

HEI Liaisons Phone Conference Meeting

Meeting Outcomes

August 28, 2014, 10 am-12:00 pm

HEI Staff participants: Stephanie McCann, Penelope Parmer, Adam Schiming, Chris Smith, Melissa Sponseller Also participating in meeting: David Cannon, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Data Management, Susan Eiselstein, Consultant; Michael Hopcraft

HEI Personnel Update: Stephanie recently took a new position at OBR but between now and November she will wear two hats. Please copy Penelope, Melissa, Chris and Adam on all emails so you can have faster turnaround time.

HEI Rewrite Update: The 90 day discovery period continues with the business analyst consultants. We expect to have documents from that work in mid-September and will then spend the following weeks reviewing their work. A list of questions is being compiled for a survey. We will send the initial survey to the liaisons and want the liaisons to complete the survey but would also like them to identify people at their institution to respond and forward the email to them. The survey will be sent in the next few weeks. OBR recently received a suggestion that we take all the financial files suggestions and have a meeting with financial contacts and HEI Liaisons to work through those reporting issues. This suggestion will be followed up on in the weeks following the 90 day review.

Math Initiative Quick Update: There is little to report at this time because the meeting with math chairs isn't until September. Some liaisons in our last webinar said they would be willing to come to that meeting. Stephanie hopes to send that information in the next few days. Staff at OBR are working with existing HEI data to see what we can provide with data that might currently exist.

Distance Education and HLC: We need a better way to collect data on programs and courses available through distance learning. We hoped to go through HLC to minimize reporting burden on institutions. Unfortunately the data are not useful for our needs. The data they get is too old (up to 18 months old) and will not match up to what is submitted to HEI. It's good that we get distance course sections in the ST but we may still need to know about programs.

Non Resident Graduate Students: We have had questions from Liaisons and data reporters on this issue. Also, recently there has been discussion in IUC about non-resident graduate students in online programs. Clarification on the issue has been added to the SN file. The clarification is:

Out-of-state graduate students enrolled exclusively in online (or other distance) courses are designated as ineligible for subsidy.

There was some discussion on the lack of change on the Revision Date on the data submissions document. During the meeting Stephanie noted we would change the revision date on the document to reflect the change. **NOTE: After the meeting there was discussion at OBR that in the past, we only changed the revision date for changes to data structures, major definition changes, and new field elements. Since this is not exactly a change along those lines, we can instead add, under the revision data a change date for clarifications. So going forward liaisons would see: Clarification added to revision on xxxxx xx, 20xx. Please let Stephanie and Penelope know if you would like to revisit the revision date issue.**

Definition for First-time Student of Graduates (for time to degree) : Liaisons discussed the Time to Degree reports on the web. The definition currently used to define first time student is if they took 120 hours or more at the institution as reported in the DC file, but large numbers of students come in with alternative credit (PSEOP, AP, and other credit) OBR should consider using first year and term from SE and first time in college flag. Liaisons recommended we pull down the latest report and rerun it using new code. **Note: the report has been pulled down and staff are looking at rerunning the report. However there was a request that came in after the liaisons meeting that we also somehow maintain the old report. We will discuss at a future meeting. For now, we will run the report with new definitions and share both with institutions for comment and review.**

Relationships between Salaries in FX, FF and the FD files : OBR needs to find a way to bring these fields together in a less cumbersome reporting manner. Salaries aren't matching and creating a lot of extra work. In particular, this needs to be a priority and not have to wait for a rewrite. The BA assigned to this issue (Susan) for the rewrite noted the definitions are a priority and OBR is looking at the definitions. Stephanie will ask Susan to contact schools to get advice on what definitions should be or how reporting might be handled and this will be one of the issues we work on with liaisons and financial people.

AP Research and Name File: A request was forwarded to liaisons from Articulation and Transfer that asked 4 year institutions for Name Files (NF) on AP students so that research Articulation and Transfer AP policy is better enabled. Fewer and fewer students are reporting SSN to college board so matches in HEI have been going down each year. Penelope noted that OBR may need it on a subset of students for the SSI calculation (nonresident grads) , but that is not finalized yet. Some liaisons said they would report it but OBR needs to say what years and terms they need data for. Some stated that they can only send those students that are in their systems as students that received AP credit (not all students). Others noted that their workloads are very high and OBR requirements are increasing. Where possible the six month notice should be used and we need to be clear on whether such data is

“required.” Stephanie will talk to Articulation and Transfer and other OBR staff to see what data is needed when and let them know about the institutional concerns on workload.

OBM Audit: David Cannon noted that in follow up with OBM auditors there seemed to be a lot of discrepancies in FAFSA and ACT data. He wondered about the data that schools get and how that corresponds to the data OBR receives so we can understand these differences and if we need to do anything. It was noted that the institutions only receive the ACT scores the student chooses to send and not all scores. There was some discussion on which ACT score should be used, but this would need to be brought to the subsidy group.

Next meeting: TBD