

Missouri Responses to College Ratings Survey, n=58

- 16 (27.59%) Public 4-year
- 12 (20.69%) Public 2-year
- 3 (5.17%) Public < 2-year
- 22 (37.93%) Private (non-profit) 4-year
- 1 (1.72%) Private (non-profit) 2-year
- 1 (1.72%) Private (non-profit) < 2-year
- 2 (3.45%) Other [Lender/Server]

I support the idea that the federal government should rate colleges and universities on which schools provide consumers with the best value.

Strongly Agree	3.45 %	AGREE: 43.11%
Moderately Agree	39.66 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1.72 %	DISAGREE: 55.17%
Moderately Disagree	24.14 %	
Strongly Disagree	31.03 %	

Under a college ratings plan, I support using the following metrics to measure ACCESS:

The percentage of a college's students who receive federal Pell Grants.

Strongly Agree	8.62 %	AGREE: 46.55%
Moderately Agree	37.93 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6.90 %	DISAGREE: 46.55%
Moderately Disagree	20.69 %	
Strongly Disagree	25.86 %	

The gap between the Expected Family Contribution (EFC) and total cost of attendance not covered by financial aid.

Strongly Agree	17.24 %	AGREE: 53.45%
Moderately Agree	36.21 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10.34 %	DISAGREE: 36.21%
Moderately Disagree	15.52 %	
Strongly Disagree	20.69 %	

The number of low- and moderate-income students a college enrolls.

Strongly Agree	13.79 %	AGREE: 48.27%
Moderately Agree	34.48 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.07 %	DISAGREE: 39.65%
Moderately Disagree	17.24 %	
Strongly Disagree	22.41 %	

The percentage of enrolled students who did not have a parent who attended college.

Strongly Agree	15.52 %	AGREE: 32.76%
Moderately Agree	17.24 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.52 %	DISAGREE:
Moderately Disagree	24.14 %	

Strongly Disagree	27.59 %	51.73%
-------------------	---------	---------------

I believe it is important to rate colleges and universities on ACCESS.

Strongly Agree	13.79 %	AGREE: 32.76%
Moderately Agree	18.97 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	18.97 %	
Moderately Disagree	20.69 %	DISAGREE: 48.28%
Strongly Disagree	27.59 %	

Under a college ratings plan, I support using the following metrics to measure AFFORDABILITY:

Net price: measure the cost of attendance after accounting for all federal, state and institutional grant aid.

Strongly Agree	15.52 %	AGREE: 53.45%
Moderately Agree	37.93 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8.62 %	
Moderately Disagree	12.07 %	DISAGREE: 37.93%
Strongly Disagree	25.86 %	

Price by quintile: link net price to family incomes for students who receive federal aid.

Strongly Agree	8.62 %	AGREE: 36.21%
Moderately Agree	27.59 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	20.69 %	
Moderately Disagree	15.52 %	DISAGREE: 43.11%
Strongly Disagree	27.59 %	

I believe it is important to rate colleges and universities on AFFORDABILITY.

Strongly Agree	18.97 %	AGREE: 51.73%
Moderately Agree	32.76 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.07 %	
Moderately Disagree	13.79 %	DISAGREE: 36.0%
Strongly Disagree	22.41 %	

Under a college ratings plan, I support using the following metrics to measure PERFORMANCE:

Completion rates using Federal IPEDS graduation rates, which track first-time, full-time students (scheduled to expand to broader metrics in 2017).

Strongly Agree	13.21 %	AGREE: 39.63%
Moderately Agree	26.42 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13.21 %	
Moderately Disagree	20.75 %	DISAGREE: 47.17%
Strongly Disagree	26.42 %	

Completion rates using an alternative to IPEDS based on data from the National Student Loan Data System.

Strongly Agree	5.66 %	AGREE:
----------------	--------	---------------

Moderately Agree	33.96 %	39.62%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.09 %	
Moderately Disagree	30.19 %	DISAGREE: 45.28%
Strongly Disagree	15.09 %	

A measure of student transfer rates, with particular attention to two-year college students who earn bachelor's degrees.

