Revenue file of HEI. Within that large area, the Enterprise Ohio campuses are a network of focused activity on workforce training.***

Note: The Noncredit Instructional Revenue (NR) file is used in HEI to report revenue for work force training. It is due Aug 1 - Aug 31 for the FY 2001 data.

Salary of Graduates

We discussed this report and the new data added for salary .5, 1.5 and 2.5 years after graduation. These data involve salaries earned in the 4th quarter 2000 for graduates in SP term 1998, 1999 and 2000. Salaries are not adjusted for inflation in this time period. ***Action Item: We decided to delete the number of graduates from the report since it is only the number of graduates for whom we measured salary. Note: we will link to other reports to identify the number of graduates.*** We will still show the percentage of Associate and Baccalaureate degree earners who are under 24 and over 23. ***Action Item: We also decided to eliminate the salaries of doctoral and professional graduates because of limited public interest and misleading data.***

We discussed a special report of salary data for a full year, to test our assumption of annualizing salary from the 4th quarter. Upon review of these

data, we agreed that the annualized salary is close enough. Ohio State University reported that in their studies 1st quarter is an anomaly, but 4th quarter is fairly representative.

There was a repeated recommendation to include salaries for high school graduates for contrast. We intend to include these data in the report when they become available from the census bureau (expected soon).

We discussed the age grouping. **Action Item: We decided to add data for associate graduates without regard to age to the rows of similar data for other degree levels.** Assumed Choice graduates are shown without age breakdown because we do not have data on their age. Moreover, Choice graduates are assumed graduates because we do not have direct data that they graduated.

There was some discussion about the relationship between the characteristics of incoming students (measured via ACT data) vs. the salary outcomes.

Action Item: We will label the three time periods, 0.5, 1.5 and 2.5 years after graduation on all related charts.

Action Item: In the Subject Field breakdown, for associate level, we will roll all the subject fields up to Engineering Technology.

A campus consultant reported that there is concern that the breakdown by subject emphasizes the idea of going to college for a vocation rather than quality of life. The other side argued that the number one reason students go to college is to get a better job. Nobody argued strenuously for excluding breakdown by subject.

We observed that there are some errors in the elimination of average salaries in cases with less than 10 graduates.

Employment Outcomes

We reviewed employment outcomes for 3 time periods (.5 years; 1.5 years; and 2.5 years after graduation and found little statewide variation. **Action item: We decided to only show employment data .5 years after graduation.** Again, we had the argument to eliminate doctoral and professional graduates from the report because the data may make it difficult to recruit students. Rob indicated that there is a public policy interest in these graduates due to the size of the state share of subsidy for these levels.

We discussed eliminating some of the percentage columns to make the report more readable. The public only cares about the student staying in state either for more education or for a job. We will review this internally and arrive at a decision.

Faculty Survey report

Action Item: We set a cutoff date for feedback from the campuses to 9/15/2001.

Space Utilization

We discussed the addition of sector and statewide rollups of the data. Campus planners should look at the data for accuracy. **Action Item: We will go with the short form data chart distributed at the meeting eliminating from the formal report the "peak day and half hour"**

Distance Learning

We need data on the NCA distance learning report.

We are still attempting to map the OLN Distance Learning course and section Ids to HEI. There is still some crosswalk data due in from campuses.

IPEDS Graduation Rates

We still need data from the campuses.

Cohort Tracking

We still need data from the campuses. We will send a consolidated list of data needed to Terry Thomas for the two-year schools.

IPEDS cost per FTE

There was a suggestion to include the amount of state support for each campus next to the cost. We will investigate this possibility; there was a question of the scope of state support to include.

There was argument that the cost data for Independent colleges is incompatible with data for public schools due to different accounting standards.

Remediation

We discussed the age breakdown on the remediation reports. The purpose of the report is to identify remediation for recent high school graduates. We considered other older age groups. We wondered if schools apply the same standards for need for remediation to all age groups. Some older students are in school just for a certain course and are not tested for remediation. **Action Item: We decided to eliminate all age groups except the under 20 group from the both reports.**

We discussed the data arrangement of branches showing by their main campus and decided to keep this arrangement for the remediation reports only. **Action Item: We should include "Main Campus" in the name of the main campus.**

We noted that there is another report on remediation on the WWW, see <http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/reports.html> .

Degrees Earned

Action Item: We decided to omit post baccalaureate and post masters certificates from this report.

Action Item: We decided to use IPEDS data for the Independent schools.

Action Item: We decided to only show the degrees earned in the latest year and link to another report for historic data.

Action Item: Here again, we should collapse the Engineering Technology Subject Fields.

Action Item: We need to clarify the heading on the Percentage columns, show the number then percent of State Total.

Schedule

We discussed the schedule of the final report and the preceding meetings. There was consensus that the work of the technical committee is now basically done. ***Action Item: We plan a full committee meeting in October and roll out the report in November. There will be no subcommittee meeting in September.***

Name of the Report

Rich Petrick had suggested that Performance Report is too narrow for this report as it has evolved. A suggestion was Annual Report. Others thought that Performance strengthens the name of the report. A compromise was suggested: *Annual Report on Higher Education in Ohio: Performance and Process Measures.*