

Performance Funding Comparison: Kansas and Florida

	Kansas	Florida
Funding Allocated	All new state funds are awarded according to performance agreements. "New state funds" are defined as amounts of additional state funding appropriated for the fiscal year in excess of state funding appropriated for the previous year.	The Florida Performance Funding Model will allocate a total of \$200 million for performance based funding in 2014-2015, which includes \$65 million in base funds. Florida has not provided funding based on enrollments since 2007-2008. Rather, funding is based on initiatives.
Eligibility	<p>a) Institutions negotiate new performance agreements every three years with the Board of Regents. The awarding of performance funds is based on an institution's level of compliance with its performance agreement and the funds available for distribution.</p> <p>b) Institutions submit an annual report of performance on measures in the performance agreement. The Board decides the awarding of new funding based on whether performance has been maintained, improved, or declined.</p> <p>c) If the institution has performed at or over the baseline on at least 51% of indicators then that institution is eligible for 100% of new funding available. If the institution has made a good faith effort, has maintained or improved over the baseline on less than 51% of indicators, and has included a plan for improvement then that institution is eligible for 90% of available funds. No new funding will be awarded to an institution with no approved performance agreement, no submitted performance report, and maintained or increased from the baseline in only one indicator. Any portion of funding not awarded to an institution is not reallocated to another institution</p>	<p>Institutions scoring 26 or more points on the metrics are eligible for a share of new funding and have base funding restored. Institutions not scoring at least 26 points do not receive new funds and must submit improvement plans and show progress in order to have base funding restored.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div>

Guiding Principles

The Board's strategic plan provides the foundation for the institutional performance agreements:

- ❖ **Strategic Goal #1:** Increase higher education attainment among Kansans
- ❖ **Strategic Goal #2:** Improve alignment of the state's higher education system with the needs of the Kansas economy
- ❖ **Strategic Goal #3:** Improve state university excellence

The Florida model has four guiding principles:

1. Use metrics that align with SUS Strategic Plan goals
2. Reward excellence or improvement
3. Have a few clear, simple metrics
4. Acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions



<p>Metrics</p>	<p>The universities must include in the performance agreements at least three indicators from the <i>Foresight 2020</i> goals noted below. One of those indicators must include the Goal Three.</p> <p>Sector-Specific Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Increasing Higher Education Attainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First to second year retention rates • Number of certificates and degrees awarded • Six-year graduation rates ❖ Meeting the Needs of the Kansas Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance of students on institutional assessments • Percent of certificates and degrees awarded in STEM fields ❖ Ensuring State University Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Institutions - Selected regional and national rankings • Comprehensive Institutions - Performance on quality measures compared to peers <p>Institution-Specific Indicators Universities must also include three indicators specific to the institution which support <i>Foresight 2020</i>.</p>	<p>The Florida 10-Metric Model:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="922 268 1425 1476"> <tr> <td data-bbox="922 268 1174 499">1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</td> <td data-bbox="1174 268 1425 499">2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="922 499 1174 667">3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree</td> <td data-bbox="1174 499 1425 667">4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="922 667 1174 877">5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)</td> <td data-bbox="1174 667 1425 877">6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="922 877 1174 1171">7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)</td> <td data-bbox="1174 877 1425 1171">8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="922 1171 1174 1381">8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)</td> <td data-bbox="1174 1171 1425 1381">9. Board of Governors Choice</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="922 1381 1425 1476">10. Board of Trustees Choice</td> </tr> </table>	1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further	2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates	3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree	4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)	5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)	7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)	8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)	8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)	9. Board of Governors Choice	10. Board of Trustees Choice	
1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further	2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates													
3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree	4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)													
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)													
7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)	8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)													
8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)	9. Board of Governors Choice													
10. Board of Trustees Choice														
<p>Weighting</p>	<p>There is no weighting of metrics in the Kansas model.</p>	<p>Presently the Florida 10-Metric Model is not weighted but the Board reserves the option to weight specific metrics such as Cost per Degree, Six Year Graduation Rate, and Academic Progress Rate.</p>												
<p>Institutional Control</p>	<p>Institutions do not control the amount of new funding available for the performance based model but do have choice of metrics among given options. Metrics must be aligned with the Board's strategic plan and must be approved by the Board. Institutions also propose a baseline for each performance metric.</p>	<p>Florida institutions also do not have control over appropriation levels and institutions can control performance on outcomes within reason. However, the Florida 10-Metric Model does give institutions some control given that there is a metric chosen by institutional boards as part of the model.</p>												

<http://www.kansasregents.org/resources/PDF/2446-revisedfundingguidelines4-19-2013.pdf>