Strongly Agree	18.87 %	AGREE: 49.06%
Moderately Agree	30.19 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13.21 %	DISAGREE: 37.73%
Moderately Disagree	22.64 %	
Strongly Disagree	15.09 %	

Employment outcome measures that track student earnings.

Strongly Agree	13.21 %	AGREE: 26.42%
Moderately Agree	13.21 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16.98 %	DISAGREE: 56.6%
Moderately Disagree	22.64 %	
Strongly Disagree	33.96 %	

A measure of graduate-school attendance rates of former students within a defined period, such as a decade.

Strongly Agree	7.55 %	AGREE: 30.19%
Moderately Agree	22.64 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24.53 %	DISAGREE: 45.28%
Moderately Disagree	16.98 %	
Strongly Disagree	28.30 %	

The percentage of students who repay loans on time.

Strongly Agree	13.21 %	AGREE: 37.74%
Moderately Agree	24.53 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.09 %	DISAGREE: 47.17%
Moderately Disagree	22.64 %	
Strongly Disagree	24.53 %	

I believe it is important to rate colleges and universities on PERFORMANCE.

Strongly Agree	20.75 %	AGREE: 50.94%
Moderately Agree	30.19 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13.21 %	DISAGREE: 35.85%
Moderately Disagree	18.87 %	
Strongly Disagree	16.98 %	

Additional Questions:

I support the idea of linking Federal Student Aid in a performance funding model to a college ratings plan.

Strongly Agree	1.89 %	AGREE:
----------------	--------	---------------

Moderately Agree	9.43 %	11.32%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	9.43 %	
Moderately Disagree	28.30 %	DISAGREE: 79.24%
Strongly Disagree	50.94 %	

I believe the college ratings plan will make college more affordable, effectively keeping the cost of college down.

Strongly Agree	0.00%	AGREE: 16.98%
Moderately Agree	16.98 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5.66 %	DISAGREE: 77.36%
Moderately Disagree	22.64 %	
Strongly Disagree	54.72 %	

I believe the college ratings plan will hold colleges and universities accountable to their consumers.

Strongly Agree	5.66 %	AGREE: 28.3%
Moderately Agree	22.64 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11.32 %	DISAGREE: 60.38%
Moderately Disagree	32.08 %	
Strongly Disagree	28.30 %	

I believe the college ratings plan will have positive impacts on low-income student and other underrepresented populations.

Strongly Agree	3.77 %	AGREE: 18.86%
Moderately Agree	15.09 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13.21 %	DISAGREE: 67.93%
Moderately Disagree	30.19 %	
Strongly Disagree	37.74 %	

I believe the college ratings plan will effectively inform student choice.

Strongly Agree	3.77 %	AGREE: 22.64%
Moderately Agree	18.87 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.09 %	DISAGREE: 62.27%
Moderately Disagree	24.53 %	
Strongly Disagree	37.74 %	

I believe the college ratings plan will effectively inform higher education policy making.

Strongly Agree	9.43 %	AGREE: 26.41%
Moderately Agree	16.98 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.09 %	DISAGREE: 58.49%
Moderately Disagree	18.87 %	
Strongly Disagree	39.62 %	

I believe students and families are interested in knowing how colleges are rated on the proposed metrics.

Strongly Agree	5.66 %	AGREE: 35.85%
Moderately Agree	30.19 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	20.75 %	

Moderately Disagree	20.75 %	DISAGREE: 43.39%
Strongly Disagree	22.64 %	

I believe college ratings will be a driving force in student and family decisions on which institution to attend.

Strongly Agree	5.66 %	AGREE: 32.08%
Moderately Agree	26.42 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16.98 %	
Moderately Disagree	22.64 %	DISAGREE: 50.94%
Strongly Disagree	28.30 %	

I believe college ratings will improve transparency and accountability.

Strongly Agree	3.77 %	AGREE: 30.19
Moderately Agree	26.42 %	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15.09 %	
Moderately Disagree	24.53 %	DISAGREE: 54.72%
Strongly Disagree	30.19 %	

Comments, n=22:

- As a community college, we do not have a floor. We accept everyone. Some of these students simply are not able to succeed in a college setting. If we tie financial aid, for instance, to our graduation rates, we will not perform well. If the cost of attending our institution is compared to a 4-year-institution, it will score favorably. If students decide not to attend a community college based on low graduation rates that you put out, they are actually going to pay more to attend a 4 year institution rather than attending here for 2 years and then transferring. I do feel strongly that more information needs to be provided to students about the cost of attendance at regionally non-accredited institutions.
- BIG government and constant over-site is not the answer.
- fish and chips
- Graduation rates weighted heavily would hurt 2 year institutions. We try to counsel students to stay and graduate and transfer as a junior so they can utilize our more affordable rates and the A+ program if eligible.
- I believe colleges and universities provide excellent information on their websites currently for students to make their own decision on where to attend college. I feel colleges might try and make their schools look better in a comparison if this plan is forced. Rich or Poor you can go to college. It doesn't matter if your parents went or not, if you want to go you will if you make that choice. I know because I went on a full Pell and had no students loans. I made the choice to work hard on both (classes and a full time job) so I could get the degree my parents did not. Make people accountable for their own choices!!!! You only learn from your own mistakes.
- How do you rate value. Value is subjective. What is valuable to you might not have value to me.
- I believe there are enough regulations in place to hold schools accountable without it turning into a beauty pageant or competition. Consumers are smarter (or dumber) than this administration thinks they are. The smart ones are going to do their own homework to make informed decisions like they always have; and the naïve ones are going to keep making the kinds of decisions they always have. Meanwhile the educational institutions are going to keep trying to educate in spite of the additional headaches and stress created by the government.
- I have concerns on how the community colleges will fair in the college ratings. It is not always the goal of the student to complete a 2 year degree and transfer. What about the person that was just at the community college for a semester while taking care of a parent? Or the farmer's wife that just took a few courses to better manage their farming income? These are all situations that will drag down a community college's retention and completion rate which may misrepresent that colleges "success". I am in love with the proposal to move federal student aid to a performance based funding model. I see so many times people receiving funding to just spin their wheels and get no where. Now they have used all of their pell eligibility, maxed out their loans and still have not completed and

associates degree. They will earn minimum wage or slightly above and not be able to afford their student loan debt or know how to reach out to people who can help them.

- I have significant concerns about the use of the Net Price calculation in its current form. For example, there is no distinction between Institutional Direct Costs and Indirect Costs. Direct costs are what institutions should be measured on, rather than indirect costs. The direct costs are a better estimate of “sticker price”. There are also several limitations to the current calculations. Such as transfer students being excluded from the calculation. Additionally, only first year awards are accounted for and there is no measure of renewability in the gift aid reported. What if an institution stacks non-renewable awards in the first year? Their net price is dramatically decreased, but this does not accurately reflect the dramatic increase in price over the next one to four years, because the funds were stacked in the first year and that’s the timeframe that’s reported in the current calculation. The same issues apply to the quintile calculation. Lastly, the Net Price creates an unintended consequence of pressure to reduce the Net Price from various invested parties. If heeded, it could produce scenarios where the COA is reduced beyond what is considered “reasonable” for a student, but helps the institution reduce their Net Price. Adjusting the net price calculation so that direct costs, such as tuition and dorm costs are the only things that can be reduced in the COA produces creative thinking and substantive reductions in the COA, rather than arbitrary reductions to indirect costs such as personal expenses or transportation. I think measuring affordability is important, but the current Net Price calculation is sub par and should be reconsidered before making it a part of an overall rating system.
- I think a college ratings plan is a good idea to help inform students' decisions, however I don't believe funding should be linked to the ratings. I also believe that many institutions will start tailoring their admissions specifically to receive a favorable rating (in effect, working the system).
- I wish that more emphasis was placed on tuition costs than cost of attendance. Cost of attendance can vary so much depending on the school's interpretation of the defining federal guidelines and estimation of costs, as well as the students' lifestyle choices, and the cost of living, which has more to do with location and less to do with education. If more emphasis were placed on the actual cost of tuition per credit and colleges of similar prestige, or the lack thereof, were compared just on tuition costs, I think this would better highlight for students what they're paying for. Online education, in particular, is generally viewed as less prestigious and unfavorable. I find it astounding what some online universities charge per credit hour, compared to some who charge half, or even one-fourth of the cost of their competitor. However, if the college with high tuition costs estimates all other expenses on the low-end of the scale (\$0 for transportation, \$1,000 for personal expenses, etc.) and the other college with the cheaper tuition estimates their other expenses realistically (\$2,000 for transportation and \$3,000 for personal expenses) you can end up with two costs of attendances that might seem comparable, but one is allowing a student the opportunity to go further into debt over costs other than tuition. Student loans should be targeted towards tuition, and not supporting a lifestyle choice. Better regulation is needed to oversee college ratings on tuition, and not cost of attendance. Regulation is also needed to oversee reasonable housing costs for students. Take for example, San Francisco or New York. Have you seen the price of rent there? How can a college justify students borrowing loans to pay those exorbitant rates? I think that if a college wants to be in a location that urban and expensive, it should be prepared to offer reasonable student living options at a reasonable price.
- it is all about the HOW the metrics are decided and then are they measured correctly. While a great concept, the devil is in the details. Metrics/measures/etc., can be great tools, but only if the right data points are identified and then the measurements designed properly.
- It is hard to have a positive effect on affordability when it costs more to put together all the information needed for the plan by both the schools and the government. Take all that money being wasted and devote it to more student aid.
- It is like comparing oranges to apples. No two institutions are the same so it is difficult to compare them on a program of this type.
- The College Ratings Plan is a terrible idea. I hope it fails miserably and is never implemented in any way.
- The definition of completion and the populations served is so varied at a community college that they will not perform as well on a standardized ratings system, even though they are often a smart choice for a student. Students might be discouraged from attending a community college when it would have been an affordable and effective choice for them.

- The Federal government should keep in mind that different colleges and universities have different missions and while we all value education, there are different purposes of each sector of higher education and also the students we serve. I don't think the federal government should impose its values of how it sees what is best (unless it involves experts and evidence-based empirical research that proves what is best for students). For example, measuring performance on income earnings is completely ridiculous. Now, basing it on a livable wage, yes, that might be helpful to know. But, basing it on who makes the most money is pointless as different types of students place a different value on wealth versus public service and those schools serving students who will become public servants should not be penalized or rated any lower.
- There is not a fair way to rank colleges. Private, public, for profit, not for profit, job placement - they are all very different and often depend on the major the student chooses. Are we going to add how much a person makes at this first job to the ratings? What about schools that provide first generation students an opportunity to attend, but because of family priorities they choose not to continue their education. How do they major student involvement and how it relates to student success? There is a considerable amount of transparency already inherit in the system if a student/parent chooses to do their due diligence. This is just another government regulation that will favor public institutions with public funding that can add additional staff just to make sure the outcomes are favorable.
- There is too great of a disparity between universities and smaller institutions to create a ratings system that would effectively apply to all. It would be of greater benefit to students and their families to focus on lowering attendance costs and/or providing additional government financial support for students interested in attending institutions of higher education.
- This is just another way to get rid of proprietary institutions.
- When considering PERFORMANCE, a student's interest in graduate school or earnings is something that institutions can impact, but I don't think universities should qualify these outcomes for students. However, I don't think many students desire to not repay their loans on time, and it is metrics like this that I think better speak to how our institutions should be measured.
- You did not address the issue of remediation and college readiness. This is a significant issue as open access institutions accept many students who are destined to fail because they are not college ready. This give a huge advantage to institutions who only admitt students with higher GPA'so and better equipped.